

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 June 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 of Assembly that Royal Assent had been proclaimed on 8 April 1982 regarding the Constitution Act, 1934-1981.

## ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Brands Act Amendment,  
Commercial Tribunal,  
Correctional Services,  
Evidence Act Amendment (1982),  
Friendly Societies Act Amendment,  
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science,  
Justices Act Amendment (1982),  
Licensing Act Amendment (1982),  
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment,  
Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act Amendment,  
Prices Act Amendment (1982),  
Radiation Protection and Control,  
South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission Act Amendment,  
Stamp Duties Act Amendment (No. 2) (1982),  
Statutes Amendment (Consumer Credit and Transactions),  
St Jude's Cemetery (Vesting),  
Trade Measurements Act Amendment,  
Trading Stamp Act Amendment,  
Trustee Act Amendment,  
Workers Compensation Act Amendment (1982).

## NEW MEMBER FOR MITCHAM

Mrs Heather Joyce Southcott, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took her seat in the House as member for the District of Mitcham, in place of Mr Robin Rhodes Millhouse (resigned).

## DEATH OF HON. J. E. DUNFORD

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

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the **Hon. J. E. Dunford**, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service; and that, as a mark of respect to the former member, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The late Jim Dunford was elected to the Legislative Council on 12 July 1975. He served on the Industries Development Committee from 26 April 1979 until the date of his death, and represented the South Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at the twenty-fourth C.P.A. Conference, held in Jamaica in September 1978. He was born at Terang, Victoria, on 10 April 1930, and was actively involved in the Australian Labor Party for some 35 years, being a convention delegate for 12 years and a member of the State Executive. He was actively involved

in the union movement and, of course, especially the Australian Workers Union. I am sure that all members of this Chamber will join with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs Dunford and to the family.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition)**: For all of us, of course, it comes as a shock, and I think presents a sense of loss, when any of our Parliamentary colleagues dies and is no longer part of the Chamber and Parliamentary life. In the case of the **Hon. Jim Dunford** we on this side of the House, I think without exception, share a very deep sense of personal shock and loss. Jim Dunford touched all of our lives in some way very directly indeed. The Premier has outlined his Parliamentary career, his contribution in that part of his life when he was a member of the Parliament, but in terms of activities within the Labor Party and the trade union movement, as has been mentioned, Jim Dunford's career goes back many years. He was always an activist, whatever trade or profession he may have been working on at any point of his life. He was always somebody who had a great impact, not only on those around him but in support of the causes about which he felt so strongly.

I think one thing probably not sufficiently recognised about Jim Dunford is that he also had considerable administrative abilities. I was privileged for a time to work under him when he was Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, a task involving a number of skills, not the least of which was administrative skill. Jim had a very impressive ability to make decisions, to provide extremely important back-up to both his organisers in the field and his industrial research officers and advocates in the courts, which left a deep impression on all those who were involved in his period of administration at the Australian Workers Union.

I think on this occasion it is very much the personal feelings that come to the fore. Jim Dunford was combative; he was a fighter; and he was never ashamed to put his point of view, firmly and vigorously, whatever the circumstances. He would not tolerate (and I guess this is one of the most striking qualities for which I will always remember him) hypocrisy or humbug. He knew when someone was not being honest or straightforward in their approach to something, and he was prepared to say so and confront the issue fairly and squarely. There are probably too many people who are not prepared to do that, and that is one very big gap that Jim Dunford leaves: he was willing and able always to say what he meant and to say where he detected others involved in what he would regard as hypocritical or unreasonable stands.

I feel privileged to have known him and I will remember with delight, as will many of my colleagues, his stories, his experiences, and his very liveliness, which will be sadly, sadly missed in the Labor Party and in the trade union movement. All of those who attended his funeral service and ceremony will never forget it, and it certainly highlighted and put the seal on a career which none of us will forget. On behalf of the Labor Party and the Opposition, I would like to express formally my condolences to his wife, Betty, and his family, so well known to us all, and to express our feelings for them in their sorrow at Jim's untimely death.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)**: Every speech that a Parliamentarian makes is a difficult one, but the few words that I want to say about a comrade who has passed on will possibly involve some of the most difficult words I will ever have to say in this Parliament (or at least I sincerely hope so). Any person who attempts to understand the relationship that my family had with Jim Dunford and his family needs to go back half a lifetime.

Norma and I first met Jim Dunford in Broken Hill in 1949 when, for reasons similar to mine, he had left his place of origin because of his volatile union activities. In fact, Jim Dunford represented my parents at our wedding. I can say clearly that Jim Dunford was one of the finest unionists I have ever known. He was a rebel when I first met him, and while he might have changed his causes for his rebellious nature, to the day he died he was still a rebel. For example, the last time I saw him was when we marched together on May Day this year. Many of us in the shearing industry shared with Jim Dunford our comradeship, our loyalty, and our determination to resist attacks from the squatters of this nation, employer organisations and, unfortunately, even the reactionary bureaucrats of the Australian Workers Union. Jim Dunford never shirked any of those challenges. He was always to the fore, even if it meant exposing himself to once again being named by the employers as a man who was on their hit list, not to be re-employed.

Jim and I were involved in many minor disputes and in some major struggles, namely, the 1951 and 1956 shearers' strikes. I sincerely believe that Jim's great strength of character was never more pronounced than in 1965, when the reactionary forces of the Australian Workers Union took control of the South Australian branch and dismissed all of the paid and unpaid officials. After an eight-month struggle, when both of us returned to our former profession of shearing, Jim and all of his mates were reinstated by the Federal Industrial Court to their elected positions. This was another classic case of the man who knew that the cause was right and therefore worth fighting for to the finish.

In my view, Jim Dunford was an outstanding union official because of his great dedication to rectifying industrial and social injustices in our society. He was a man who sincerely believed that those injustices could only be rectified permanently by changing the current political system. He had very deep fundamental beliefs that a socialist way of life was the only real one for the underprivileged in our society. With his usual zest and enthusiasm, this was the course that Jim pursued all his working life. Jim Dunford—shearer, unionist, protagonist, union official, socialist, and family man. South Australian and, indeed, Australian working conditions are much better for his short journey through this life. I know that all his friends and supporters join me in saying that I wish that his journey had been a lot longer. We all very much regret Jim's death and offer our deepest sympathy to his wife, Betty, and children, Peter, Tracey, Jamie, and Matthew, to his mother, who is 85 years of age, and also to his brother, Paddy, and sister, Kathleen.

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** I would like to support what my colleague, Jack Wright, has just said. We were both shearers and organisers with the same union, the Australian Workers Union. I would just like to say briefly that my first meeting with Jim Dunford was in 1951 at Broken Hill, and on that occasion I had a disagreement with Jim. Jim was a fresh-faced young fellow who had big ideas and at that time I had just met him. We had had a dispute at a shearing shed, and we were discussing it in town with a shearing contractor. Jim, knowing a couple of the shearers, also joined in the discussion, and, because he was not shearing in the shed, I had a few words with Jim. I came out of that discussion having learnt a fair bit. I have respected Jimmy Dunford for all the years since then until he died, and I still respect him. I am certain, because he said so, that Jim Dunford also respected me from the time that I met him.

At a later stage, I supported Jimmy Dunford as a unionist to become an organiser, as I thought that he would be able to hold that position because he had stood up for workers, the aged and the underprivileged, throughout his life, since he was about 15 or 16 years of age. This was prior to my

meeting him, as he was in his early twenties when I met him. Jim's first concern was about conditions, rates of pay and to ensure that elderly people were looked after. As I said, Jim won an election and became an official of the Australian Workers Union, and for many years I was a shearer while Jim Dunford was an organiser. I never heard anyone criticise Jim Dunford for what he did as an organiser. He always did his job. Subsequently, I became an organiser with support from Jim. He also became President and then Secretary of the State Branch of the Australian Workers Union, and, as an organiser, I worked under him.

I would like to say here that Jim Dunford was one of the finest secretaries, State-wise, that a person could possibly work under. It would take too long to explain why this was so, but I always expressed the view that Jim was a tremendous person to work under. I then also came into Parliament, as Jim did, and since entering Parliament I have been very close to Jimmy Dunford as everyone in the House would know. He will be sadly missed by me, and I send my condolences to Betty, his wife, whom I have known for many years, and also to Peter, his eldest boy Jamie, Matthew, Tracey, Jimmy's mother, and Paddy Dunford, his brother, and his sister, Kathleen.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I would like to pay a tribute to Jim Dunford, whom I knew in none of the ways that have been described by previous speakers. I knew him as a constituent, as he and his family lived in my electorate, although that was not the case at the time of Jim's death. In that capacity, as a constituent of mine, I knew Jim as an absolutely devoted husband and father, a family man who was very much committed to the welfare of his children. At the time when one of his children was undergoing a severe illness, which caused great worry to his parents, I kept in touch with Jim to try to keep track of the child's progress. It was then that I came to know him as a man of very great warmth and of tremendous fatherly affection.

Because no members of us in this place could possibly do their jobs if it were not for the support of their families, I would like to place on record that I know that Jim's wife, Betty, was the most tremendous support and comfort to him, and I doubt whether he could have fulfilled his role in either the trade union movement, the Labor Party, or this Parliament without the very strong support of his family, to whom I offer my condolences.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I wish to support the motion that the Premier has moved. I came to know Jimmy Dunford somewhat later than my colleagues, the member for Adelaide and the member for Peake. I first met him in about 1968, and from that time on he and I got on very well, and I was privileged to call him a friend and, particularly within the Labor movement, a comrade.

Jim Dunford was a very unique person. Wherever I went throughout Australia, I kept running across people who knew Jim Dunford. When I would say that I was a member of the Labor movement in South Australia or a member of the South Australian Parliament, people would say, 'You would probably know Jim Dunford.' I cannot turn my mind to any other person whom I have known in my lifetime and who seemed to have more friends not only in this State but throughout this nation of ours. I was very privileged to consider myself to be a friend of his. Jim, probably more than anyone, was responsible for launching me on my political career. He supported me and always did so throughout the time that I have been in this place.

I heard with great sadness of his death while I was in Sydney. That night I was speaking to an old friend of his, who, I think, summed up all our feelings when he said to

me, 'I hope that when I die they can say that I compromised myself as little as Jimmy Dunford did.' I think that really epitomises and sums up the way in which we all saw Jim. As has been said, he was a great fighter, and Jim had causes in which he passionately believed. Although his life's work was interrupted by his premature death, Jim added very greatly to the furtherance of those causes while he was with us.

I can remember when Jim, as a member of the Legislative Council, on many occasions brought to my attention constituents of his who had particular legal problems and asked me for advice. I can say that more than anyone else he made a layman's judgment as to the fairness of that advice, not as to the legal correctness of it, and he was one person who was never prepared to accept a situation that he did not consider to be fair. If Jim came across an unfair situation, he would fight and struggle to see that situation corrected and to see the anomaly or injustice overturned.

I, too, want to convey my condolences to the members of his family, whom I know very well. I am sure that there are thousands of people in this community who support with great sadness the motion that the Premier has moved today.

**Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson):** I, too, wish to support the Premier's motion and to say that I think the numbers attending the funeral of Jimmy Dunford must surely be seen as a living testimony to the man. Although I was not privileged to know Jim for any length of time, I recall the last session here before rising for Easter when Jim taught me a lesson that I think a lot of us young rookies need to learn when we first get into politics: that we may fight on political grounds within the House but that, while out of the House, there is a time and a place to be friends and to discuss things in general.

Jim gave me a lift home that night, and that is one of the things he pointed out. He wanted very much to be a part of the people living in the southern areas of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide. He wanted us to work together in that southern area as friends and for the benefit of the community there, putting our politics aside.

I also endorse the comments made by the Minister of Health about the support that Jim's wife, Betty, gave Jim. With Betty working in the office next door to mine, I got to know her fairly well and, through her, to know a lot more about Jim. I therefore convey my condolences to Betty and wish her well for the future. I again express my respect for the man because, as I said before, the numbers attending his funeral must surely be testimony to the merit of the man.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.28 to 2.35 p.m.]*

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the death of the Hon. J. E. Dunford.

#### PETITION: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 128 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a

pedestrian crossing on South Road, Mile End, in the vicinity of King Street, was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.  
Petition received.

#### PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL COSTS

A petition signed by 14 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 Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: ROAD REPAIR

A petition signed by 168 residents of the Spalding area praying that the House urge the Government to provide the necessary funding to repair the Spalding to Hilltown and Andrews to Booborowie roads was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: TEROWIE WATER

A petition signed by 57 residents of Terowie praying that the House urge the Government to provide an adequate water reticulation system for the township of Terowie was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: WOODVILLE FOOTBALL CLUB

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to enforce the Noise Control Act, 1976-1977, in relation to the Woodville Football Club, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: ONKAPARINGA RIVER

A petition signed by 1 851 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to take immediate action to return the Onkaparinga to a clean, free-flowing river was presented by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: BETTING SHOPS

A petition signed by 1 460 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the closure of the licensed betting premises in Port Pirie was presented by Mr Slater.

Petition received.

#### PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 1 056 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 the Hons P. B. Arnold, J. W. Olsen, D. O. Tonkin, and D. C. Wotton, and Messrs Abbott, Ashenden, Billard, Evans, Mathwin, and Trainer.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: BAROSSA WATER SUPPLY**

A petition signed by 158 residents of the District Council of Barossa praying that the House urge the Government to provide residents of the District Council of Barossa with a water supply of reasonable pressure and quality and provide financial recompense for the non-ratable lands controlled by the E. & W.S. Department was presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the 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. 238, 289, 324, 382, 385, 391, 392, 429, 461, 466, 474, 488, 526, 570, 580, 583, 588, 592 and 597.

**LEAD IN BLOOD**

In reply to **Mr KENEALLY** (30 March).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The current blood lead testing programme is being conducted by the Port Pirie Local Board of Health. It was developed in consultation with the Central Board of Health, and arose from requests from parents of primary school children. It is understood that these requests arose from the concern of some parents over the finding of elevated blood leads in a small number of children.

The absorption of lead from environmental sources in Port Pirie has been shown in the past to occur mainly in toddlers and young children who crawl and play on contaminated particles of lead-based paint. These occurrences in adults are quite unusual. By far, the major cause of elevated blood lead in adults is exposure due to occupation.

For these reasons, it was felt that there was little justification in arranging a programme to include the whole population of Port Pirie. Rather, it was felt that the group in the population most at risk, that is, pre-school and primary school children, should be offered the opportunity of a blood lead test. When these results have been processed, further consideration can be given to the need for other investigations.

The programme is by voluntary participation. It is quite usual in such programmes to protect those offering the service from legal action arising over some accidental occurrence. Accordingly, the Local Board of Health was advised to attach an indemnity clause to the application form. The solicitors of the local board interpreted the meaning of the clause as follows:

the indemnity form as it stands fully covers all concerned against any claim arising out of the blood tests. It is a matter of interpretation how far that indemnity goes, and at the end of the day it would be up to a court to provide an authoritative interpretation. The indemnity was, as I understand it, to relieve all involved with the testing of any responsibility as far as the test itself was concerned, but not from liability for claims for damages if any grounds for legal action were established. My own view is that the indemnity is limited to that extent but, of course, it is open to others to interpret it very widely.

The indemnity clause covers the interests of the Local Board of Health, the Central Board of Health and the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty Ltd.

**WORKERS COMPENSATION**

In reply to **Mr HEMMINGS** (1 April).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Until about six months ago, queries relating to workers compensation charges and the attitude of insurance companies to the payment of such charges were directed towards the reasons why recognised hospitals charged a higher fee for compensable patients.

However, since then, there have been a number of new types of workers compensation queries relating to the following matters:

(a) Attempts by solicitors to:

refuse payment of recognised hospital accounts on the basis that no provision was made in the settlement to cover hospital and medical fees; or

have the account reduced to ordinary rates;

or

pay only a percentage of the account, alleging that there was only a partial settlement of claim;

(b) the lodging with the health benefit funds of claims for hospital and/or medical fund benefits where the patient was clearly a workers compensation case;

(c) a number of private hospitals which have:

set substantially higher inpatient fee rates for compensable patients; or

charged interest on all accounts outstanding for more than one or two months; and

(d) the refusal by at least one insurance company to pay private hospital accounts at the higher rates or to pay interest.

The current schedule fee (in force from 18 November 1981) for Item 25 is \$20.50. From time to time the Australian Medical Association has advised doctors of its own suggested fee rates, which are generally slightly higher than the schedule fees. It is not known what the A.M.A. suggested fee is for Item 25, but based on a small number of known A.M.A. suggested fees, it would appear unlikely to be as high as \$25.50. In addition, there is a fairly common practice of doctors charging a fee in excess of the schedule fee or A.M.A. suggested fee, but reducing it to a lower level where immediate payment is made. Given this situation, it would be difficult to assert positively that a higher fee was charged because the patient was a workers compensation case. However, it is probable that this was in fact the situation.

No information is available as to the average period for which workers compensation hospital and medical charges are outstanding, but prior to the agreement with the State Government Insurance Commission in relation to motor vehicle third party, the average was 2½ years to 3 years. Normally, workers compensation cases are considered to be outstanding after a shorter period than this, but, nevertheless, for a period significantly in excess of outstanding ordinary patient accounts. While there is no positive proof, it is suspected that workers compensation cases are taking longer to settle than previously.

I believe the following points may assist in understanding the overall situation:

recognised hospitals and an increasing number of private hospitals charge a higher fee for compensable patients (motor vehicle third party and workers compensation);

on average, the time a compensable patient account remains unpaid is greater than for other patients; many doctors provide a substantial discount for payment at the time of consultation;

while doctors in South Australia have a greater rate of adherence to the schedule fee than in other States,

there is still a significant number who either set their own fee or follow the A.M.A. suggested fee; there appears to be a basis for querying the item number charged if the consultation was for less than 25 minutes; without knowledge of the fee normally charged by the doctor in question for an Item 25 consultation, it is not possible to determine whether a high fee was charged because the patient was a workers compensation case, but this would appear to be likely; while higher fees can be justified in respect of recognised hospitals, where the ordinary fees are less than average cost, the only justification for higher fees to be raised by private hospitals and medical practitioners in private practice would be the time taken to receive payment and the extra accounting costs involved—any documentation or reports are usually subject to an additional fee.

#### HOTEL ASSAULTS

In reply to Mr MAX BROWN (3 March).

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Information concerning the number of assaults occurring in hotels is not readily available from records compiled by the Police Department. To obtain the information would involve a labour-intensive exercise to analyse manual files.

#### PROTECTED SPECIES TRADING

In reply to Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (31 March).

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** No officers from the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department of Environment and Planning were attending a conference interstate when the question was asked, nor was a complaint received by the Minister of Environment and Planning from any pet shop proprietors concerning the matter.

It is true that inspectors from the National Parks and Wildlife Service were attending a training course at the Cleland Conservation Park during the week in question. However, arrangements were made prior to the commencement of the course for any enquiries needing the urgent attention of an inspector to be relayed to the course venue. It should be appreciated that any enquiry from the city area could have been attended by an inspector within thirty minutes.

In addition, an inspector attended at the division's office at Unley on each day of the course to deal with any outstanding matters on a day-to-day basis. Dealers have expressed satisfaction with the arrangements made. Further, some members of the committee of the Pet Traders Association have dissociated themselves from any complaint regarding these arrangements.

#### PRECIOUS STONES FIELDS

In reply to Mr GUNN (31 March).

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Discussions have taken place between departmental officers and the company concerned and the matter of access for your constituents has now been resolved.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Highways Department Regional Office, Port Augusta, Mount Barker South Primary School—Stages II and III,

Robe Water Supply Improvements.

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

Port Broughton Area School—Replacement, South Coast Boat Launching Facility (O'Sullivan Beach), A.D.P. Centre (Glenside) (Report No. 2).

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SUMITOMO METAL INDUSTRIES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am overwhelmed by leave being granted, Mr Speaker. I am pleased to be able to report to the House on discussions I had this morning with senior executives of the Japanese firm, Sumitomo Metal Industries. Members would be aware that during my recent visit to Japan I had talks with Sumitomo about the possibility of utilising Wakefield coal for a major coal-to-gas project. During those talks the company expressed the desire to send representatives to South Australia for more detailed discussions on this project.

As a result of those further discussions today, I am pleased to be able to inform the House that the Government and the company have agreed on the basis for a joint feasibility study into this project. This agreement has been formalised in a letter which I have forwarded this afternoon to Mr Nire, the General Manager of the Coal Technology Department of Sumitomo Metal Industries Ltd. I now quote from the letter:

Dear Mr Nire,

I am pleased to acknowledge your intention, indicated at our meeting today, to enter into a joint feasibility study in connection with the gasification of Port Wakefield coal. As a result of our discussions, which we have had in both Adelaide and Tokyo, I am well aware of the interest of Sumitomo Metal Industries Limited and Sumitomo Corporation in this project. The South Australian Government is very pleased with the progress already made by your company. It appreciates the considerable amount of work already carried out at the central research laboratories and understands that this will now lead to the testing in the pilot plant at Kashima Steel Works. We are pleased that the knowledge already derived will be applied to the feasibility study to be conducted in connection with the Wakefield Coal deposit owned by E.T.S.A.

The South Australian Government wishes to assure you of its desire to assist Sumitomo in every way to progress this matter through to a conclusion. We acknowledge that there is a long time frame involved and that if the results of the studies are satisfactory, production would not be likely before 1988.

In view of your commitment to a joint feasibility study, the Government of South Australia will be pleased to make available the resources of the appropriate Government departments and E.T.S.A. personnel to assist your officers throughout the various stages which are detailed in the preliminary study presented to me today. This will also involve the supply and delivery of an adequate quantity of coal for testing and the provision of Amdel facilities for analytical work and some other evaluations. At this stage, I feel it is appropriate for me to indicate the Government's desire to bring about a successful conclusion to the feasibility studies which also opens the way for discussion to take place on the other ways in which my Government can be of assistance in the following stages of what I hope will be a very successful project.

Those are the terms of my letter to Sumitomo. Members will be aware that this announcement comes at a time when the Government is considering a range of options to ensure that its future energy needs are provided for. In this respect, the Minister of Mines and Energy has initiated negotiations

with a view to rationalising current contracts for the supply of natural gas from the Cooper Basin, to extend, if possible, those supplies for South Australia's needs beyond 1987. In this context, gasification can be seen as one option to meet our future gas needs in the 1990s and beyond.

Members would be aware that the Wakefield coal is one of several deposits in South Australia being evaluated at present. Others include those at Kingston in the South-East, at Sedan and in the Arckaringa Basin. The Government has previously announced its interest in considering a range of options for developing and utilising these deposits. Gasification in the manner proposed by Sumitomo is one option which officers in the Department of Mines and Energy have been examining for some time, and I am pleased that their work has been instrumental in attracting the interest of Sumitomo. The Department of Mines and Energy will manage this joint study on the Government's behalf.

Sumitomo began initial experiments in coal gasification early in 1978. In April 1979, the planning of a pilot plant with a capacity of 60 tonnes of coal per day was begun. In February 1980, the pilot plant construction was completed in the firm's Kshima steel works. If this feasibility study does bring positive and successful results which lead to a full-scale coal-to-gas project, it will mean, of course, another major resource-based industry for South Australia. It would involve investment of hundreds of millions of dollars and, more to the point, generate further employment opportunities, with many more jobs, particularly in the construction phase.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROXBY DOWNS SELECT COMMITTEE

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know whether the habit of distributing copies of Ministerial statements is still in vogue. However, I wish to report to the House that it has been decided to convene another meeting of the Select Committee on the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill later today to clarify an aspect of the evidence already presented on which further information has been submitted for consideration. As a result, it will not be possible to table the Select Committee report today, as originally indicated. I expect to be in a position to table the report tomorrow.

The Government has taken this course because of its determination to ensure that every point at issue before the committee is fully canvassed. It would be improper, of course, under Standing Orders relating to the conduct of Select Committees, to make any public disclosure about the nature of the evidence so far given to the committee, or that to be considered at the further meeting later today.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982—Regulations—Threshold Rate for Credit Unions.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

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

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Electrical Articles and Materials Act, 1940-1967—Regulations—Examination and Testing Fees.
- ii. Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Act, 1981—Regulations—Removal of Sand.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—

- i. Commercial Safety Code—Registrations.
- ii. Industrial Safety Code—Regulations.
- iii. Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1981.
- iv. Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1979—Regulations—Provision of Statistics.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1980—Regulations—Child Reports.
- ii. Companies Act, 1962-1980—Regulations—Fees for Companies Auditors Board.
- iii. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Special Days and Closure of Schools.
- iv. Further Education Act, 1975-1980—Regulations—Reappointment of Officers.
- Rules of Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—
- v. Land and Valuation Rules—Notices of Valuation.
- vi. Supreme Court Rules—Costs.

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

- i. Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 113th Meeting, 8 February 1982.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1979—Regulations—Compensation Payable.
- ii. Forestry Act, 1950-1981—Proclamation—Oodnadatta Forest Reserve Resumed.
- iii. Meat Hygiene Act, 1980—Regulations—Chillers.
- iv. Vertebrate Pests Control Authority—Report, 1980-81.
- v. Marketing of Eggs Act—Report of Auditor-General on, 1980-81.

By the Hon. W. E. Chapman, on behalf of the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980—Regulations. Exemption from Prohibition of Keeping Alsatian Dogs.
- ii. Dog Control Act, 1979-1981—Regulations—Tattooing of Dogs.
- iii. Local Government Act, 1934-1981—Proclamation—Model By-law—Tattooing of Dogs.
- Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981—Regulations—
- iv. Corporation of Salisbury Planning Regulations—Zoning Amendment.
- v. Whyalla Planning Area Development Plan—Corporation of Whyalla—Development Control.
- vi. City of Henley and Grange—By-law No. 1—Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore.
- vii. City of Marion—By-law No. 31—Playgrounds.
- viii. City of Mount Gambier—By-law No. 24—Signboards.
- ix. City of Noarlunga—By-law No. 25—Dogs.
- x. City of West Torrens—By-law No. 54—Keeping of Dogs.
- xi. City of Whyalla—By-law No. 19—Public Health.
- xii. District Council of Onkaparinga—By-law No. 33—Keeping of Dogs.

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

- i. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Display of L and P Plates.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1980—Regulations—Trade Promotion Lotteries.
- ii. Racing Act, 1976-1982—Rules of Trotting—Blood Typing.

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

- i. Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1980—Regulations—Public Trustee's Commission and Fees.
- ii. Consumer Credit Act, 1972-1980—Regulations—Delegation of Chairman's powers.
- Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—
  - iii. Fees for Committee Members.
  - iv. Licence Fees.
- v. Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1981—Regulations—Board Fees.
- Health Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—
  - vi. Clean Air (Port Augusta).
  - vii. Slaughterhouses.
  - viii. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1980-81.
- ix. Licensing Act, 1967-1982—Regulations—Fees for Late Night Permits.
- x. Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978—Regulations—Licence Fees.
- xi. Occupational Therapists Act, 1974—Regulations—Fees.
- xii. Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—Airports.
- xiii. Trade Standards Act—Report on, 1980-81.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. River Murray Waters Act, 1935-1971—Regulations—Control of Vessels.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. J. W. Olsen)—

*By Command—*

Report of the Royal Commission on allegations in relation to prisons under the charge, care and direction of the Director of the Department of Correctional Services and certain related matters.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—
- i. United Friendly Societies Council of South Australia.
  - ii. The South Australian District No. 81 Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly Society. Amendments of General Laws.
  - iii. Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1982—Regulations—Dollar Limits.
  - iv. Prisons Act, 1936-1981—Variation of Regulations.
  - v. Commissioner of Police—Report, 1980-81.

## QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on questions, I indicate that any questions to the Minister of Environment and Planning will be taken throughout this week by the Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the asking of questions without notice to be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

## TAX AVOIDANCE

**Mr BANNON:** Will the Premier say whether the Government has directed the Corporate Affairs Commission to investigate whether the tax avoidance schemes revealed by the Premier of Victoria last week are operating also within South Australia; in addition, whether any large-scale avoidance of State tax is occurring, and if not, why not? Last week the Premier of Victoria (Mr Cain), gave the Victorian Parliament details of a \$200 000 000 tax avoidance industry involving almost 1 000 Melbourne-based companies and a number of business men, some of whom are known in this State. Because of these schemes, hundreds of millions of dollars are being lost to revenue and an inequitable burden is being put on ordinary wage and salary earners who are paying their full share. This also has a direct impact on South Australia, as it reduces the funds that the Commonwealth has to distribute. That \$200 000 000 means that about \$4 500 000 is lost to South Australia under the tax-sharing entitlement. The report of an independent investi-

gating team, which the Victorian Premier tabled, revealed details of companies being deliberately stripped of assets and dumped so as to avoid tax. The Australian Taxation Office apparently was aware of what was going on but was powerless to take action, or possibly unwilling to act. On the question of State tax avoidance, the House will recall statements made by the Premier in this House last year during the Estimates Committees, when he said he had not had reports in specific terms of substantial avoidance.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Corporate Affairs Commission is constantly observing the possible cases of tax avoidance referred to it in respect of State taxation. I may say, first, to put the record straight, that investigations which resulted in the report being laid on the table on the Victorian Parliament, although they were laid on by Mr Cain, were initiated by the former Liberal Government. It refers in great part to practices that took place over several years. I should point out, to reassure the Leader, that many of the practices complained of in that document have now been stopped by the passage of Commonwealth legislation designed specifically to overcome the difficulties that he talked of.

I do not think that anyone in this House would in any way condone the practice of tax avoidance, especially on the scale we have heard of in recent times. It seems to be an on-going affair. It also seems that as soon as one loophole is closed some person can find another. Obviously, the Federal Government and the Federal investigation authorities are constantly looking for examples of new tax avoidance schemes. Obviously, if the Leader has any details of any kind about such matters he has a duty to put them forward. The suggestion that the Commonwealth has been powerless to act, which the Leader has made, is therefore proved, in fact, not to be true because it has acted, and acted quite conclusively, in making changes to close the loopholes that exist.

So far as State taxation is concerned (and I understand that that is the gravamen of the Leader's question), the matter is under constant review and, from time to time (as he would know), measures are brought before this House to close loopholes. Indeed, I can think of three instances since this Government has been in office and I can recall numbers of others introduced by former Governments. There will be a constant review of this situation and steps will be taken wherever necessary to close any loopholes that appear. If the Leader is desperately hoping to be able to pull some \$200 000 000 out of the air in order to finance his rather interesting and totally impractical economic package, then I am afraid he will be very disappointed.

## INVESTMENT FIGURES

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Will the Premier report to the House the latest investment figures for South Australia and how they compare with those of other States? Many recent announcements have been reported concerning investment in this State. They include the international airport terminal, the Telecom building, the aquatic centre and the Windy Point restaurant, to name just a few. Earlier this year, the \$1 000 000 000 mark was passed and reported to this House by the Premier. I am sure the latest figures will be of interest to us all.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is very important, I think, that we have placed on record very clearly (and this is something I have said time and time again for many months) that this Government is totally dedicated to investment and development in South Australia simply because investment and development in South Australia means more jobs for South Australian's and more jobs means more financial

security. That is the long and the short of our search for investment. There is no question but that the situation so far as South Australia is concerned is a very heartening one indeed. I refer honourable members to an article in the *Financial Review* of Tuesday 25 May 1982, at page 12. That article is an extraordinarily good one. It goes into the general overall picture of the financial situation of the various States and the economic status of Australia as a whole. It states:

One surprising feature of the slide towards recession in Australia is that the States which suffered most in employment terms in the upswing are now showing the strongest growth in employment.

To give one or two quotations, the article states later:

New South Wales is bearing the brunt of the labour market downturn, while South Australia's in danger of losing its status as the Cinderella State.

Later, the report states:

Western Australia has fallen down a hole, surpassed only by an even bigger descent of the Tasmanians. On the other hand poor little South Australia, written off for years, has turned in an even better recent performance than Jo Bjelke-Petersen's Queensland. If we take the unemployment figures over the year to April, the league table of changes (from bottom to top) is Tasmania, Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia. Yes, South Australia at the top of the list—and with an unemployment rate only marginally different from Western Australia.

**Mr Keneally:** Who wrote this, Lewis Carroll?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am sure the honourable member is interested in that. It was written by Owen Covick, Kevin Davis, Barry Hughes, Matt Polasek and Graham Scott, of the Flinders and Adelaide universities. Barry Hughes is a name that I think would be very familiar to honourable members opposite.

**Mr Abbott:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am delighted to answer the question; I could go on through most of Question Time detailing the Government's fine record.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Having been subjected to such generous invitations, I am encouraged to go on. The article further states:

*The Advertiser* has seen its help-wanted ads soar every month in the three months to February. The reason South Australia is now smelling sweetly is that almost all the nasty things that could have happened occurred years ago. It is now some other people's turn. Which probably doesn't help Mr Tonkin all that much, given that, while his relative position [that is in the State] has improved the national economy is slipping.

I think the Leader himself was on record some little time ago (I think a little over two years ago, and I am sure he has regretted making these statements ever since) as saying that the only real measure of a State's progress is to compare it with the progress in other States. Indeed, I totally and absolutely agree with him in this matter, because everything that is happening now, all of the indicators, are proving quite conclusively that in comparison with other States we are moving on while the other States are moving back.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I tell you what: the people are not rating you very highly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. H. Allison:** We have to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I know that this is a subject that does not—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

*Mr Langley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister of Education and the member for Unley will do the House a great service by remaining silent.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I know that this does not particularly please honourable members opposite, who, when

they came into Opposition, believed that this Government would have no chance whatever of achieving its election promises about employment and development. Indeed, we have proved them totally and absolutely wrong, because our record of development, investment and job creation, and our relative levels of unemployment show quite conclusively that we have been successful.

There are many figures which can be used; in fact, there is a multiplicity of figures and various indicators which now show quite conclusively that this is so. There has been a massive increase in investment, whether one takes the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce total list of projects committed, or whether one looks at the list kept by the various State departments. The announced new capital expenditure in South Australia by manufacturing, retail and service industries, as at 31 May 1982, is \$1 000 052 000. More importantly, the employment aspect shows nearly 4 000 jobs in those industries. I repeat, the question of investment and development is one which is quite crucial to South Australia because it is the only way in which jobs can be created that are worth while, permanent, and putting security in people's minds by putting money in their pockets.

In such a critical time as this, when we are about to look at the Roxby Downs indenture, and when we are looking at other developments, such as the Sumitomo coal gasification project (the feasibility study for which I announced today), with all these things coming forward, anything that will destroy business confidence in South Australia by virtue of the treatment the Roxby Downs indenture gets in this Parliament could be disastrous for South Australia, not just in terms of investment dollars lost but in terms of jobs lost.

All I can say is that if these people who pretend to be responsible members of Parliament and a responsible—Lord help us—alternative Government really do want employment in South Australia, if they are really concerned about people who have not got jobs, if they are concerned to find jobs for school leavers over the next five to 10 years, then they have only one thing to do, and that is to support the programme of development that is being carefully planned by this Government.

It will take a great deal of time, and we will in no way relax from our efforts, because our efforts are going to go forward as hard as they can go. It is one thing to sit and promote doom and gloom by saying that the figure in Adelaide is too high. Of course it is, but what is the Opposition, which is constantly talking about these high levels of unemployment, doing to help? It seems to me that it is interested merely in keeping unemployment high and keeping employment low, simply for its own political advantage. I believe that when it comes to the point the people of South Australia will not take this sort of attitude, this irresponsible political play acting, by the members of the Opposition. We have a fine record of development, and I repeat that development means jobs and jobs are badly needed, not only in Australia but in South Australia. Fortunately, we are making progress where the other States are beginning to slip back.

## CASINO

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Will the Premier give a final categorical assurance that neither he nor any of his Ministers has been involved in negotiations with representatives of Federal Hotels Limited about the establishment of a casino in South Australia during the period that the legislation was before this House and while a Select Committee was considering the Bill?

I have been reliably informed that the Government and Federal Hotels Limited were involved in negotiations about the establishment of a casino in South Australia before and



after the introduction of the casino legislation currently before this House, and, more seriously, during the period when a Select Committee of this House was deliberating and hearing evidence on the Bill. I am further informed that discussions were held in the fortnight following the Premier's return from his overseas trip, even though such negotiations would be considered a breach of Parliamentary ethics, by pre-empting the findings of the Select Committee and the decisions of this House.

The Leader of the Opposition and I have both been reliably informed that a monetary inducement was made to the Government to introduce a casino Bill. It has already been reported in the media that the Premier and Ministers were quoted shortly before the introduction of the Bill as saying that no such Bill for a casino was forthcoming. Indeed, I understand that one Minister made such an assurance only days before the introduction of the Bill. However, I should stress that I understand that the campaign donation to the Liberal Party was conditional only on the Bill being introduced and not on the Bill being passed because the developer making the offer believed that such a Bill would pass both Houses on a conscience vote. It may well do so; we do not know.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am aware that these are serious allegations. They are serious allegations that deserve a serious answer, because I can assure the Premier that the matter will be pursued continually.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I rather hope that the matter will be pursued continually and that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will make those allegations outside this House. I will be delighted to take action against him. I must say that I am no longer angry about these scurrilous and gutter tactics in which the Deputy Leader has been indulging for some few weeks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I would hope that he would listen to me. I listened to his scurrilous rubbish. Now he can listen to me telling him some facts. If the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have any such information, I challenge them to bring it forward with names and documentary proof outside this House. This is the most underhand and miserable performance I have ever heard from any Opposition in Australia. It is sheer dirt, it is imputation, and all I can say is that there is no evidence at all that the member can produce because there has been—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I am waiting for you to deny it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not think the Deputy Leader wants to hear the answer.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I am waiting for you to deny it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There has been no such approach to any member of this Government, and that is categorical. I repeat that I am surprised, quite frankly, because I have always counted the Deputy Leader as being an honourable man, and my opinion of him has sunk completely.

### UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Will the Premier state the latest unemployment numbers for South Australia and the implication of those figures for our economy?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable the Premier will not be able to hear the question and the explanation unless there is less talking.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I will repeat my question because I am sure that, because of all the audible comments in the House—

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

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I represent an area which is regarded as having about the fourth highest unemployment figure. People have always expressed a concern about unemployment figures in South Australia, and yet it is interesting to note that, as I move around my district, compared to a few years ago, such places as child-care centres now have some of the highest enrolment numbers for many a year. That is usually an indication that the economy is doing somewhat better or alternatively that many more people have found employment. In view of the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics labor force figures which were released last week and the clear South Australian position that was reported in those figures, I ask my question.

Further to that, it was reported yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition said that the job rot had not stopped and that unemployment in South Australia for the six months to April 1982 was 47 900. I therefore ask the Premier to clarify the figures.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Of course I am delighted to clarify those figures, because the Leader of the Opposition has once again, in his desperate ploy to draw attention away from the Labor Party's difficulties over the Roxby Downs issue, deliberately falsified the facts, or misused them. South Australia is the only State in which unemployment fell in the past 12 months, and that is something of which we can be very proud. The number of unemployed has increased in every other Australian State and Territory from April 1981 to April 1982.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am talking to the Leader's press secretary, who is up in the gallery.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Reference to places in the precincts of the House is out of order.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He has left anyway, Mr Speaker. The number of unemployed has increased in every other State and Territory from April 1981 to April 1982 by a total of 60 200, and South Australia's unemployment fell by 1 600 in the same period. That is an encouraging trend indeed. South Australia's economy is now clearly performing better than the economy of the rest of Australia.

The release by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday concerning the uranium campaign quoted, I think, inaccurate unemployment figures for South Australia. I refer him to the A.B.S. labour force statistics for April 1981 to April 1982. Just so that he can get it right, it is catalogue No. 6202. The figures are quite clear: in April 1981 the unemployment figure in South Australia was 46 500. In April 1982, unemployment in South Australia was 44 900, which is a decrease of 1 600 in the past 12 months. That is not a great number until one considers the total increase of 60 000 in the rest of Australia.

Those numbers are increasing in every other State, and they are the honest answers and honest numbers to quote. If we look back further to unemployment numbers since this Government came to office, we see that South Australian unemployment has fallen whilst that in every other State has risen. From August 1979 to April 1982, unemployment fell by 1 per cent in South Australia, but rose in Tasmania by 39 per cent, in New South Wales by 24 per cent, in Queensland by 17 per cent, in Victoria by 16 per cent, in Western Australia by 4 per cent, and in Australia as a whole it was up 17 per cent. I repeat that from August 1979 to April 1982, South Australian unemployment fell by 1 per cent. My Government is still concerned about unemployment. The number of unemployed is still too high. However, we are improving in South Australia against the national trend, something in which we can all take some pleasure.

### TAB DEFICIT CHARGES

**Mr SLATER:** I ask the Minister of Recreation and Sport whether legal proceedings against a punter involved in the \$348 000 shortfall of funds at the Riverton TAB subagency are now being withdrawn. If so, can the Minister explain why the proceedings are being withdrawn?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I am not aware that they have been withdrawn, but I will check for the honourable member and give him an answer.

### WORKERS COMPENSATION PREMIUMS

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs explain the reasons for the substantial increase in workers compensation premiums that a number of companies have recently experienced, and say what action can be taken to alleviate these additional costs? I have been approached by a number of constituents who are extremely concerned at advice that they have received from their insurance companies about increased workers compensation premiums that they are being forced to bear. The constituents who have approached me predominantly come from the small business area, and some have indicated that the premiums now being mentioned to them by representatives of various insurance companies are such that they will have a very serious effect indeed on the ability of their businesses to continue in operation.

I have also been approached by one constituent from what can only be described as quite a large business in South Australia who has also expressed those concerns to me. I have also been told that these businessmen have been informed that the reasons for those increases are the South Australian Government's fault. I would appreciate the Minister's clarifying the situation regarding these allegations.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I, too, have been very concerned at some of the reports in the daily press about increased premium rates for workers compensation. I have also had specific cases referred to me by companies, and I can substantiate that in some cases there have been increases of 100 per cent. I know of one specific case for a fairly substantial company where so far the best premium he could receive involved about a 150 per cent increase on last year's premium. As those increases are being talked about, I asked the Insurance Council of Australia to come forward and have talks with me, and those talks took place at 9 a.m. yesterday. All of us, as members of Parliament, would be concerned about the impact of that sort of increase in the workers compensation premium rate on small businesses, in particular, and in fact on any business in South Australia, because it substantially increases labour costs and, therefore, tends to decrease the number of people who will be employed.

I was also disturbed to see a report in the *Advertiser*, I think quoting a Mr Kelly, an insurance broker, who claimed that he had had cases of 100 per cent to 150 per cent increase reported to him and that they resulted from Government legislation changes. Yesterday's talks with the Insurance Council highlighted a number of reasons for those increased premium rates. It is fair to briefly talk about those this afternoon. One reason for the increase in premiums is the wage increases over the past 12 months, which were approximately 20 per cent and which have, therefore, accounted for about a 20 per cent increase in workers compensation premiums. Another reason for the increase is that there has previously been very severe discounting of workers compensation premiums within the insurance industry. Because of substantial losses covered over the past two or three years in that industry, the insurance companies have now decided substantially to increase their premium rates so that they

will no longer suffer those losses. I was interested in that being put forward as a reason yesterday and to see the actual figures. From the figures I saw, I can substantiate that claim. A report in the *Financial Review* today backs up the statement that I just made. It contains a quote from the Confederation of Insurance Brokers for the whole of Australia which highlights that in New South Wales, particularly, there have been very substantial losses on workers compensation. The report states:

The actual loss ratio for workers compensation in New South Wales for the year to 30 June 1981 was 165 per cent compared with 143 per cent the previous year.

Of course, with substantial losses like that over the past two or three years, it is only appropriate that insurance companies will increase premiums so that they no longer suffer that sort of loss. I stress that employers themselves have received benefits from that discounting in the past two or three years. Statistics collected by my department suggest that, whilst actual workers compensation claims have increased, the total premiums paid here in South Australia have remained basically the same in that period.

The next point was the impact of recent changes in workers compensation legislation. The Insurance Council of Australia recommended increases of about 20 per cent because of those changes. I stress to the House, and particularly to the honourable member, who possibly could pass this on to small business people involved, that it was rather fortunate that the amendments proposed by the Labor Party were not passed because they would have doubled yet again the cost of workers compensation. I think the honourable member knows of the various amendments, particularly those of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and of the devastating effect that they would have had on workers compensation premiums. But, the actual increase that can be allocated to the Government legislation should be no more than 20 per cent. My personal view is that once that legislation has operated for a while it will actually reduce the cost of workers compensation premiums, because it tidies up substantially the administration of the Act.

I am also concerned about the common law area, where the number of claims has increased substantially. Yesterday, industry members indicated that common law claims as a percentage of the total cost of workers compensation have gone from 7 per cent two years ago to 17 per cent now. So, I can understand that there are four or five reasons why workers compensation premium rates have lifted so substantially.

I point out, though, that South Australia is not alone in this. In fact, we are better off than New South Wales and Victoria. It is expected that in New South Wales premiums will increase this year by 118 per cent and those in Victoria by 98 per cent. Certainly, we are, fortunately, looking at an average increase substantially less than that. Employers can expect no immediate relief. In fact, the best way of obtaining some relief from these high premium rates is for employers to place a far greater emphasis on industrial safety and also to make sure that they properly administer a rehabilitation scheme within their work place.

I am confident that the Rehabilitation Advisory Unit that was set up by the recent changes to the legislation will carry on a very effective educational role so that workers compensation in this State can be better administered along with better industrial safety, and that, as a result of that, we can reduce the cost and also the premiums.

*At 3.30 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

**ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities, which is an association comprising the South Australian Highways Department and similar interstate authorities, undertook a study to determine the most appropriate mass and dimension limits for commercial motor vehicles which should apply nationally or in particular regions of Australia. The study, known as the Economics of Load Vehicle Limits Study, brought down its report in November 1975, and the report was then referred to the Australian Transport Advisory Council. After consideration by the Advisory Committee on Vehicle Performance, and after consultation with industry, draft regulations incorporating the recommendations were adopted by ATAC in February, 1977. These draft regulations were referred to a State committee established to consider commercial vehicle limits in South Australia.

The committee has recommended the adoption of the draft regulations with a few minor variations to suit South Australian conditions. The major purpose of the present Bill is to provide the legislative framework under which the regulations can be implemented. The opportunity is taken to amend certain definitions and evidentiary provisions in order to facilitate prosecutions of overloading offences.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act. A new definition of 'axle' is inserted, as the existing definition has been criticised by some courts as being too difficult to interpret. A definition of 'primary producer' is inserted. A new subsection is inserted dealing with the technical matter of ascertaining the mass carried on a wheel of a vehicle. Clause 4 repeals a section relating to determining the mass of vehicles. This provision will be more appropriately placed in a later part of the Act. Clause 5 is a consequential amendment.

Clauses 6, 7 and 8 are all concerned with amendments that make possible the implementation of the new provisions relating to vehicle dimensions and vehicle mass. The substance of the provisions will of course be contained in the regulations, but the Act provides the basic structure and penalties for infringement of the mass and dimension requirements. Under the proposed regulations, there will be a 10 per cent tolerance for gross vehicle mass limits and gross combination mass limits for owners of heavy vehicles (except primary producers) for a period of 3½ years, at the end of which time their vehicles must not exceed the mass limits determined in respect of their vehicles.

However, primary producers are to be given a 20 per cent tolerance factor for the gross vehicle mass limits and gross combination mass limits applicable to their vehicles for a period of 3½ years, and then a 10 per cent tolerance factor for the next 6½ years. At the end of 10 years, therefore, their vehicles must not exceed the mass limits determined in respect of their vehicles. New section 147 replaces section 34 that was repealed earlier in this Bill.

Clauses 9 and 10 are consequential amendments. Clause 11 amends the evidentiary provisions relating to determining the mass of vehicles and their loads, and the mass carried on axles and wheels. A statement from a person in charge

of a weighbridge may contain statements as to certain measurements, dimensions and specifications that must be ascertained for the purpose of determining the extent to which a vehicle, axle or wheel, etc., is overloaded.

Clause 12 inserts a regulation-making power providing for the determination by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles of specified mass limits (that is, gross vehicle mass and gross combination mass limits) in relation to particular vehicles or a particular class of vehicle. An advisory committee may be established by the regulations for the purpose of advising the Registrar in relation to carrying out this function. The regulations will provide for mass limits determined by the Registrar to be entered on certificates of registration.

**Mr O'NEILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL**

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until tomorrow.

Motion carried.

**CASINO BILL**

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until Tuesday 22 June 1982.

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** Although I support the motion to extend the time of bringing up the report, I want to make known to the House that there are certain aspects of the Casino Select Committee that give me cause for serious concern. I realise that I am not able to refer to submissions or evidence that have already been presented to the Select Committee until the report goes before the House, but I express my disquiet and concern in relation to two matters.

The first matter is a press report that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 30 May 1982 which indicated, to me at least, some breach of confidentiality in regard to the deliberations of the Select Committee. I believe that that is quite improper until the Select Committee reports back to this Parliament. The other matter that gives rise to my concern relates to the question that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition directed to the Premier this afternoon. I have been told that those circumstances, as described by the Deputy Leader, had occurred. It has been alleged that the Bill was introduced into this House following the categorical statement that was made by the Premier only a few weeks earlier that the Government would not proceed with a Casino Bill. I believe that, while these allegations of suspicions exist, they inhibit to a quite serious degree the deliberations of the Select Committee.

This afternoon in his reply, the Premier challenged the Deputy Leader to make these statements outside the House. I believe that, rather than saying that, the Premier should have given a categorical undertaking that those alleged occurrences did not take place. Those allegations come not only from the Deputy Leader but also from another source. I would like the matter to be resolved definitely. The Premier should give a categorical undertaking to this House and to the people of South Australia that he, the members of his Government and, indeed, the members of his Party have not had any discussions with any person or organisation that might have had a vested interest in the establishment of a casino in this State. If those matters are not resolved,

as a question of personal integrity I would need to seek leave of this House to be discharged of my duties as a member of the Select Committee.

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I, too, whilst supporting the Minister's motion, want to say one or two things. First, I in no way reflect on the Minister of Recreation and Sport, any of the other members of the Select Committee, the research officer, or the clerk. In fact, I believe that the deliberations of our committee have been perfectly impartial. The inquiries have been very forceful and, in my view, very objective. I believe that the worrying aspects have been highlighted by my colleague from Gilles. There was the question of the leak to the *Sunday Mail* and it is difficult to demonstrate, without being in breach of Standing Orders, just how serious that matter was. I can only leave it at that.

Far more serious than that, however, is the persistent continuation of allegations in the community concerning alleged inducements to the Government and/or the Liberal Party to permit the introduction of a Bill in this House that may eventually lead to a particular company obtaining a licence. Those allegations are very serious, and I am sure that neither my friend from Gilles nor I would be in any way persuaded by them unless they came from very strong sources indeed. I want to assure you, Mr Speaker, that these sources have been checked and rechecked most rigorously both by my friend from Gilles and by me. So, these remarks are not made lightly: they are made only after the deepest consideration.

I do not believe that the situation was helped particularly this afternoon when the Premier used phrases, in answer to a question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, such as 'There has been no evidence of such a thing.' We need a clear, definite statement. The Premier has already made a clear and simple statement that no member of the Government has received any inducement or promise from any company; that is on the record, and so be it. That is the end of that matter. I take the phrase 'any member of the Government' to mean 'any Minister of the Government'. There is one matter that must now be cleared up, and that is the position of the Liberal Party, because it seems to me that that is the other avenue which an unscrupulous person or company may adopt.

Let me make quite clear that I do not want to go on record as putting a company on trial by suspicion: I am attempting to give the Government, the Liberal Party and the company the opportunity to come forward and make clear, simple, crisp statements and have done with the whole cloud that hangs over this affair, because otherwise I am completely satisfied with the way in which the committee is working. The committee has been working well and very hard, and has made considerable progress.

So, in the next 24 hours I would like to see clarification of the position of the Liberal Party and clarification of the position of Federal Pacific Hotels. If that clarification is not forthcoming, then in all conscience I find myself in the same position as the member for Gilles and, indeed, I take the liberty of using his own words, namely, that if these unqualified assurances are not forthcoming I would have to seriously consider my position as a member of the Select Committee.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** Obviously the member for Playford is quite concerned about this matter, as is the member for Gilles. I simply make the point that I, too, have heard wild rumours in the community about people of all political persuasions being subjected to bribes over this matter. I have heard them for some considerable time over the years. Indeed, while I was Leader of the Opposition I heard the same sorts of things said

about the Government of the day. I gave no credence to them then, and I give no credence to them now. It does not please me to say that, but it seems to be one of those things said from time to time by people who are extreme in their views and who want to make sure that their views prevail.

The honourable member ought to know a little more about the Liberal Party and the way it works, because in actual fact, as has been said in this House before, any approach by anyone wanting to influence the Parliamentary Party by offering inducements of any kind to the organisation would have no chance of success whatever. Quite apart from the fact that the Liberal Party itself does not accept donations (it does not have a slush fund as it is colloquially called), it does not accept donations with any strings attached.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** That's the Parliamentary Party.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am talking about the Party organisation, but nor does the Parliamentary Party have a slush fund, again, contrary to some other Parties that I know of. But the point is that members of the Parliamentary Party have no idea, first of all, of those who give the organisation donations. There is no communication on that score; I deliberately go out of my way to avoid knowing who is responsible for contributing to Party funds. I would suggest that that is a good policy and one that ought to be adopted by all political Parties.

The other point, of course, is that the political organisation, the Liberal Party, does not dictate in any way to its members; nor has there been any such attempt made by the Party to influence its members in this particular matter or indeed any other. I think that sums up the position in a nutshell. It is unfortunate that these matters should be raised. I repeat that I have heard stories about all sides of politics but I cannot in any way substantiate them. However, if members have any evidence of inducement, malpractice or corruption, it is their clear duty to bring it, first of all, to the Select Committee, and then to this Parliament. That is what they should do. I am quite certain that the member for Gilles is acting with the best of motives; I am surprised, though, that the member for Playford, with his long service as an officer of the court, should in any way attempt to suggest trial by imputation—

**Mr McRae:** I resisted that; I denied it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes; in denying it, it actually came forward, and I think that that is something to be regretted. I noted, too, that the honourable member was sorry indeed and that he did not want to imply to the company trial by imputation, but he did not express any such feelings about the Liberal Party.

**Mr McRae:** It was meant to refer to all Parties.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am reassured to hear that, because it seemed to me, from the way I heard it, a most one-sided extension of the Labor Party's normal feelings for the Liberal Party. I would hate to think that that was really so. The honourable member has asked me for categorical assurances—I have already given them. I have no evidence at all that the Liberal Party has received any such inducements (I am talking about the organisation) and, indeed, I would be absolutely amazed if it had, because it would not do any person seeking to support the correct procedures of a Select Committee the slightest bit of good anyway. Certainly, as far as the Government and members of the Government are concerned, there have been no negotiations of the kind that the honourable member mentioned at all.

All members of this House over the last few years have been involved in discussions with lobbyists, and the company that was mentioned by the honourable member has been assiduous in its lobbying of members. I do not know whether the new members who came in at the last election have been involved in this as yet, but many people (and indeed

I have heard this said by a number of people, companies and representatives) have said that they know that they are going to get the casino because the Government has already made up its mind. May I say that, unless the subject comes up in the course of other conversations, it is not raised, and I have specifically and constantly taken the line that, if anyone wants to come to see me in respect of the casino, I refuse to see them on that matter. I will not discuss the issue, because it is properly before a Select Committee, which is where it should be, and properly before the Parliament.

There is no way that I am going to have discussions on the matter of who gets or should get the licence before those deliberations are completed and, indeed, if the Bill passes there will be no known reason for me to have discussions about who should get the licence afterwards, because the Bill sets down quite clearly the procedures whereby that licence will be allocated, together with the terms under which the commission can decide where the licence can go. Nothing can be clearer than that. If, in fact, members are genuine in their concern, I hope that that has reassured them.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** As the mover of a similar Bill last year for the establishment of a casino in this State, it concerns me that there are allegations that money has been offered to the Government now and, by connection, to me, or to anyone who introduces a Bill at any time. Once again I would like to state in this House and put on record the fact that at no stage was I offered any financial inducement to bring that Bill forward. Never at any stage was I approached by any officer of any company in this country or any other country to establish a casino. I would like that again placed on the record.

The matter of the Government being offered money to bring the Bill forward has been mentioned to me, but there is no-one with evidence. I have been given no statement of fact on this. The Government's change of heart has been mentioned to me by many people, and I have been asked why, but I do not know. No-one has ever given an explanation of that, and a suspicion has been placed in people's minds concerning the obvious change of tack in only a matter of several months. It has been only a matter of months since the rejection of what I call the original Bill. There is that suspicion, and in all fairness to this Parliament and the people of this State, if there is any other evidence at all, it should be put before that Select Committee. It can be done *in camera*.

As a member of the Select Committee, I am concerned that these allegations are being made. I really do not think that resigning from the Select Committee is the correct way. I think that the Select Committee still must bring down a report on the evidence it has received and, if that evidence happens to include some statement of fact about a consideration being offered to the Government, that has to come forward, too.

I would like it clearly on the record that I certainly was not involved. As a matter of fact, the only time that I received communication from Federal Hotels was when I wrote to them. I wrote to Federal Hotels in Hobart, and I wrote to their Director, Mr Hadad, in Melbourne. I received a letter back from Mr Hadad referring me to Hobart for a report. All I received from them was the Wrest Point report, a report which everyone else who has considered the casino issue has looked at. If there is evidence, it must be brought forward; otherwise this matter will never be defined in people's minds, and the provisions for that to be done are there in the Select Committee.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** As a member of this Select Committee, I also have been concerned about leaks to the press and about two reports in the *Sunday Mail*, in particular, indicating the type of information given to the Select Committee and what its findings will be. How on earth they can pretend to know what the findings of the committee will be, I do not know, but nevertheless the community has been told that it is a foregone conclusion.

We have worked very hard on that Select Committee, and have had a number of very long meetings. At one meeting we were taking evidence from 9.30 a.m. until 5.45 p.m. It has been a good working and conscientious committee, and we have inspected various casinos throughout Australia.

I refute the allegation of bribes being taken by members of the Government (I presume that is the Cabinet). Nobody has given me any such bribes, and it is certainly news to me. Nobody has come up to me, confidentially or otherwise, to say that there are problems in relation to this matter. Maybe it is the situation in Queensland in relation to poker machines, with bribes being given to the Labor Party, that has confused the situation in some people's minds. Perhaps that is the reason why this matter has been brought up here.

It does worry me, however, that as a member of the committee I might be smeared with this sort of suggestion and people may think that approaches have been made to me. I am sure that other members of the committee feel exactly the same as I do. I can state categorically that nobody has ever approached me in relation to altering my mind on this matter. Nobody has offered me any money or any advantage at all to alter the opinion I held at the beginning of the original debate before this matter went to a Select Committee.

I am very upset about what has happened here this afternoon and about the close questioning during Question Time. It appeared to me that there was very little foundation in those questions and, as far as I am concerned, there is very little foundation in any of the material brought up this afternoon. I agree entirely with the member for Semaphore that when a Select Committee is set up its job is to collect evidence. The Select Committee collects that evidence and makes its recommendations and its report to the Parliament—not to the Government but to Parliament—for Parliament to make up its own mind.

If people have information, good or bad, that ought to be presented, it is their responsibility and duty to come before the committee and give that evidence. Information given to the committee is confidential until it is released as a report in this place, and if people think that that information should not become public they can ask the committee to take the evidence *in camera*. Every witness who comes before the committee is told this by the Chairman, who in this case is the Minister. This has taken place with all the Select Committees of which I have been a member, so the protection is there. This information is conveyed to the witness, and that fact ought to be made known to the community.

I suggest that if anybody feels that he has information as drastic as that which has been suggested here today, he could give it to the committee *in camera*. I am very upset about what has happened. The extension of time has been sought today by the Minister, not for any political reason or for any reason other than that there is more evidence to be given to the committee. There are a number of witnesses still to come before the committee and a number of letters still to be received, so the committee's job is not yet complete. I believe that until the evidence has been completed, whatever that evidence may be, the committee should not make its final report to this Parliament for the Parliament's (not the Government's) decision on the outcome.

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I do not wish to prolong this debate any longer than necessary, but as a member of this Select Committee I wish to express my concern at the events so far. I can certainly concur in and echo the sentiments of the members for Semaphore and Glenelg that should there be any relevant evidence whatsoever that evidence should be presented to the Select Committee, either *in camera* or not, so that it may be properly recorded.

The attitude of members of that committee has been extremely good: they have sought to get as much evidence as possible. With all the inquiries I have received in my electorate office, I have been extremely careful to explain to my constituents and people writing to me that I cannot enter into a debate with them on the question of a casino because of my position as a member of that Select Committee, but that when the committee has reported to Parliament and the document has become public I would enter into discussions with them.

I have adopted that attitude, because it is difficult for a person who is a member of the Select Committee to make any form of decision, whether in written or verbal form, without drawing upon conclusions and opinions which may have been formulated from the evidence given. So, I have tried to ensure that I explain carefully to people that it is not possible to enter into discussions with them on this question. However, to my correspondents and in my discussions with people I have added that, if they have any information which they believe should be made public and brought to the attention of the Parliament through the Select Committee, they have the right to appear before that committee and/or to extend their views in a written submission.

Those comments apply to anyone who has reason to believe that there has been some impropriety in this whole business. Therefore, I echo again those sentiments expressed earlier namely, that, if anyone has any evidence that they wish to give, they should make those representations. If any person believes that there has been some impropriety, then they should make that known to the Select Committee be it *in camera* or be it reported in the evidence eventually tabled before this House.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I am not a member of the Select Committee. I would like to speak as a person who has listened to the debate, read newspaper reports, and taken note of both. I think it is important for people to remember the comment made by the member for Brighton a moment ago: that people can give evidence to the committee *in camera* if they so wish, and the committee can decide whether or not it will take that evidence and, if it does, whether or not it will take notice of it.

If a person asks for evidence to be taken *in camera* and the committee says 'No', then the person can either withdraw, or give the evidence so that it can be made public later. I can remember an incident in the past with another Select Committee where similar concern was expressed. I asked a question then, and attempted to have it clarified recently, about the confidentiality of evidence given to a Select Committee. I believe the situation to be that, if the news media know that a person is to give evidence before a Select Committee, and if that person states before going before the Select Committee that he will give evidence and say 'X', then that person is not breaching any of the conventions of this Parliament or of confidentiality, but is saying beforehand that this is the sort of evidence he will give.

If this were a person like myself, not a member of Parliament but a person in the community, who had strong views on the subject, the media automatically would know what that person's approach would be, and might even ask him for some comment. That is my first point: if the media know of an individual who is to give evidence, even if

media representatives have not approached that person, if that person has been vocal with his comments in the community then the media would know what he was likely to say.

My next point is that if a person goes before a Select Committee and gives evidence and then, after giving that evidence, goes out into the community and starts talking at a public meeting or in a bar, saying 'I believe this' or 'My attitude towards this subject is this', and then expresses a point of view, but at no time says 'That is the evidence I gave before the Select Committee', and just expresses a view about the subject, that person is not breaching any area of confidentiality so far as the Select Committee is concerned. I believe that that is the situation, and that members of the Select Committee can have that statement checked and find that it is so. For a long time I have been anti a casino being established in this State. Ever since I started on that path, several sections of the news media have attempted, whenever they can, to lead public opinion. I believe that the reports in the press concerning members of this Parliament and the Select Committee have been nothing more than a bit of good judgment, because the Select Committee seems to be suggesting that that is the way some of the evidence has gone. This has been suggested by the reaction of members of that committee during this debate. I do not know whether or not I am correct in this, but that is the feeling I get. It seems that sections of the news media have been attempting to set the stage (as they have been for a long while) in an attempt to convince the community that a casino is the right thing, and to discredit other arguments. Those sections of the media have tried to do this for a long time.

I hold the view that we should not be concerned about that press report, because there is no way of knowing how the journalist or journalists arrived at such a conclusion—whether from evidence given to them by people who were to appear before the Select Committee, whether it was evidence that they thought certain people were likely to give because they knew the attitude of those people, or whether it was because of comments people made after giving evidence, but without referring to those remarks as having been given as evidence. For those reasons, I think that there is not much we can do about this as a Parliament, nor much that the Select Committee can do about it. The other aspect that concerns me is the way in which some sections of the news media try to lead public opinion in the direction they want it to take. I hope that they fail.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I accept what the member for Fisher has just said about the manipulation of public opinion. I also accept his scenario of what could happen (hypothetically, of course) with a witness or a series of witnesses so far as making statements is concerned. I was extremely disturbed to see the statement referred to in the weekend press, especially as this committee has been sitting in a highly charged atmosphere within the community. Not only in this House, but out in the community, the question of a casino is a highly emotional subject and I have attempted to lead that committee, and the committee has agreed and behaved, in a manner which is bipartisan.

In my opinion, this has been an excellent committee in the way it has conducted its proceedings. It has shown a genuine desire to get at the truth of the evidence without pre-empting decisions that may be made later when the Select Committee makes its report. That is why I am somewhat disappointed by the actions taken by two members of the committee today, especially as they did not do me the courtesy of telling me what they were going to do; I think that courtesy should have been extended to me.

Nevertheless, I accept, and have always accepted, that both Opposition members who have spoken today are people of integrity. I have to accept what they say as being their genuine feelings and desires. I hope very much that that is the case, and that this is not an orchestrated attempt by the Opposition to give credibility to the Deputy Leader's allegations. I would be horrified if that were the case. As I said, I do not believe that those two members would lend themselves to that action. I hope very much that that is not the case.

*Mr McRae interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Allegations concerning payments to the Liberal Party have been made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition both inside and outside this House. I tell the Deputy Leader, through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this has not made the work of this Select Committee very easy. I do not agree with my colleagues on this side of the House, and the member for Semaphore, that that evidence should necessarily be made to the Select Committee *in camera*. I say that, if the Deputy Leader has evidence of these allegations, he should either say so inside this House, or outside, and name the people from whom he received this evidence. If he does use the privilege of Parliament to give this information it can then be investigated.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I have already asked for an investigation and it was knocked back. I asked the Attorney-General—remember that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I ask to be allowed to continue, Sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The member for Playford said that he wished a simple, crisp statement. The Premier on three occasions to my knowledge has made a simple, crisp statement in response to these allegations and that simple, crisp statement is 'No'. How much more simple must a statement be? I hope that today's occurrences will not affect the conduct of the Select Committee and will not affect its genuine desire to get at the truth of a very, very difficult subject and, I might say, without breaching Standing Orders of this House, that the longer the Select Committee sits and the more witnesses it hears, the more difficult the subject becomes.

Motion carried.

#### DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 3681).

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** Before touching upon the provisions of the Bill, I would like to make two brief comments. The first is to indicate my sadness, along with that of other members of the House, at the death of our late colleague, the Hon. Jim Dunford. He was a person known to me for well over a decade and a half, and I found him worthy of considerable respect, whose opinions I valued and whose judgments I valued. I valued those judgments and opinions long prior to my entering this place. On a number of occasions I was treated to his wisdom either in a convivial spirit or, if he did not agree with me, in a spirit of forthright statement. He was indeed a member whom this Parliament can be proud to have had included in its ranks, and his memory will live on in the minds of not only members of the trade union movement but in the minds of many South Australians for a long time to come.

Secondly, I convey my welcome, as one of the members of this House, to the new member for Mitcham. I wish her well in her time in this place and the hope that she finds the job as challenging as I am sure most others of us in this place find it. I am sure that, if she enters into the spirit of that electorate in the way in which she seems to have done, she will indeed be the member for Mitcham for a long time to come. Indeed 8 May proved to be a paradox. It proved that the seat of Mitcham—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has given the honourable member a great deal of latitude. I now suggest that he relate his remarks to the Bill.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The cows will be in and out of the paddock before they are milked, the way he is going.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Thank you for the protection from the ravages of the Minister. This Bill is not what has been referred to by some members as a piece of rats and mice legislation; it is a piece of sheep and goats legislation. It is not a matter of separating the sheep from the goats; it is, in fact, a matter of including them in the interpretation of the dairy industry. The Opposition supports the provisions of the Bill. They are logical and I do not intend to speak at great length on them. I know that that will disappoint the Minister, but if he wants to debate with me at greater length in the corridors of the building on the Bill I am certainly happy for that to take place.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It would break a good record—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think the deliberations of the House have been assisted by the Minister's conversation across the Chamber.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** The possibility of extending the interpretation of the meaning of the dairy industry to include sheep and goats is not anticipatory in any sense at all, because there has been production and limited marketing of products from sheep and goats for a long time. It is now merely extending to that area of the industry the legislative provisions that have always applied to cows.

In this country the production and marketing of non-dairy dairy products, non-cow dairy products, is not significant, but in other countries it is. In many parts of Europe the use of milk from sheep and goats for cheese production, yoghurt production, even for consumption as straight milk, is reasonably significant, and it would be hoped that, when this Bill is proclaimed and when in fact we see the change in the purpose of the Dairy Industry Fund, being as a secondary purpose to promote the dairy industry, part of that promotion will go, in fact, towards the promotion of production and marketing of non-cow dairy products. It is an area that for too long has been overlooked. Indeed, I have been going through documents of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, from Canberra, in its various papers at the various national agricultural outlook conferences held over the years. I stand subject to correction that someone has information that I have not been able to find, but in my perusal of those documents I have not been able to find any evidence of any comment by agricultural economists, State or Federal, or lobby groups, upon the possible role of non-cow dairy products. Indeed, in the definitive work that I suppose sums up dairy farming in this State, the South Australian edition of *Dairy Farming in Australia*, again I cannot find any evidence or mention of that. To indicate that that lack of evidence might undermine the worth of any changes to the legislation, I would like to quote from *A Manual of Australian Agriculture*, which was edited for the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science by Mr R. L. Reid, the latest edition being in 1981. It talks about goats in particular and about milk production, and it states:

Although goats produce more milk per unit of food intake than cows, they require more labour per unit of milk production.

That would be an important area for any Dairy Industry Fund to touch upon: ways in which Hills farmers could get more involved in goat milk production, the way in which they could more efficiently produce that milk, given the fact that it has a higher labour constraint. The article continues:

Thus they are better suited to subsistence farming or single-household requirements than to commercial milk production. There are no marked differences in the gross compositions (fat, protein and other solids) of goat and cow milk, but both the fat and protein components of goat milk are more easily digested. Goat milk is therefore particularly suited to invalid diets, and is suitable for most infants and young children allergic to cow milk.

There is more information on the quantity of milk that can be produced by lactating goats. The figure is suggested of about 750 litres a year, which is quite a significant amount. The final sentence of that paragraph states:

Dairy hygiene is as important for dairy goats as it is for dairy cows.

That is a truism, perhaps, but in the present legislation it is not recognised at all, so it is a worthwhile point. There are a number of people in the community who could become a market for goat milk. First, there are those who are asthmatics, and it has been recommended as a product for asthmatics for a long time. Anyone who has read the literature of the Asthma Foundation will know that asthma is an affliction that touches upon thousands of people in this State. Secondly, it is often recommended as a substitute milk for nursing mothers in situations where they are not able to provide their natural breast milk, because it is in many ways considered a more ideal milk for the infant stomach to digest than is cows milk.

In the first six months of an infant's life cows milk is indigestible unless it has been boiled. Then there is the third category that we should not overlook: the potential consumer who merely likes the taste, as do I. I do appreciate the taste of goats milk, but as one trying to get hold of it I have found that it is a very rare commodity. Indeed, it is particularly difficult to maintain a regular supply.

As a consumer, I have had to force into the back of my mind certain ideas about the manner in which it may have been produced. I have perhaps not been quite as confident about the hygiene standards of some of the suppliers as I could be about the standards of a cow milk vendor. If this Act were extended, as a future consumer I would be much more reassured that the supplies I would drink would be hygienic, that they would have the right composition according to set standards, and, hopefully, if the Dairy Industry Fund takes on non-cow products in its promotion, they would be more accessible.

Sheep milk products are somewhat less than significant in this country. I suppose, from my limited knowledge of the field, that cheese becomes the main area in which we see sheep milk products. But, given the large number of sheep in this country, it has possibilities. Legislation to cover that is important because the variety of sheep grazing environments in this country must affect the composition of the milk and cheese produced. Because pasture quality varies so widely, the milk and its quality must also vary widely. If we are to ensure that consumer protection applies to that extent, then this should come under the ambit of this Act.

One other point I noticed in the Minister's second reading explanation is that it is proposed that a number of licence fees will now be more able to be changed by regulation than previously was the case. I indicate that the Opposition will monitor increased fees in this area because we, as a Party and an Opposition, have been very concerned about the number of fees that have been increased by this Government. We will want to ensure that this is not a back-door entry

into increasing revenue whilst trying to take advantage of a catch-cry that one is not increasing taxation, because fees are an impost upon production.

Inasmuch as part of the fees from these licences will go to fund the administration of the Act, which is what the Bill states, and indeed it proposes that as its primary purpose, then they are meeting ordinary Government expenditure. Therefore, they are a revenue offset against Government expenditure, and a revenue by any other name can be considered a tax. The very term 'impost' is an English derivative of a Latin word that means a tax.

I indicate again that the Opposition supports the Bill and hopes that it receives support here and in another place. We also look forward to the promotion of non-cow dairy products as well as the on-going promotion of cow dairy products, because it is true that that sector of the industry has had troubled times over years gone by. Indeed, there have had to be major restructuring efforts. From the middle 1960s and onwards we have had to be involved in major efforts to ensure that production is efficient and that dairy farmers are in the industry on a viable basis. I hope that moves in that direction will continue in years ahead so that we do not end up with an over-supply situation that cripples many dairy farmers without giving them the chance to either restructure themselves out of the industry or change the way in which they are involved in the industry.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I appreciate the Opposition's view on this Bill. Its support in this Chamber was conveyed after what I believe was the appropriate amount of homework by the member for Salisbury, who has demonstrated on a number of occasions his interest in matters associated with the rural industry. I say again how disappointed I am that his Party has not chosen him as rural industries spokesman on its behalf, because his rational and reasonable attitude and approach to such subjects demonstrates that he is capable of carrying that position and doing it well. It is an area of State interest that should be represented at all times in this Chamber. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to do so, and I again urge the Opposition to consider that matter. I thank the honourable member for his contribution in which he raised several small points to which I refer.

It is true that milking sheep is not widely practised in Australia. But, it is only a few weeks since I was involved in sheep milking in Ain-Kawa, near Erbil, in Northern Iraq, where diet is dependent on milk from that source. If we are to recognise the requirements of ethnic communities as they continue to settle in this country, and their desire for certain traditional diets, there is provision in this amendment to cater for that need. The honourable member referred to the initiative of the Government in incorporating reference to and provision for appropriate hygiene standards for goats milk. I recognise community needs there. A considerable and growing number of people are demanding this product. It is only fair that the legislation should embrace sufficient hygiene standards to cover that product as it covers other dairy products. I acknowledge the honourable member's favourable comment about Government moves in this direction.

The other matter worth noting is the point made by the member for Salisbury about the rural industry's contribution by way of licence fee. The South Australian rural industry is well known for its contributions to Government for research and administering Acts associated with its respective industries. Therefore, it is no exception here that the rural industry has agreed not only to the fee structure that is currently to apply, but to a system of adjusting that fee structure from time to time as and when appropriate. The rural industry's contribution to research and administration



of legislation to service that industry is a practice of long standing. The Government very greatly depends on this contribution in order to provide services to the rural sector.

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

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** This afternoon I wish to raise two matters before the House, both touching upon transport and both affecting my constituency. The first is a matter of considerable concern to a large number of local residents, namely, the proposal jointly considered by the State Transport Authority and Australian National to install underpasses at the Greenfields and Parafield Gardens railway stations.

This may not sound a very consequential matter to many members in this place, but it is a matter of considerable concern to a large number of local residents, because they literally fear for their own well being, if they are forced to use such underpasses late at night. We have ample evidence of underpasses not only on the North Gawler line but also on other lines to indicate that they can become havens for those who would not wish well to pedestrians who walk through them. That certainly means that a very real hazard is posed, particularly to women, but also to men who walk alone through the underpasses at night.

The proposal has come about because the new standard gauge rail is being constructed, and apparently, quite illogically, it is proposed that freight trains will be parked along the line north of the Dry Creek marshalling yards adjacent to those two stations. I say 'illogically' because anyone who has seen the extent of the Dry Creek marshalling yards would be staggered to think that more parking space is needed for freight trains and that that parking space is to be none other than the standard gauge line itself. I thought that the line was intended for the through movement of traffic, not for the parking of freight trains. I wrote to the Minister on 14 April about this matter, and I will quote in brief part of my letter, as follows:

Local experience with the subway at the Salisbury railway station has confirmed the fear in the minds of many local residents that these new subways will be a most unsatisfactory solution to the problem of pedestrian passage across the tracks. While subways might reduce the hazard involved in crossing the tracks they will, particularly at night and at unmanned railway stations (which both Greenfields and Parafield Gardens are), present a serious hazard to pedestrians in the form of the threat of molestation or assault. Unlike Salisbury station, the setdown or pickup of passengers at both of these stations at night is particularly small, often amounting to only one or two passengers; this small pedestrian volume will increase the ease with which those who went to exhibit threatening behaviour can do so out of sight of surrounding houses.

The certain effect of the installation of these subways will be to reduce patronage of train services originating from those stations as a result of increased doubts about personal safety at those stations.

I commented on the proposal to park freight trains in that area, and I then wrote:

As redevelopment is presently under way at both the stations in question your prompt attention to this matter and consideration of alternatives would be very much appreciated.

The prompt consideration involved a reply by the Minister, on 21 April, stating that he had the matter under consideration. On 1 May, at 11 o'clock at night (May Day, Saturday night), as I was arriving home, the telephone started to ring. That was the first of a series of 10 telephone calls from 11 p.m. to 3 a.m. from local constituents complaining about

the construction site that had been erected at the Parafield Gardens railway station at that time of night. I went down to look, and found that those people were entirely correct: in the dark hours of the night, when other people are turning into pumpkins, there were front-end loaders, jack hammers, trucks, cars, and about 30 workmen who were beginning to construct the subways. I was staggered, needless to say.

My constituents were appalled and alarmed that my approaches on their behalf should have met with that response: first, that they had not been forewarned that their night was to be totally disrupted; secondly, that, rather than coming out in an open debate about the virtues or otherwise of a subway, the depth of night would be chosen to install one. I must give full credit to the press secretary to the Minister of Transport: he was the only person I was able to contact at 2.30 that morning. I was able to convey my alarm to him. I could not convey my alarm to the Minister of Transport, the executives of Australian National (who were way out of touch), or to the chief officers of the State Transport Authority.

I suppose that members would be aware that it was not too long (in fact, about 24 hours) before I wrote a letter of considerable indignation to Australian National, because I had been advised by the Minister's press secretary that the S.T.A. and the Minister of Transport knew nothing about the proposal to construct on that night at that time. My letter, I might say, was very curt: indeed, some could say it might have been a little rude, but I was trying to reflect the very real indignation that I felt on behalf of my constituents about this matter.

My indignation turned to consternation. I had indicated my opposition to work being carried out at that time of night without the courtesy of the department alerting local residents, and in the light of, I thought, my known objection to the proposal proceeding. The Minister said that he was considering my objection, and I presumed that that meant that he had contacted Australian National.

The response that I received from Australian National was good and bad: it was good to the extent that Australian National acknowledged that it should have advised the local residents and gave an undertaking that it would do so in the future. I am pleased about that. I hope that no other residents in other parts of Adelaide are subjected to the same discourtesy to which my constituents were subjected, so from that point of view I hope it was beneficial. I was then informed, by letter dated 12 May, as follows:

With respect to the strong objection to the work proceeding in the light of local expression of concern about the advisability of subways being installed I wish to advise that I had not been notified of your correspondence addressed to the Hon. M. Wilson, Minister of Transport, dated 14 April.

I have taken action to cease further work on the subways concerned pending resolution of your objection directed to the State Minister.

I again give some credit to Australian National, because work ceased forthwith. Then, of course, I had to write a letter to the Minister of Transport, asking him why, if in fact he was considering the matter, Australian National knew nothing about it. My letter was as follows:

May I say that my consternation was immense when I read in the enclosed letter that, as of 12 May, you had not made contact with the commission to convey my protest on behalf of my constituents that the subways not proceed. On the night that work was in progress, when a number of constituents rang me in the early hours of the morning, I was somewhat reassured by the response given by your press secretary; his willingness to talk with me at 2.30 a.m. and his obvious concern were appreciated. I find now, however, that you do not have the same understanding of the seriousness of the situation.

The letter I received from your office dated 21 April which stated that you were 'considering' this matter was either, given the information now available, seeking to mislead me or giving rise to the impression that 'consideration' by you is not so much a matter of action as one of meditative contemplation.

In fairness to the Minister, I received a very prompt reply to that letter—two days later. In fairness, the Minister has acknowledged that a mistake was made and he duly accorded an apology to both myself and my constituents, and has now indicated that prompt action was taken to see that the letters were forwarded to the right place, namely, Australian National, as previously they had been diverted to the S.T.A. I raise the matter in this House because I want members and the Minister to know that, just because the culverts have been installed, I do not intend to drop my opposition to the proposal. I still intend to pursue the matter of the subways not going ahead, because a very real threat exists. I close with the words of one of my constituents, who summarised her objections as follows:

The interiors are out of sight of surrounding houses and passers-by, thus meaning that the risk of assault or molestation would be great, especially at night. Children in particular would be in danger of assault or molestation at any time of the day. The filth and excreta which would accumulate as it does in station shelters would make passage through the subways a serious health hazard.

Vandalism would be far greater in a subway, and maintaining lighting would be an expensive and continual task. The Police Force are already greatly overworked in attempting to supervise this area and do not need any extra burden such as the subways would give.

My constituent finished as follows:

Overpasses can surely be—

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

**Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach)**: At this early stage of the sitting it is good to see worthwhile use of time being accorded to us for bringing grievances before the House. The previous speaker has just clearly outlined to the House one of his grievances, and I hope to do the same. As the member for Henley Beach, I have made it my policy to speak with small business people in my area as regularly as possible. In communicating with them one picks up from time to time some of the concerns that small businesses have. One of the matters raised in the House today concerned workers compensation payments and insurance costs for small businesses, which is a matter that I had heard about earlier and about which I was able to speak to the Minister. I am sure that we will be able to provide an answer to those small business people.

Today, I want to talk about the area of real estate. Within my electorate I have what I would term three small real estate agencies. All of them have been there for a number of years. They are all family-based businesses; they are based on personalities who are well known throughout the district and, when a person in the area wants to dispose of his home, he usually contacts one of these gentlemen because they are so well known and no doubt do such a good job. I am concerned about the disposal of homes by the Public Trustee on behalf of beneficiaries. I have raised this matter with the Minister before, and the answers I have received have caused me not to be happy. On that basis, I wish to raise the matter again in this House in the hope that another look at this issue will be taken.

It appears that four or five real estate agents in this State are the only ones who ever have the opportunity to dispose of properties from the Public Trustee. To me, this is a concern, because when I asked real estate agents in my electorate about the matter I found that they had never disposed of properties from the Public Trustee, except if a beneficiary demanded that a certain land agent dispose of a property. However, the demands must be strong to get to that stage. Nowhere does the Public Trustee approach a local agent, who should, because of their local knowledge, have the best opportunity to dispose of the property at a

fair and equitable price. On that basis I wrote to the Minister, and late last year he wrote back, stating in part:

Using these criteria Public Trustee will instruct an agent who will give superior service either by being a 'specialist' in a particular area or one of four or five agents who best answer the above criteria.

The criteria were set out in the letter. Because it has been quite well demonstrated to me that four or five agents appear to be getting all the properties to dispose of, I asked that those making the complaints to me carry out a survey in their local papers and in the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* and to demonstrate to me their concern. They did that by photocopying over a period of four or five weeks. They were able clearly to demonstrate to me that four or five companies in this State were receiving the bulk of the real estate deals from the Public Trustee's office. Also, it was demonstrated that out of those four or five companies three of them were quite large major city-based real estate companies, and they handled the bulk of property disposal in this State. I believe that that is unfair because, I understand, there are approximately 1 900 registered real estate agents in this State; and out of those 1 900 people three big companies get all the properties to dispose of on behalf of the Public Trustee.

As I said, if a beneficiary is persistent enough, the Public Trustee will arrange for a land agent of their choice to dispose of the property, but it takes a long, hard battle to get that far and, in most cases, which is evident if one looks at the advertisements in the paper, the Public Trustee chooses one of those three major companies to dispose of such properties. This is a concern to me because I believe that the real estate agents in the electorate of Henley Beach must know the value of properties much better than would a city-based company. They have a rough idea of what the property is worth and put that price on the property for disposal. On many occasions I believe that full benefit is not flowing to the beneficiary.

I believe that the Public Trustee has a responsibility to get the best price for a property and should endeavour to do so. I believe that a smaller efficient company can offer a far better service than can the big real estate companies. For instance, if a property is put in the hands of one of these city-based companies, most of which are in the vicinity of Waymouth Street, quite often it takes three, four or five days before an agent goes to see the property and arrange its sale with the beneficiaries, whereas a local real estate agent given the job can be on the front doorstep, if not on the same day, certainly by the next day, to arrange the property sale and the necessary business transactions and give the personalised attention that is necessary. They are able to work through prices and give details about how to sell the property by auction. I refer to the reply by the Minister of Consumer Affairs dated 8 September 1981, in which he said:

Beneficiaries are consulted before a reserve is fixed and the firm who makes the valuation or sales report—whether nominated by the beneficiaries or by Public Trustee—is usually instructed to conduct the auction. Where Public Trustee nominates an agent, Public Trustee makes his selection bearing in mind his obligation as a trustee to do the best he possibly can for the estate. Accordingly, he selects an agent who has demonstrated to Public Trustee by past performance that he has the ability, expertise and resources to deal properly with a sale.

I have quoted from an answer that I received from the Minister. I would like to see that policy fulfilled in the community that I represent and to see at least some of those small real estate agents beginning to get some of the work from the Public Trustee's Department of this State.

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

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** The matter that I want to draw to the attention of the House this evening relates to a proposal by the Adelaide City Council to impose a curfew on the time of trading of the Adelaide Railway Station pie cart.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SLATER:** Members may think that that is a bit of a laugh, but I point out that I believe the pie cart has a rather unique place within the City of Adelaide.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It is still by the railway station. What are you worried about?

**Mr SLATER:** I ask the Minister of Agriculture to be patient. After all, if part of the end product is the result of agricultural pursuits, I am sure he would be interested in the future of the pie cart. I wish to draw to members' attention the fact that the Adelaide City Council, on hearing evidence and submissions from businesses nearby, has decided to endeavour to impose a curfew of 11.30 p.m. on one of Adelaide's best-known eating spots, the Adelaide Railway Station pie cart, which has unique features and is part of the Adelaide scene.

**An honourable member:** It's a tourist attraction.

**Mr SLATER:** Of course it should be regarded as a tourist attraction. It is unique as far as our city is concerned. I point out that it caters for the community, for shift workers, and that it provides the community with an opportunity to use it. Indeed, many members of this House have been patrons of the pie cart during late-night sittings. The Adelaide City Council proposes to provide certain trading hours. From 30 June the hours will be from 6 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. I believe that this is the foot in the door for the eventual loss of the pie cart from the Adelaide Railway Station site.

The submissions to the council claim that the pie cart is responsible for noise and misbehaviour at night that affects the patrons of nearby hotels. Complaints have specifically come from the Grosvenor Hotel, the Strathmore Hotel, and, for some unknown reason, the State Transport Authority. I indicate to the House that I will be putting a question to the Minister of Transport to ask just what interest the State Transport Authority has in regard to noise after 11.30 p.m.

I believe that it is the old story that the majority are being penalised for the behaviour of a few. I do not believe that the pie cart is responsible for all the misbehaviour and noise that occurs on North Terrace at that time of night. As a matter of fact, most of the patrons who attend the pie cart have usually attended some other place or establishment that provides to its patrons some of the fluid which accounts for the noisy behaviour when they attend the pie cart.

I hope that the pie cart will be retained at its present site. Its proprietor has supplied to me a statement by a public accountant that, if the council persists with its desire to close the Adelaide Railway Station pie cart at 11.30 p.m. it will operate at a loss, because a great proportion of the patrons patronise the pie cart after 11.30 p.m. I might mention in passing that this statement was prepared before it was known that the Adelaide City Council intended substantially to increase, in some cases by up to 400 per cent, the licence fees for street traders within the City of Adelaide. I want now to quote from this public accountant's report to the proprietor of the pie cart, Mr Oram. It says:

Our calculations have been based on the statistics supplied and those requested by us. They relate to the week ended 13 February 1982. There were no extraordinary events in that week to cause any fluctuation in the number of customers.

A table is attached to the statement indicating the number of customers serviced during those trading hours, and another table sets out the expected number of customers if the trading hours are reduced, based on the assumption that the number of customers per hour is constant. From observation, the net result of such a change would be a loss of 29.76 per cent of your customers. An additional table sets out the number of customers serviced before 11 p.m. and after that time. The letter goes on to say that the importance of these statistics relates to the average value of customer orders. Those served after 11 p.m. purchase an average of 28c more than those served before 11 p.m. The statement goes on to say that the further adjustments to variable expenses include light and power, paper bags and wrapping, and wages. The letter goes on to say:

In addition to the expenses of operating the pie cart, there is approximately \$44 000 invested in the capital value of the pie cart itself and a further \$6 000 in the supply truck. A further \$10 000 would probably be invested in storage and back-up equipment. The earning capacity of the capital investment should be notionally taken into account when assessing the profitability (or loss) of the business.

We were surprised to observe the demand you meet in the unusual hours of your existing trading, and this no doubt indicates the service you render to people when other businesses are closed. The fact that the average order is 28 cents greater in those hours is an indication that you are involved in an important service industry, and your willingness to serve the public at those times is a tribute to you.

Attached to this statement is a proposed trading and profit and loss statement which indicates that, if the council proceeds with the closing of the pie cart at 11.30 p.m., a \$23 349 profit result in 1981 would result in a \$7 225 loss in the operation of the pie cart under those trading conditions. So, I indicate to the House the importance of the pie cart to the people of Adelaide.

The proposal by the Adelaide City Council will certainly inhibit or restrict its operations, and eventually we will see that the pie cart will no longer exist. I think that would be a loss to the people of Adelaide and the people of South Australia. The Adelaide City Council by-laws need to be considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I make a plea to the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee to consider very carefully the by-laws that will come before them in regard to the time of trading for the railway station pie cart and, even more seriously, the proposed licence fees for all street traders.

For example, it is proposed that the licence fees for street traders will rise on 1 July, and in some instances they will rise by 400 per cent. The 26 traders that are affected are the fruit, vegetable, and flower stall holders, newsagents and pie cart operators. The annual fee for one food trader kiosk in Rundle Mall has jumped from \$4 800 to a proposed \$12 000. Now, where are the champions on the other side of the House who say that they are the stalwarts and friends of small businesses? There has not been one squawk or one thing said by the Government or any of its members regarding these proposed increases. I think that they are exorbitant. The street traders play a very important part in the Adelaide scene, and they should not be unduly penalised. Here again—

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

Motion carried.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 2 June at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 June 1982

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## RANDOM BREATH TESTING

273. Mr PETERSON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Since the random breath testing programme was commenced on 15 October 1981:

- (a) in what streets and towns or suburbs have the units been located;
- (b) at each location, how many drivers have been tested and how many have been or will be prosecuted as a result; and
- (c) what has been the cost of the programme per driver tested and per driver apprehended in the metropolitan and country areas, respectively?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The time and effort involved in providing this information is not considered warranted.

## POLICE FORCE

322. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the staff of the Police Force, and, if so, when, by how many and in what specific areas and, if not, why not?

2. How many representations during 1981 have been made to the Government to increase police numbers and what organisations and community groups made such representations?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The replies are as follows:

1. This matter is receiving consideration.

2. 10—Andamooka Progress and Opal Miners Association Inc.; Coonalpyn Progress Association; Corporation of Jamestown; District Council of Spalding; District Council of Willunga; Central Yorke Peninsula Liaison Committee; Corporation of the Town of Thebarton; Nangwarry Primary School; Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier; Flinders Ranges Regional Tourist Association Inc.

## MARIHUANA CROP

349. The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Concerning the marihuana crop which was detected at Deep Creek—

- (a) was the crop initially discovered by local police officers;
- (b) did these police officers advise the Drug Squad of the existence of the crop and, if not, how did Drug Squad members become aware of it;
- (c) on what date was the crop discovered;
- (d) on what date was the Drug Squad advised of the crop's existence;
- (e) was the crop kept under surveillance and, if so, for what period, from which sections were the police drawn for the surveillance, and was the crop watered during the surveillance period and, if so, how and by whom;
- (f) what mechanism existed for providing water to this crop, and was the mechanism operated by a manual switch or a timing device;
- (g) was the crop in a healthy condition at the time of the destruction; and

(h) was the crop growing on private land and, if so, why have no arrests taken place to date?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: In view of the court case pending, the questions raised are *sub judice*.

## ASIAN VISIT

381. Mr SLATER (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier or any other Minister to be personally involved in the proposed visit to and promotion of South Australian products in Asia in March and April, and, if so, what involvement will the Premier or Minister have?

2. What will be the cost of the project to the Government?

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

1. As part of the Premier's recent overseas trip he was directly involved in the promotion of South Australia and its products in Asia. The itinerary included investment seminars which were held in Singapore, Hong Kong and Tokyo. Wine and food promotions were also staged at the same time in all three locations. As well as hosting the investment seminars which involved prominent speakers from South Australia together with local personnel, the Premier attended a number of official receptions in addition to appearing on television and being interviewed on radio.

2. The total promotion, including the seminars, was jointly arranged and funded in conjunction with the Hilton Hotel chain, Cathay Pacific, South Australian wine producers and Safcol. The cost to the Government was in the vicinity of \$200 000.

## PUBLIC RELATIONS

411. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health what was the cost of:

- (a) publications;
- (b) advertising; and
- (c) public relations,

by departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the years ended 30 June 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

## Department of Tourism

Year Ended	30 June	30 June	30 June
	1979	1980	1981
	\$	\$	\$
(a) Publications . . . . .	206 000	244 000	311 000
(b) Advertising . . . . .	212 000	312 000	583 000
(c) Public Relations . . . . .	3 700	3 700	39 500

## Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science

Year Ended	30 June	30 June	30 June
	1979	1980	1981
	\$	\$	\$
(a) Publications . . . . .	2 750	5 400	4 540
(b) Advertising (for staff only) . . . . .	4 200	3 400	7 500*
(c) Public Relations†	1 890	2 100	2 670

\*The increased cost of advertising in 1980-81 was largely due to advertisements placed Australia-wide and overseas for a Director of the Institute.

†The cost of 'public relations' mainly covers an Institute newsletter which is forwarded to clients (doctors, veterinary surgeons etc.) plus a telephone information pad which is also forwarded to clients of the Institute.

Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board			
Year Ended	30 June 1979	30 June 1980	30 June 1981
	\$	\$	\$
(a) Publications . . . . .	Not avail- able	2 561	2 880
(b) Advertising . . . . .	Not avail- able	2 301	3 600
(c) Public Relations . . . . .	Not avail- able	No accu- rate record is kept for this type of expend- iture. Est.— \$3 500	No accu- rate record is kept for this type of expend- iture. Est.— \$3 500

South Australian Health Commission (Central Office Only)			
Year Ended	30 June 1979	30 June 1980	30 June 1981
	\$	\$	\$
(a) Publications* . . . . .	61 067	142 222	136 658
(b) Advertising . . . . .	8 676	32 992	73 765†
(c) Public Relations . . . . .	Nil	Nil	Nil

\* Defined as including all printing charges incurred by the S.A. Health Commission. These costs include the costs of printing standard stationery and forms etc., as well as S.A.H.C. publications and reports. The effort involved in separating out these costs is not justified.

† The increase in cost of advertising 1980/81 was due to the following factors:

1. Advertising—Staff Vacancies  
Arising from the Central Office re-organisation programme there is a firm commitment to attract suitable applicants. This is reflected in the ongoing expenditure in this area.
2. Advertising—Other  
The increase is solely connected with Health Education and reflects (a) the establishment of Mr J. Cowley, Director, Health Promotion Services, in the Health Promotion arena, and (b) the concerted programmes effected during 1980/81 relating to Immunisation, (\$22 000) and Amoebic Meningitis (\$22 000).

**DRUGS**

433. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What was the value and respective amounts of the following drugs confiscated or found illegally growing during 1979-80, 1980-81 and each month since 1 July 1981—

- (a) heroin;
- (b) marihuana;
- (c) amphetamine;
- (d) barbiturates; and
- (e) other types of drugs,

and how many convictions, respectively, resulted for growing or possession of these drugs?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The time and effort to provide the information sought cannot be justified.

**LICENSING COURT JUDGE**

468. Mr CRAFTER (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs:

1. Is it the intention of the Government not to appoint a replacement Licensing Court judge when Judge Grubb is transferred from that jurisdiction?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to provide judicial staff to the Licensing Court from the magistracy?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Timothy Russell Anderson, LL.B, was appointed Acting Licensing Court Judge from 15 April 1982.
2. Mr C. G. Eardley, S.M., a magistrate designated a member of the Licensing Court, is hearing matters in the Court on three days each week. This is in addition to the Licensing Court Magistrate, who is engaged in the Licensing Court on a full time basis.

**FLIGHT CHARTER**

490. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the cost incurred in 1980-81 by departments, statutory authorities or corporations under the Premier's control for each charter of aeroplanes or helicopters and what were the departure and arrival points in each case?
2. On how many occasions were endorsed Liberal candidates, including sitting Members other than the Premier, carried on such flights?
3. Why was each charter necessary?

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

1.	\$
Adelaide/Penola/Adelaide . . . . .	500.00
Adelaide/Mount Gambier/Adelaide . . . . .	2 296.40
Adelaide/Canberra/Adelaide . . . . .	3 835.00
Adelaide/Pinnaroo . . . . .	308.00
Adelaide/Northern areas/Adelaide . . . . .	519.40
Adelaide/Cooper Pedy/Andamooka/Adelaide . . . . .	499.80
Adelaide/Cooper Pedy/Adelaide . . . . .	621.00
Adelaide/Cooper Pedy and surrounding areas/ Adelaide . . . . .	559.39
Adelaide/West Coast and Far Northern/Adelaide . . . . .	765.00
Adelaide/Leigh Creek and area/Adelaide . . . . .	676.20
Adelaide/Cooper Pedy/Adelaide . . . . .	728.00
Adelaide/Alice Springs/Adelaide . . . . .	350.00

2. Four.
3. As required by the Premier, Government Departments and authorities in carrying out necessary functions of Government.

**PRISON INMATES**

491. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary—What are the numbers of inmates of each nationality in the respective State prisons and correctional institutions?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The time and effort in obtaining the information from the present recording system is not warranted.

**STOLEN VEHICLES**

493. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many motor vehicles were stolen between July and December 1981 and how many of these vehicles have been recovered?

2. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation making it an offence for a person to leave his motor vehicle unlocked and if so, when and if not, why not?

3. Which other States have legislation of that type?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 2 879 vehicles. During the period 1 July-31 December 1981, 2495 vehicles were recovered. However, from records available it is not possible to ascertain how many of the recovered vehicles were actually part of the number stolen during that period.

2. This type of legislation is not contemplated by the Government.

3. Information regarding the situation in other States is not available from sources within the Police Department.

#### S.T.A. STAFF

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

1. Is it a fact that an officer of the State Transport Authority was placed on special duties to sort out problems of 'made available' staff and if so, what was the period involved in this exercise and who was the officer concerned?

2. What negotiations with the Railway Union took place as a result of those investigations and what were the recommendations of that officer to the S.T.A.?

3. Is it a fact that the S.T.A. intends to write or has written to the 'made available' staff offering them employment within the S.T.A. and if so, why and under what conditions is the employment offered?

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

1. The former personnel manager of the State Transport Authority was placed on special duties from October 1980 until his retirement on 30 September 1981, to identify problems and seek solutions relating to the direct employment of Australian National employees seconded to the State Transport Authority to operate the metropolitan railways.

2. Late in 1980, following negotiations between the State Transport Authority and the Australian Railways Union, a document was distributed to all Australian Railways Union members who were made available to the State Transport Authority setting out proposals and arguments for such employees to become directly employed by the State Transport Authority. No further negotiations were held on the subject with the Australian Railways Union prior to October 1981.

3. The current secondment arrangement is unsatisfactory in particular from a supervision point of view. The State Transport Authority has been asked to seek ways of resolving the problem associated with 'made available' staff becoming 'direct employees'. Whenever individuals have approached the Authority seeking direct employment they have been advised of the Authority's conditions of employment.

#### ROAD ACCIDENTS

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

1. Is the Minister aware that during 1980 in New South Wales there were more than 3 200 road accidents involving telegraph poles, accounting for more than half of all accidents with immovable objects?

2. Is similar statistical information available in South Australia for 1980 and 1981, respectively, and if so, what are those figures?

3. How many injuries and deaths were recorded during these years in the Adelaide metropolitan and country areas, respectively?

4. What investigations, if any, have been carried out and by whom to determine if these accidents can be reduced by—

(a) better siting of these poles; and

(b) use of reflectors or reflecting materials?

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

1. No.

2. According to recorded accident data held by the Highways Department, in 1980 the number of accidents involving fixed objects was 3 518, of which 697 accidents involved poles. (Accident reports are generally not specific as to whether 'telegraph' poles or other poles are involved).

3.

	1980	
	Injured	Deaths
(a) No. of recorded injuries and deaths in the metropolitan area . . . . .	6 913	136
No. of recorded injuries and deaths in the rural area . . . . .	2 962	133
(b) <i>Metropolitan Area</i>		
No. of recorded injuries and deaths—all fixed objects . . . . .	876	34
No. of recorded injuries and deaths—poles only . . . . .	317	13
(c) <i>Rural Area</i>		
No. of recorded injuries and deaths—all fixed objects . . . . .	584	24
No. of recorded injuries and deaths—poles only . . . . .	86	1

Overall, during 1980, nearly 15 per cent of accidents causing personal injury or death involved stationary objects. Of this 15 per cent, 27½ per cent involved poles.

The information for 1981 is not available at this time.

4. (a) A recent study of accident reports by the Highways Department produced no evidence to show that safety would be enhanced by the resiting of particular poles.

(b) On roads maintained by the Highways Department, where an obvious and unusual traffic hazard may be created by the presence of any particular pole, this is indicated by the installation of standard reflective hazard markers.

#### DRIVING INSTRUCTORS

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

1. What are the required qualifications for driving instructors in driving schools?

2. What is the length of their training, if they are required to have any?

3. Are driving instructors permitted access to the Police Driving Academy and if so, on what basis and if not, why not?

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

1. Persons who provide driving instruction for some form of remuneration or consideration are required to meet the following qualifications:

(a) be a holder of a valid driver's licence;

(b) have held a driver's licence in South Australia or elsewhere for a continuous period of not less than three years immediately preceding the date of application for an instructor's licence;

(c) be, in the opinion of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, a fit and proper person to hold an instructor's licence; and

(d) be, in the opinion of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, proficient as a motor driving instructor.

2. There is no requirement for a driving instructor to undergo formal training. Applicants for an instructor's licence are, however, required by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to undertake a comprehensive examination, which is conducted at the Road Safety Instruction Centre at Oaklands Park. There is also an advanced course in defensive driving

available at the centre of which many applicants for instructor's licences avail themselves.

3. No. The Road Safety Instruction Centre is the appropriate facility and is staffed with officers qualified to assess the proficiency of driving instructors.

### CONFIDENTIALITY OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

516. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it required practice for a public servant seconded from the State public service to interstate or Federal Ministerial offices to sign a declaration that they will do nothing to prejudice interests of South Australia (or words to that effect) and that on their return to this State they will do nothing to betray the confidentiality of the Commonwealth Government (or words to that effect) and if so, how many officers have been required to make such declarations during the term of the current Government, who are they and what are their positions and what is meant by 'the interests' of South Australia?

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

### STATE PUBLIC SERVANTS

518. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it Government policy to require State public servants who are seconded to interstate and/or Federal Ministerial offices to agree to return to the 'unattached list' of their original State department and if not, what is the policy concerning the reinstatement of such public servants on the completion of the seconded period?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The South Australian Public Service does not have an 'unattached list'. It is normal practice for seconded S.A. public servants to return to their former positions on termination of their secondment.

### MINISTER'S TELEX

523. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Fisheries: Was the previous Minister responsible for a telex to the Management Committee of A.F.I.C. on or about Monday 13 July 1981 requesting the committee to consider 'options to relocate three Commonwealth licensed vessels from the Investigator Strait prawn fishery into other State prawn fisheries' and if not, who was?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** Yes.

### SALISBURY BUS SERVICE

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

1. What would be the extra cost per run of running buses on Route 6 beyond their present northern terminus up to Salisbury town centre in the evenings, Saturday afternoons and Sundays when Service 501 does not operate and what level of extra patronage would be required to justify operating Route 6 in such a manner?

2. Will the Minister give consideration to operating such a limited extension to Route 6 for a trial period if analyses indicate that the required extra patronage could be achieved from the Salisbury/Salisbury Downs/Parafield Gardens sector and if not, why not?

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

1. The cost of providing bus services varies according to the day of operation e.g. weekdays, Saturday or Sunday, and on public holidays varying levels of costs are incurred

at different times of the day. It is therefore, not practicable to express operating costs on a 'per run' basis. However, the additional cost to provide the services requested by the honourable member would approximate \$4 000 a week (\$208 000 per annum).

State Transport Authority weekday services are timetabled in line with established loading standards. These standards provide for buses to operate with fully seated loads between weekday peak periods and with a level of standees in peak periods. During weekday evenings and at weekends only a minimum level of service is provided when these standards are not met.

2. The State Transport Authority's assessment of the patronage offering beyond the normal Route 6 terminus is less than that experienced on routes where the minimum level of service is now provided. Accordingly, it is not proposed to operate the service beyond the existing terminus on a trial basis.

The State Transport Authority is developing plans for the extension of the hours of operation of services on Route 501. However, no changes are expected before 1983.

### SALISBURY BUS PATRONAGE

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

1. What level of patronage would be required to justify operating Route 411 at selected times on Thursday evening (to cater for late night shoppers patronising the Salisbury shopping centre), Friday evenings (to cater for late night shoppers returning from Adelaide, as well as patrons returning from entertainment venues), Saturday afternoons (to cater for patrons attending sporting functions) and Saturday evening (for patrons attending entertainment functions)?

2. Will the Minister consider operating such after-hours services for a trial period if analyses indicate that the required patronage could be achieved for such runs and if not, why not?

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

1. State Transport Authority services are designed to operate with full seated loads during weekdays and with standee passengers in peak periods. At times when demand does not meet standards, a minimum level of frequency is adopted. During weekends, evenings and holidays, patronage even on routes with significant peak patronage is generally very low.

2. The level of patronage on Route 411 during the peak periods is very low in comparison with other services. The indications are that there would be even less on evening and weekend services, if they were introduced, than is the case on routes with significant peak hour loadings. Accordingly, it is not proposed to introduce after hours services on a trial basis.

### BUS SERVICE PROVISIONS

527. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What plans are in hand for the provision of bus services to the residents of Salisbury Downs (north-west of Martins Road), Parafield Gardens (north-west of Martins Road) and Paralowie and when can such plans be expected to come to fruition?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority has no immediate plans to provide bus services in the Salisbury Downs (north-west of Martins Road), Parafield Gardens (north-west of Martins Road) and Paralowie areas. However, as the areas develop, public transport demand will be monitored and improvements to public transport in the area will be allocated priorities in the light of competing demands elsewhere in metropolitan Adelaide.

### STOCK PADDOCKS

530. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Subsequent to the recent Supplementary Development Plan covering the stock paddocks area, what area of land bounded by Port Wakefield Road, the railway line and a line formed by the joining of Ryans Road with Ponsford Crescent to the railway can, when fully developed according to plan precepts, be expected to be used for—

- (a) open space;
- (b) residential land;
- (c) industrial development; and
- (d) special uses?

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

The Salisbury Stock Paddocks Supplementary Development Plan delineated, in general terms, land to be used for a range of purposes including those you have listed. Within the area described, being portion of the stock holding land within the Salisbury electorate, the following approximate areas are delineated:

- (a) open space—26 hectares
- (b) residential—5 hectares
- (c) industrial—249 hectares (of which 9 hectares were previously shown for such purposes on the authorised development plan)
- (d) special uses—0

A large portion of the industrial land however may be required for drainage purposes associated with the Dry Creek channel. The land involved in drainage ponding areas may be as high as 102 hectares, all of which is shown for industrial purposes. A further 29 hectares of industrial land is required by Australian National Railways Commission in association with the Dry Creek Marshalling Yards. This scenario results in the following figures:

- (a) open space—128 hectares (including drainage ponds)
- (b) residential—5 hectares
- (c) industrial—147 hectares (9 hectares of which were previously shown for industrial purposes)
- (d) special uses—0

### INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE TREE

532. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What activities are being considered by the Education Department to tie in with the United Nations International Year of the Tree due to commence on World Environment Day, 5 June 1982 and, if any, has any financial allocation been made in the Education budget for them?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There will be no United Nations International Year of the Tree commencing on World Environment Day, 6 June 1982. There will, however, be an Australian Year of the Tree which is being sponsored jointly by the United Nations Associations in the different states. As yet, the Education Department has received no direct information about this project, but when and if this is forthcoming, schools will be encouraged to use the project to assist in the implementation of environmental education. Many of our schools have already been involved in tree-planting programmes.

### ELECTION CANDIDATES

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

1. Are any members of the staff of the Minister endorsed candidates for the next State election and, if so, who are they, what Party are they preselected for and for what electorates?

2. Will the Minister ensure that any such preselected candidates will not be permitted to unfairly take advantage of information available to them by virtue of their employment?

3. Will the Minister also ensure that any such candidates will not conduct activities related to their political preselection during working time?

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

1. Yes. Mr L. Crosby Liberal Party Norwood.
2. No unfair advantage will be taken of information made available to Mr Crosby by virtue of his employment.
3. The conditions which have applied to Ministerial staff, whose working time varies frequently, in successive Governments will continue to apply.

### EDUCATION COSTS

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

1. What is the annual cost of the office of the Minister of Education and how much of that is salaries?

2. Are the staff positions in the office of the Minister answerable to the Director-General of Education?

3. Were the previous positions that were dispensed with, thus permitting the appointment of staff to the office of the Minister (as indicated by the Minister during the Estimates Committee debates), answerable to the Director-General of Education?

4. What alterations to the task specification of the office of the Minister have been made from those proposed by the Keeves Committee and why were such changes made?

5. Has the Budget Review Committee made or will it make an investigation of the value of the office of the Minister as it is presently constituted and if not, why not?

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

1. The total annual cost of both offices was provided in Budget Estimates for 1981-82 at \$291 000, comprising salaries \$262 000 and contingencies \$29 000.

2. (a) The Minister of Education's office is served by two groups of officers—

(i) Seven Public Service Act appointees in the office of the Minister of Education, and two Ministerial appointees.

(ii) Five Public Service Act appointees in the office of the Ministry of Education.

(b) All Public Service Act staff are responsible to the Director-General of Education, as permanent head of the Education Department.

(c) The two Ministerial appointees are responsible to the Minister of Education.

3. When the five officers were appointed to the Ministry of Education, three positions were abolished which were answerable to the Director-General of Education, together with the abolition of two Public Service Act positions on the establishment of the Department of Further Education which were answerable to the Director-General of Further Education.

4. The Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia in its First Report recommended that an Office of the Minister of Education be established and outlined nine functions which in the committee's opinion the office could perform. The Government, in establishing an Office of the Ministry of Education, reduced the number of functions to six of those recommended by the Keeves Committee, as the remaining three functions covered responsibilities associated with the operations of a proposed Education Policy and Priorities Executive and proposed Regional Education Councils. The Government is still giving consideration to those latter proposals.



5. The Budget Review Committee is charged with the task of overseeing the budgets of all Government operations. It is not known what attention the committee may give to the Minister's Office.

**ELIZABETH/PLAYFORD PROJECT**

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

1. What is the present stage of development of the Elizabeth/Playford project?
2. When can it be expected that students and staff at the schools concerned will start to feel the impact of recommendations made in that proposal?

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

1. A recently released report contains a number of options including a proposed secondary college made up of four campuses. High schools in the area would work co-operatively with the multi-campus college.

2. A final report will be submitted to me in term 3 of this year. After due consideration an approach will be made to schools via the Director-General of Education.

**ENROLMENT ESTIMATES**

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

1. What are the current—

- (a) high;
- (b) low; and
- (c) expected,

estimates of enrolments in Government primary and secondary schools, respectively, for each of the next 10 years?

2. What assessment has been made of—

- (a) projected migration to and from the State;
- (b) the birth rate;
- (c) the move to private schools; and
- (d) retention rates at senior secondary level,

in arriving at the expected estimates of student enrolments?

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

1. The current enrolment projections for government primary and secondary schools are as follows:

Table 1  
July Government Enrolment Projections ('000)

Primary	High	Low	Median
1981*	-	-	137.8
1982	134.3	131.7	133.0
1983	130.5	127.1	128.4
1984	126.1	121.3	123.7
1985	123.2	117.3	120.3
1986	122.8	115.4	119.2
1987	124.4	115.0	119.8
1988	127.5	115.3	121.3
1989	131.7	116.4	123.7
1990	137.2	117.9	126.8
1991	143.1	119.5	130.5
Secondary	High	Low	Median
1981*	-	-	75.1
1982	75.1	72.0	74.0
1983	75.5	72.0	73.7
1984	76.0	72.0	74.0
1985	75.7	71.1	73.4
1986	73.9	69.1	71.4
1987	71.0	65.7	68.2
1988	68.0	62.2	64.9
1989	65.8	59.3	62.3
1990	64.1	57.2	60.4
1991	63.4	55.7	59.3

\* Actual

2. (a) The enrolment projections take into account information on migration made available by the Interdepartmental Forecasting Committee. These migration estimates include a low, median and high migration series. Within this population movement, 18 per cent is assumed to be aged 5-16 years and 20 per cent is assumed to be aged 0-4 years.

The projected median enrolment series assumes migration at twice the high series level for 1980-1981 and 1981-1982 of children aged 0-16 years. After 1982, the assumptions of the high migration series were applied.

(b) A total fertility rate of 1 920 per 1 000 women was used for the median series. Rates of 1 800 and 2 011 were used for the low series and high series respectively.

(c) Problems of projecting non-government school enrolments are the subject of a national co-operative study involving the Commonwealth Schools Commission and education authorities. In arriving at the median series for government school projections, a high estimate of growth in primary non-government school enrolments from 24 700 in 1981 to 29 500 in 1988 and in secondary enrolments from 18 600 in 1981 to 24 000 in 1988 has been assumed.

(d) An increase of 1 per cent in the participation rate of 16-year-olds was assumed in developing the projections. This would result in some increase in retention rate at senior secondary level, approximately 200 students. The retention rates will be reviewed when the current projections are revised.

**TEACHERS SALARIES**

538. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has Mr Bruce de Belle been briefed on a full-time or part-time basis to oppose the teachers salaries application and if so, how much is the brief costing the Government and why were Crown Law officers not used in this instance?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is normal practice for both the Government and the South Australian Institute of Teachers to be represented by advocates in salaries hearings which are before the Teachers Salaries Board. Mr Bruce de Belle has been commissioned by the Government to assist officers of the Public Service Board in presenting the employer's case to the board. Crown Law officers are not normally used. The Government's cost to date has been \$16 171.

**SCHOOL DISPLACEMENT PROCEDURES**

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

1. What advance notice is usually given to schools affected by displacement procedures and what is the minimum notice that applied in any case in 1981?

2. Will the Minister give an undertaking that in future schools will be advised as soon as it is known that a displacement will be required from that school?

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

1. Displacement procedures normally take place twice a year. By using established and published procedures which have been in effect now for some years, teachers are identified as early as possible.

2. Present procedures are considered to be adequate. School principals are normally among the first to be aware of the need to increase or displace staff.

### COMMERCIAL ART COURSE

545. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding the Advertising and Graphic Design Course of the Commercial Art Section of the Croydon Park College of Further Education—

- (a) how much are students charged for 'fees for materials used' in order to pay for such items as air brushes, compressors, P.M.T. machines, model fees and the maintenance of photographic machinery etc., and how much is this per capita;
- (b) what contribution is made by the Government to meet, in part, such costs;
- (c) how much could the average student expect to pay in excess of 'fees for materials used' for consumables each year;
- (d) has consideration been given to providing materials free of charge to students in this course as applies to Stream 3 students of the Department of Further Education and if not, why not; and
- (e) what is the Government allocation for items equivalent to those included in (a) for Stream 3 students at the Croydon Park College and how much is this per capita?

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

- (a) Part-time students are required to pay \$10 per semester and full-time students pay \$50 per semester.
- (b) Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education was allocated \$4 000 for Commercial Art.
- (c) An *ad hoc* survey indicated that costs in similar courses around Australia would be of the order of \$900 per annum.
- (d) Stream 3 students are indentured apprentices, it is normal practice not to require apprentices to pay material fees. Because of the framework within which apprentice courses operate and longstanding departmental policy, which states that students enrolled in vocational courses are required to pay material costs, no consideration has been given to changing this.
- (e) This information is not available.

### EDUCATION BASICS

548. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What percentage of schools is estimated to spend less than two-thirds of total time on teaching the basics (including social learning) and how is that estimate arrived at?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Basics or foundations of learning as defined by the Committee of Enquiry in South Australia include:

- the acquisition of skills associated with the use of the English language both oral and written (language);
- knowledge and understanding of the physical world and the natural environment (science);
- knowledge, understanding and ability to apply certain concepts and relations of number and space (mathematics); and
- knowledge and understanding of the society in which we live and our relationship to it as individuals (social learning).

Given this definition no primary school spends less than 72 per cent and no secondary school spends less than 63 per cent on the basics. It is more difficult to establish the proportion of time spent on each specific area of basic learning. This information has been derived from a survey

conducted by the R-7 Curriculum Implementation Team in 1981 and an analysis of annual Secondary Curriculum Statistics.

### PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

549. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the present stage of the proposal to redevelop Pinnaroo Area School and when can a start to construction be expected?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The redevelopment of Pinnaroo Area School is proposed in two stages. The first stage is scheduled for completion in September 1983 and the second in December 1984. At the moment it is expected that the scheduled completion dates for Stage I and II will be met.

### ANDAMOOKA RENTS

551. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What rents are charged for houses owned by the Government and let to policemen at Andamooka?
2. Are utility charges incorporated in those rent figures or charged separately?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$18.50 per fortnight.
2. No—charged separately.

### TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SUBSIDY FUND

553. Mr KENEALLY (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: How many projects have been approved under the Tourism Development Subsidy Fund 1981-82, what are they and what is the cost of such projects in—

- (a) electorates held by Labor M.P.s;
- (b) electorates held by Liberal M.P.s; and
- (c) electorates held by the Country Party and Australian Democrats M.P.s?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

	Subsidy \$
1. Arno Bay Caravan Park—construction of new amenities block	17 250
2. Christies Beach Caravan Park—upgrading of site works	40 250
3. Cowell Foreshore Caravan Park—construction of new amenities	37 500
4. Waterloo Bay Caravan Park, Elliston—completion of site works commenced in 1980-81	4 942
5. Kadina Caravan Park—construction of tent sites	4 000
6. Morgan Caravan Park—sealing of internal roads and drainage	5 500
7. Point Turton Caravan Park—provision of handicapped facilities	2 000
8. Renmark Caravan Park—completion of upgrading of sites	16 348
9. Wallaroo North Beach Caravan Park—construction of additional sites	17 000
10. Coober Pedy—construction of Tourist Information Bay	1 550
11. Loxton—enlargement of Loxton Tourist Information Office	17 500
12. Meningie—completion of tourist lookout	751
13. Mount Gambier—construction of tourist Lookout at Keenan Drive	4 000
14. Waikerie—construction of tourist lookout	1 248
15. Bowhill—construction of public toilets	5 650
16. Moonta Bay—construction of public toilets	17 500
17. Renmark—construction of public toilets at Plushes Bend Reserve	3 000
18. Millicent—construction of handicapped facilities at public toilets	1 425
19. Stirling—construction of public toilets	6 000

	Subsidy \$
20. Gumeracha—construction of public toilets . . . . .	15 000
21. Penneshaw—development of recreation area at Chapman River . . . . .	2 000
22. Kingston—development of recreation areas . . . . .	4 800
23. Renmark—construction of wayside stop on Sturt Highway . . . . .	4 100
24. Wellington—development of Wellington Riverside Reserve . . . . .	16 500
25. Renmark—tourist sign posting . . . . .	500
26. South East Region—tourist sign posting . . . . .	5 000
27. Barmera—development of Lake Bonney Foreshore . . . . .	4 500
28. Burra—sign posting and tourist lookout in Burra Mines area . . . . .	3 458
29. Burra—beautification of Burra Creek . . . . .	12 500
30. Kadina—development of Victoria Square for Kernewek Lowender activities . . . . .	3 500
31. Naracoorte—stabilisation of Naracoorte swimming lake floor . . . . .	5 500
32. Australian Railway Historical Society—re-tyring coal fired engine 'Sir Malcolm Barclay-Harvey' . . . . .	60 500
33. Burra—renovation of Paxton Square Cottages . . . . .	40 000
34. Loxton—erection of storage shed and workshop at Loxton Historical Village . . . . .	2 400
35. Port MacDonnell—Development of Mount Shank volcano . . . . .	11 100
36. Robe—construction of interpretive centre . . . . .	20 000

Projects are considered on their merit and their location in electorates is not taken into consideration. It must also be recognised that the bulk of tourist facilities for development are in areas outside the metropolitan area.

**TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES**

554. **Hon PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: In each of the police regions, how many on-the-spot traffic infringement notices were issued from the commencement of the scheme until the end of February?

- The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:
- Region B (Headquarters, Adelaide)—5 473
  - Region C (Headquarters, Port Adelaide)—4 329
  - Region D (Headquarters, Para Hills)—3 483
  - Region G (Headquarters, Murray Bridge)—2 076
  - Region H (Headquarters, Port Augusta)—1 280
  - Region T (Traffic Police, Adelaide)—7 365

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES**

556. **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Are Public Buildings Department employees making doors for Fricker Brothers and, if so, is the Department providing the material for these doors and, if not providing the material, why not?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. No.
- 3. The basis of the approach by the Fricker Carrington Group for the contract was for 'labour only'.

**KINGS ROAD BOOM GATES**

558. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it still proposed that the installation of boom barrier protection at the Kings Road level crossing, Parafield, will be completed by June and, if not, why not, and what new date for installation has been set?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Yes.

**ANIMALS FOR PENANG**

560. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: 1. How many animals were presented by the previous Government to the State of Penang, what animals were presented and when?

2. Is the Government aware that most of those animals have now died and that the remaining few animals are contained in a cage bearing the notation that they are a gift from the South Australian Government?

3. Will the Government consider replenishing the number of animals displayed in Penang as a gift from South Australia to the number originally presented?

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

- 1. 1 Kangaroo Island Kangaroo
  - 3 Western Grey Knagarooos
  - 4 Hairy Nosed Wombats
  - 6 Dama Wallabies
  - 12 Adelaide Rosellas
  - 12 Musk Lorikeets
  - 12 Rainbow Lorikeets
  - 12 Galahs
- 62

2. Whilst the Government is aware that many of the animals have died, it is not aware of the circumstances of the remaining animals.

3. Any decision would depend on a number of factors, not the least of which would be whether the Government of Malaysia would be prepared to accept the animals, which in the light of past experience, should be limited to specimens from common hardy species. Other matters to be taken into consideration would be availability of suitable housing facilities in Penang where the animals would be kept, approval of the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service to export native animals and the cost factor.

**TOWNSEND SCHOOL**

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

1. How many visually-impaired children were receiving support from specially trained teachers on the staff of Townsend School in 1981 and how many is it estimated will be receiving such support in 1982?

2. How many staff (full-time equivalents and actual persons) at Townsend House provided this support in 1981 and how many will there be in 1982?

3. After allowing for travel time, what is the estimated time each month that a visually-impaired child could expect contact with a teacher from Townsend School on average (recognising that different children will have different requirements for such support)?

4. Is the access to contact with such teachers worse for students in country areas and if so, how great is the disadvantage caused by isolation and what steps are under way to alleviate it?

5. How many braillists (full-time equivalents and actual persons) are employed (and by whom) in the preparation of braille materials for students?

6. Is this allocation adequate to provide for the reasonable educational needs of the children concerned and if not, what steps are underway to improve the situation so that as far as possible visually-impaired children can have similar educational opportunities to normal children?

7. Does the Government make any allocation for the production of computer produced braille materials and, if so, how much and are any changes in allocation proposed?

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

1.	1981	Pupils	Year 6	29	December 1981	February 1982
	Visiting Teacher Service .....	130	Year 5	30		27
	Townsend School Enrolments .....	60	Year 5	31		27
	Total .....	190	Year 4	27	Year 4/5	9+19
	1982	Pupils	Year 4	27		28
	Visiting Teacher Service .....	123	Year 3/4	27	Year 4	30
	Townsend School Enrolments .....	53	Year 3	28		30
	Dover High School Enrolments (with teacher from Townsend school) .....	10	Year 3	28		31
	Total .....	186	Year 2/3	27		—
			Year 2	27	Year R/1/2	23
			Year R/1/2	27	Year R/1/2	20
			Year R/1/2	26	Year R/1/2	21
			Year R/1/2	25	Year R/1/2	21
			Year R/1/2	26	Year R/1/2	21
			Year R/1/2	25	Year R/1/2	21
			Year 1	26	Year R/1/2	22

2.

1981	Staffing:
18.1	FTE Teachers
22	Actual Teacher numbers
5	FTE School Assistants
6	Actual School Assistants

1982—as for 1981.

3. Visually-impaired pupils in regular schools on average have approximately one hour per month of direct Visiting Teacher Service. As part of the service is to assist the regular class teacher to provide appropriate education for the visually-impaired child, direct contact with pupils is not the only guide. Visiting teachers travelled 55 000 km, by car, in the provision of this service. Additional travel included visits by air to out-lying country centres.

4. Country children may be visited once a term and depending on level of handicap, sometimes less frequently than this. With respect to this question and questions 5, 6 and 7, provision of additional resources is being considered as part of 1982-83 Budget discussions.

5. The Education Department employs one person 20 hours per week as a brailist. Other braille materials are prepared by volunteer workers of the South Australian Braille Writing Association.

6. The matter is currently being reviewed as part of 1982-83 Budget discussions.

7. Small proportions of school-based funding have been utilized to purchase some computer-produced braille materials. Again the matter of purchasing further computer produced braille materials is under examination.

### CLASS SIZES

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

1. What were the actual class sizes at the Long Street Primary School as at the end of term 3 1981 and beginning of term 1 1982 and what was the staff allocation to the school in each instance?

2. What is the estimated enrolment at the school at the commencement of term 2 1982 and does this anticipated enrolment justify the appointment of another staff member and, if so, when will such an appointment be made?

3. Was consideration given by the Department of Education to maintaining Ms Kirby in her position from the start of term 1 pending the anticipated increase in enrolments?

4. By how many students was the total school enrolment short of the level that would have prevented Ms Kirby's displacement for term 1 and was this shortfall contrasted with the potential education dislocation for the students concerned that will have resulted from the displacement-replacement procedure?

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

1. Actual class sizes, Long Street Primary School	December 1981	February 1982
Year 7	31	29
Year 7	29	28
Year 6	32	30

Year 6	29	December 1981	February 1982
Year 5	30		27
Year 5	31		27
Year 4	27	Year 4/5	24
Year 4	27		9+19
Year 4	27		28
Year 3/4	27	Year 4	30
Year 3	28		30
Year 3	28		31
Year 2/3	27		—
Year 2	27	Year R/1/2	23
Year R/1/2	27	Year R/1/2	20
Year R/1/2	26	Year R/1/2	21
Year R/1/2	25	Year R/1/2	21
Year R/1/2	26	Year R/1/2	21
Year R/1/2	25	Year R/1/2	21
Year 1	26	Year R/1/2	22
	528		461
Staff allocation	23.7		22.7

2. The estimated enrolment for the beginning of Term 2, 1982 is 465.

Eleven students will commence their schooling four weeks into the term.

There is not sufficient evidence at this stage to warrant the appointment of an additional staff member.

The situation will be monitored closely during the next few months by the Regional Office.

3. The possibility of Ms Kirby remaining at the school pending increasing enrolments later in the year has always been recognised as one of the options available.

4. The school was staffed on its estimated enrolments of 490. Actual enrolments were 461. Had enrolments been greater than 480 it would have been unlikely that the school would have been approached to identify a teacher for relocation.

There has been no educational dislocation in the school. It is adequately staffed for its existing enrolments.

### LOXTON NORTH PRIMARY

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

1. When is it proposed to proceed with the redevelopment of the Loxton North Primary School and what stages will be involved?

2. What were the 'criteria for review of new school development' referred to in the Minister's letter of 28 September 1981 to the Loxton North Primary School Council and in which aspects did the findings of the Public Works Standing Committee Report on the redevelopment fall short of meeting those criteria?

3. Does the Government accept the investigations and recommendations of the Public Works Standing Committee in this matter?

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

1. The first stage (Stage I) of the redevelopment of Loxton North Primary School is due for tender call in the near future.

Stage I, programmed for completion in February 1983, includes classrooms, library resource centre, practical activities area, student sick rooms, disabled persons' toilet and cleaners' store.

Future stages will include the remainder of the planned provisions, separate staff/administration and activity/withdrawal/canteen buildings.

2. The seven criteria used in carrying out the review of the building programme were:

- (1) Demography
- (2) Current school age, area, condition
- (3) Constraints of grounds, amenities and buildings on curriculum

- (4) Availability of other options such as enrolment ceilings, emergency accommodation and staging of projects
- (5) Recurrent cost implications of redevelopment
- (6) Any special circumstances
- (7) Public interest including community involvement.

The report of the Public Works Standing Committee of 29 May 1981 preceded by several months the review of the building programme and therefore did not specifically take the criteria as listed into account.

3. The investigations and recommendations made by the Public Works Standing Committee are accepted by the Government. In fact it is the intention of the Education Department to implement the remainder of the total plan for the redevelopment of Loxton North Primary School when funds can be made available in accordance with State-wide priorities.

#### D.F.E. SEATON SITE

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

1. When was the Seaton site for a Department of Further Education College purchased, where is it situated, how much did it cost and what moves have been made towards developing it?

2. Is the site still owned by the Department of Further Education and, if so, are there any plans to dispose of it and, if it is not now owned by the Department, why was it disposed of, to whom was it sold, for what price and when?

3. Have any alternative sites been purchased or are any intended for purchase to provide facilities similar to those pertaining at other recently developed Department of Further Education facilities (e.g. Gilles Plains, Noarlunga)?

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

1. The D.F.E. Seaton Site situated on the corner of Frederick Road and Meakin Terrace was purchased for \$450 000; payments being made during September 1975, 1976 and 1977. No moves have been taken to develop the site.

2. The site was surplus to D.F.E. requirements and was sold to the South Australian Housing Trust for \$475 000 on 13 January 1982.

3. No.

#### PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

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

1. What applications have been made to the Government for funding to assist the pre-school education of handicapped children?

2. What funding allocations have been announced for 1982 for this purpose?

3. What criteria are used in assessing funding levels for such applications?

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

1. Under State policy for the staffing and funding of pre-school children, children with special needs are provided a service on an integrated basis in a regular pre-school setting. The State supports integration by the provision of specific personnel to the Kindergarten Union and the Education Department, specialist equipment where necessary and a lowered child staff ratio of one staff person to every eight children in special need. Severely handicapped children cannot be accommodated for in this system. The Schools Commission, however, allocates funds for severely handicapped children. The distribution of these funds is made by a joint committee, which includes representatives from other Government and non-government groups. This committee, through the South Australian Education Department, conducts the administration and financial management of these funds.

2. A total of \$214 000 will be allocated in this way throughout 1982.

3. The services provided by these groups do not discriminate on an age basis, though most children serviced would be older than five years. Although the Schools Commission funds are for 5 to 18-year-olds, it has been the practise to allocate direct to a servicing group. Funding is based on the number of students and the type of service provided.

#### ADULT MATRICULATION

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

1. What is the staffing formula used by the Department of Further Education for staffing adult matriculation units?

2. According to that staffing formula, what should the staff allocation for each adult matriculation unit be as at March 1982 and what is the actual allocation and the reason for any difference in each instance?

3. What was the staffing allocation at the adult matriculation school of the Port Adelaide Community College for each year since 1978 and by how much has that varied from the formula in each of those years?

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

1. The staffing of the full-time adult matriculation units at Elizabeth Community College, O'Halloran Hill College of TAFE and Port Adelaide Community College is based on student numbers and the range of subjects to be provided to the students. In general the minimum staffing level is one senior lecturer and five lecturers (or equivalent) to offer a range of 9 subjects to at least 70 full-time students (or 80 equivalent full-time students). This formula is flexible with each teaching unit being allowed to annually balance full-time and part-time lecturers' skills to meet the student needs. Staffing at the much larger unit at Kensington Park Community College is based proportionately on the same criteria as for the smaller units above.

2. The answers to these questions are complex and would entail several pages to fully document. However, a brief overview is as follows:

The normal staffing formula for Elizabeth, O'Halloran Hill and Port Adelaide Colleges is one senior lecturer and five lecturers with a flexible allocation of PTI funds to accommodate changes such as subjects to be offered. O'Halloran Hill College conforms exactly with that formula.

At present a deputy head instead of a senior lecturer manages the teaching unit at the Elizabeth Community College. This is by special agreement between the staff and the Department as the present incumbent is there for historical reasons. If he was to leave that position a senior lecturer would take his place.

At Port Adelaide the fifth lecturer has been replaced by additional PTI funds to enable the teaching unit to provide subjects which would otherwise lie outside the skills of the full-time lecturers based at the college.

3. The staffing allocation has varied slightly in composition each year since 1978; however, in each year the college has had the appropriate staffing resources in line with the formula and the need to offer a balanced programme.

In 1979 there were six full-time equivalent staff: one senior lecturer and five lecturers.

In 1980 and 1981 there were five full-time equivalent staff: one senior lecturer, 3.5 lecturers plus additional PTI funds.

In 1982 there are five full-time equivalent staff: one senior lecturer, five lecturers and additional PTI funds.

**TEACHERS' STRIKES**

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

1. What was the total amount of money spent by the Government on advertisements during the industrial dispute that resulted in the teachers' strikes in March and April 1981?

2. What was the annual cost of the half-time salary of the former counsellor at the Port Adelaide Community College Adult Matriculation School?

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

1. \$16 952.31
2. \$8 835.00 p.a.

**ADULT MATRICULATION**

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

1. Has the Minister received a copy of correspondence from a Mrs Bevan dated 11 March on 'Friends of the Adult Matriculation School Port Adelaide, letterhead' concerning the cost efficiency of that college and professional counselling needs?

2. What is the cost efficiency of each of the adult matriculation schools in the State?

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

1. Yes. The letter focused on the non-provision of a student counsellor at the Port Adelaide Community College, Adult Matriculation Teaching Unit.

2. The question in the form in which it has been put is difficult to answer since there is no agreed definition of 'efficiency' in this area. This is a matter to which the Department of Technical and Further Education is giving close attention and it is developing a system of reporting and financial management which will assist in this respect in the future.

**AUSTRALASIAN OAKS CARNIVAL**

571. Mr SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Have the investigations by officers of the Division of Recreation and Sport into the lottery conducted by the South Australian Jockey Club associated with the Australasian Oaks Carnival been completed and, if so, what were the results?

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

I have received a full report including an independent audit report on the lottery conducted by the South Australian Jockey Club in conjunction with the Australasian Oaks Carnival.

Both reports conclude there is no evidence of any kind of malpractice in relation to ticket control or lottery funds.

**AIR FARES**

572. Mr SLATER (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Premier been able to achieve any results from his protest to Trans Australia Airlines and Ansett Airlines in regard to South Australia's being the only mainland State not to benefit by the reduction in air fares and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No. The position arose in other States because of the introduction of wide-bodied jets on regular scheduled services. Availability of similar cheaper fares could be possible with the introduction of similar services to Adelaide.

**FLEURIEU PENINSULA**

573. The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Is the Minister aware of the Lamprey-Mitchell study 'Biogeographical and Landform Survey of Fleurieu Peninsula, South Australia'?

2. How many areas does it recommend for inclusion in the Register of the National Estate, how many have been included, how many are still under consideration for inclusion, and how many have been excluded and why?

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

1. Yes.
2. The study 'Biogeographical and Landform Survey of Fleurieu Peninsula, South Australia' recommends 35 areas for inclusion in the Register of the National Estate. Four areas have been included. Eighteen have been advertised on the interim list for the register. The remaining 13 areas are still under consideration.

**SURPLUS TEACHERS**

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

1. Is the Minister aware of reports on ABC radio on 30 March which stated that the Premier during a visit to Malaysia indicated that 'surplus teachers' could be provided to Malaysia from South Australia under a scheme that would cover 'English language' and 'vocational' areas?

2. Have discussions commenced between Malaysian and South Australian Education Departments to set up such a scheme and, if so, when, and what are the details of the scheme?

3. What incentives, if any, in financial terms or terms of conditions of service (both in Malaysia and on return to South Australia) is it proposed to offer teachers involved in such a scheme, how much is it anticipated these will cost the Education Department in a full financial year and what recoup would be available from the Federal Government to help meet these costs?

4. Does the general 'surplus of teachers' extend to such areas as 'English language' and 'vocational' areas in South Australia and, if not, why are they being involved in the scheme?

5. Was the South Australian Institute of Teachers consulted about the scheme before it was announced by the Premier in Malaysia and, if not, is it proposed that the institute will be involved in discussions?

6. Did the Premier consult with the Minister before the scheme was announced in Malaysia and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. See 2 above.
4. See 2 above.
5. No. Negotiations would probably be conducted on an individual basis as generally happens with other overseas appointments.
6. The Minister of Education had already held brief exploratory talks with the Malaysian Minister of Education when the latter visited Adelaide in 1981. No commitments were made or sought. We await a formal approach from Malaysia.

**HEPATITIS**

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

1. In the event of an incidence of hepatitis occurring at a school, what measures are required to be taken by the school with regard to notifying—

- (a) the regional office;
- (b) the local board of health;
- (c) the school staff;
- (d) the students of the school;
- (e) students of neighbouring schools;
- (f) parents of students likely to have been in contact with infected students;
- (g) parents of students at other schools whose children may have had contact with infected students;
- (h) parents of pre-school age children, in particular those whose mothers may have used playgroup facilities sited at a school where an incidence of the disease has occurred; and
- (i) the local medical community?

2. What provision is made for inoculation upon discovery of an incident of hepatitis, who is covered by this provision, and what personnel are responsible for providing it?

3. In the 1982 academic year so far, how many schools in each region of the Education Department have reported an incident of hepatitis to their regional office and how many students were infected in each incident?

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

1. School principals are required to exclude hepatitis sufferers from school until a medical certificate of recovery is produced or until the symptoms have subsided but not before seven days have elapsed after the onset of jaundice. In accordance with the provisions of the Health Act, 1935-1978, relating to infectious and notifiable diseases, principals are required also to report suspected hepatitis cases to the local Board of Health. In the course of its duties, the board may request that the principal take action to rectify any potentially unsanitary situations that exist at the school.

2. Currently it is not general practice to arrange any immunization programme when hepatitis is confirmed. However, individual students and parents may decide to have themselves inoculated as a precautionary measure.

3. There have been no hepatitis cases involving students reported to regional education offices in 1982.

**BUS SERVICES**

577. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Will the Minister undertake a limited trial of a proposal to divert those services of route 503 that could transport students resident in Brahma Lodge to and from Salisbury East High School via The Strand, Brahma Lodge?

2. What extra time would be involved for those 503 services making a diversion via The Strand, Brahma Lodge for such a purpose?

3. How many students would be serviced by such a diversion?

4. Is a similar type of diversion of some route 503 services undertaken with regard to The Levels campus of the Institute of Technology and, if so, which and what levels of patronage can be attributed to the diversion?

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

1. Many requests are received for variations of bus routes to better serve schools and colleges in the metropolitan area. If the State Transport Authority were to accede to all of these requests, the bus route network would soon become a complicated system of devious routes which would not encourage the use of public transport by those passengers who wish to travel as quickly as possible between their originating points and destinations.

The majority of homes in The Strand, Brahma Lodge, are within 500 metres of Route 560 services along Park Terrace and Smith Road (adjacent to the Salisbury East School) or Route 503 services along Frost Road and Cross Keys Road. Students living at the southern end of The Strand can travel by Route 503 and Route 560 services to and from the Salisbury East school. In the circumstances it is not proposed to divert bus services along The Strand, Brahma Lodge on a trial basis.

2. The diversion of some services to operate via The Strand, Park Terrace, Main North Road, thence the normal route via Frost road and Cross Keys Road would involve an additional ten minutes running time.

Frost Road between Main North Road and Cross Keys Road is only served by Bus Route 503. The diversion of some services via The Strand only would lower the level of service along Frost Road and Cross Keys Road and would disadvantage residents adjacent to these roads.

3. The State Transport Authority is not aware of the number of students who would be serviced by diverting some Route 503 buses along The Strand. However, it is unlikely there would be any net increase in patronage on routes in the vicinity.

4. Some services operating on Route 503 are scheduled to operate via The Levels campus of the Institute of Technology. These services and levels of patronage attributed to the diversion are:

From Adelaide	Patronage to/from The Levels	
9.16 a.m. ....	33	alight
9.55 a.m. ....	8	alight
4.30 p.m. ....	13	join
From The Levels		
8.52 a.m. ....	23	alight
4.47 p.m. ....	83	board
5.32 p.m. ....	17	board
6.02 p.m. ....	9	board

**TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS**

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

1. Did the Education Department advertise on 27 February 1982 for persons without teacher training qualifications to apply for teaching positions in South Australian secondary schools and, if so, why and how many such appointments have been made, where and on what terms (e.g. part-time/full-time, permanent/contract) as a result?

2. Has the Minister ordered an investigation into the allegation made to him in a letter dated 10 March 1982 that 'untrained persons were being offered jobs' last year in the Education Department with 'a promise that the department would "fix" their registration' and, if not, why not, and, if so, what was the result of the investigation?

3. Have either the Minister or the department asked the Teachers Registration Board to alter its registration standards to allow untrained teachers into the classroom and, if so, on what conditions?

4. Are non-government schools obliged to employ as teachers only persons who are registered with the Teachers Registration Board and, if so, what mechanism is used to oversight the meeting of that requirement by non-government schools?

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

1. Yes. All available qualified applicants in these teaching fields had been placed. An advertisement for qualified teachers placed in the *Advertiser* on 13 February produced insufficient applicants.

School	Length	Subject(s)
Ceduna	8.3.82-19.3.82	Technical Studies
Kidman Park High School	23.3.82-14.5.82	Indonesian
Port Augusta High School	1.4.82-17.12.82	Commerce
Findon High School	5.3.82-2.4.82	Chemistry/Maths
Thebarton High School	8.3.82-8.4.82	Physics/Maths

2. An investigation was conducted and the allegation was not substantiated.

3. No. The Teachers Registration Board has always been able to grant authorities to use unqualified teachers. These are limited to the specific school and duration of the vacancy.

4. Yes. An annual survey of all non-government schools is conducted in March/April. The principals are requested to certify that they have sighted registration certificates for all members of their teaching staff.

### INSURANCE COVER

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

1. What financial protection (by insurance or Government policy) is available to parents to meet costs incurred as a result of injury sustained by students during participation in outdoor education and physical education activities?

2. What is the approximate cost of such protection and is assistance available for those who cannot meet the cost?

3. Does the Government provide any assistance to those students injured in such activities who are ineligible for insurance cover?

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

1. Financial protection is available by way of membership of a medical benefits association, taking out of a school children's accident insurance policy, or by Government acceptance of responsibility if there is evidence of negligence by a Government employee.

2. The premium for twenty-four hour children's accident insurance cover varies between insurance companies, but is of the order of \$10.00 per annum. No further assistance is available.

3. The attitude of Government is that whilst it will exercise all proper care of children attending departmental schools, and will accept responsibility for injuries which may result from negligence of Government employees, it does not accept responsibility, by insurance or otherwise, for every injury sustained whilst the child is at school.

### STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

581. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What statutory authorities, boards, advisory committees, and semi-government instrumentalities are currently under the control of each Minister?

2. Are there any such bodies not under the control of a Minister and, if so, what are they?

3. In relation to the membership of each body—

(a) what is the term of appointment;

(b) who are the current members, what is the occupation of each, and when was each appointed; and

(c) what allowances are paid to the members and what was the total cost in 1980-81?

4. On how many occasions did each body meet during 1981?

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

1. I refer the member to the answer to question 15, 10 December 1981, which updated the *Hansard* records in relation to this matter.

2. It is not clear what is meant by control. Acts of Parliament establishing authorities are committed to appropriate Ministers and varying degrees of controls and delegations apply. The act relating to the establishment of a particular authority can be referred to.

3. and 4. This information is not available in a central and summarised form. It would take considerable time and expense to survey all authorities again, which is not justified. I would be prepared to provide the details sought for individual authorities, boards or committees.

### HONEYMOON SITE

584. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Are there or have there been Department of Mines and Energy caravans or living quarters parked at the Honeymoon site as recently as 19 March 1982 and are there Department of Mines and Energy employees on the site living in these facilities and, if so, how many, and why did not the Minister disclose these facts in the answer to question 447 part II given on 23 March 1982?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Three Department of Mines and Energy caravans (comprising a kitchen diner, ablutions van and a two-berth caravan) are currently on hire to the operators of the Honeymoon project. From time to time, Department of Mines and Energy inspectors, Health Commission and radiation safety officers visit the site.

### RADIATION MONITORING

585. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What radiation monitoring is currently being carried out at the Honeymoon site, and who is conducting it?

2. If Government employees are involved in the monitoring, who is paying for it, and how much is being charged?

3. What results have been obtained from monitoring:

(a) generally in the mine area, and how do those results compare with the normal background levels in that area;

(b) specifically at the drill holes; and

(c) at the sludge pits, tailings dams or whatever facility has been established for the liquid wastes pumped out of the mine holes?

4. How many notices are erected at Honeymoon indicating that their activities involve radiation, is that number in accordance with coded practice and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Under the 'Code of Practice on Radiation Protection in the Mining and Milling of Radioactive Ores', basic radiation monitoring is the responsibility of the operators of the mine or mill. It is the responsibility of the S.A. Health Commission to ensure that the monitoring is carried out properly; i.e., that techniques, sampling frequencies etc. are appropriate, and that results are representative and accurate.

Radiation measurements undertaken by both Mines Administration (the operator) and S.A. Health Commission during field leach trials included radon and radon daughters, gamma dose rates, and surface contamination of plant, tanks etc.

2. No charge is made for the monitoring by Government employees, as is the case in other health monitoring areas.



3. *Results of Monitoring*

- (1) Radon and radon daughter concentrations in the general area are consistent with those expected in 'normal' continental air. The maximum radon daughter concentration measured was 7 milli-working levels during one very calm period just before dawn. Radon concentrations were too low to measure accurately. The only elevated concentrations measured were immediately above the pregnant liquor tank, where radon daughter concentrations reached 15 milli-working levels, and in the air issuing from one of the wells, during 'air lifting' (a process in which compressed air is blown down the well) where radon concentrations of 150 Bq/l (Becquerels per litre) and radon daughter concentrations of 50 milli-working levels were recorded. These concentrations would be rapidly diluted before reaching the breathing zones of workers.

- (2) Gamma dose rates throughout the general area range from 0.05 to 0.1 micro Gray per hour. This is similar to the dose rate in Adelaide. In the immediate vicinity of the drill holes, dose rates range from 0.10 to 0.15 micro Gray per hour.

Sludges etc. from drilling have been collected and stockpiled for disposal at a later stage of the project. Dose rates on the stockpile range from 0.15 to 0.3 micro Gray/hr. It should be noted that these are of low activity, for, of the total of approximately 120 m of core from each hole, only approximately 10 m contain ore.

Liquid wastes from pumping tests etc. are returned to the ore zone.

4. At present there are 3 warning signs on the field leach trial plant. The area of operations is fenced, and the plant area is enclosed in a high security fence. Additional signs will be posted before commissioning of the plant.

The 'Code of Practice', although requiring signs in certain circumstances, does not specify numbers or locations of signs. A 'Guideline' to the Code makes recommendations on sizes, lettering and placement of signs, but again does not specify any particular number.

## ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

586. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. In relation to the Honeymoon project environmental investigations conducted by the Government and others:

- (a) by whom were they conducted and when;  
(b) to whom were they reported; and  
(c) will the Minister make public any reports?

2. Does the leaching method being used at Honeymoon differ to that planned for the Beverley uranium deposit and, if so, how and why?

3. Is it a fact that to date the leaching method being used at Honeymoon has been unsuccessful and that no uranium has been extracted by this method?

4. Is it a fact that the acid solution being used at Honeymoon has only resulted in leaching out sodium deposits and, if so, what are the environmental and mining implications?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) (b) (c) These investigations were undertaken by a number of consulting groups employed for the purpose by the proponents over a period of some two years. The results of these studies were first published in draft form for public comment in November 1980 and the final environmental impact statement published in March 1981 and approved

by both State and Commonwealth Governments in May 1981.

2. As investigations preliminary to a decision on leach technology for the Beverley uranium deposit are still in train the similarity or otherwise to the Honeymoon method is still not known.

3. Field leach trials have been reasonably successful as evidenced by the proponents decision to proceed to a pilot plant operation.

At the present time all field testing is proceeding on the basis of keeping the uranium in solution and this is reintroduced into the ore-bearing horizon.

4. The leach solution used at Honeymoon has not resulted in the leaching of sodium deposits.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

587. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the unemployment rate in the Adelaide metropolitan area significantly above the rate for the whole State and, if so, what are the latest respective metropolitan and non-metropolitan unemployment rates?

2. What schemes does the Government have to reduce unemployment specifically in the Adelaide metropolitan area to bring the rate there into line with the non-metropolitan rate?

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

1. Appropriate figures can be obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

2. The Government's overall policies are aimed at reducing unemployment throughout the State, not specifically the Adelaide metropolitan area.

## JOB CREATION

589. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many jobs for young people were created under the Government's pay-roll tax incentive schemes between November 1979 and November 1981?

2. Is it a fact that pay-roll tax youth employment concessions apply only in respect of the creation of full-time and not part-time jobs?

3. Is the definition of full-time work for the scheme 35 hours weekly or more?

4. How much was allocated for the payment of pay-roll tax youth employment rebates in each of the years 1979-1980 to 1981-1982, and how much was spent in 1979-1980 and 1980-1981.

5. What was the total level of unemployment in South Australia in November 1979 and in November 1981?

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

1. 1 340.  
2. Yes.  
3. Yes.  
4. This information is contained in the budget papers.  
5. Information available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

## EMPLOYMENT

590. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the increase in total employment in the State between November 1979 and November 1981?

2. Does the Government claim credit for the creation of such jobs and, if so, under which Government schemes and programs were they created?

3. How many of the extra jobs were in agriculture and associated industries and were these jobs the result of better seasonal conditions or Government employment and industry programmes?

4. How many of the extra jobs were part-time and how many were full-time?

5. How many of the extra jobs were in the 'Community Services' sector, i.e. the public sector?

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

1, 3, 4 and 5. Appropriate details can be obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

2. The Government's overall policies stimulated the economy and the confidence of employers with the resultant increase in employment. There are numerous schemes which have helped to increase employment significantly in South Australia since the Liberal Government was elected. These schemes include:

- Establishment Payment Scheme.
- Motor Vehicle Assistant Scheme.
- Consultancy grants to small business.
- Payroll Tax incentives for additional employees.
- Self Employment Venture Scheme.
- Pay-roll tax rebate for decentralised industry.
- Export Bridging Finance Scheme.
- Industrial Premises Scheme; and many others.

### JOB CREATION

591. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What is the factual basis for the Premier's claim to the Liberal Party State Council that his Government had created 22 100 jobs?

2. As a result of which Government policy measures were the 22 100 jobs created, and how many jobs were created under each scheme?

3. Over what period were the 22 100 jobs created?

4. Was August 1979 the base date for the calculations and, if so, what difference would the use of September 1979 as a base make to the calculations?

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

1. A.B.S. monthly Australian labour force estimates provide the basis for assessing the number of employed persons in South Australia. The number of employed persons has increased indicating an increase in the number of jobs in South Australia since this Government came to office.

2. A number of Government incentive schemes have applied, but the most widely recognised and applauded policy has been the Government's strong support for private enterprise.

3. August 1979 to December 1981.

4. Yes. Reference to A.B.S. catalogue No. 6202.0 provides full details on the numbers employed full-time and part-time and other relevant statistics.

### EMPLOYMENT

593. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier—Did total employment in South Australia increase from September 1978 to September 1979 and, if so, what was the extent of that increase?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Employment figures are released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Honourable Member can obtain this information from that source.

### PUBLIC SECTOR EXPENDITURE

594. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier—What was the share of South Australian public sector expenditure on goods and services in total expenditure on goods and services by all State public sectors, in 1970-1971 and in 1978-1979?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Based on data published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, South Australian public sector expenditure on goods and services accounted for 9.5 per cent of total expenditure on goods and services by all State public sectors (excluding the Northern Territory) in 1970-1971; the comparable proportion for 1978-79 was 9.6 per cent.

### PUBLIC SECTOR BORROWING

595. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the total level of borrowing by the South Australian public sector in 1970-1971 and in 1978-1979 expressed in constant 1970-1971 dollars?

2. Was the rate of growth in total borrowings by the South Australian public sector lower than the average rate of growth of all funds available to the Government sector over the period 1970-71 to 1978-1979?

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

1. Based on Australian Bureau of Statistics definitions and sources, State public sector borrowing in South Australia amounted to \$89 500 000 in 1970-1971. The comparable figure for 1978-1979, expressed in 1970-1971 prices, is estimated on the basis of the implicit price deflator for final expenditure on goods and services by all State and Local Government Authorities, to have amounted to \$88 100 000.

2. All funds available to the State public sector in South Australia grew at an annual average rate of 17.8 per cent between 1970-1971 and 1978-1979. South Australian public sector borrowings grew at an annual average rate of 12.6 per cent over the same period.

### MURRAY RIVER

596. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine:

1. Has dredging and desnagging of the Murray River been carried out from 1979-1980 onwards to accommodate either or both of the vessels, *Murray River Explorer* and *Murray River Queen* and, if so, was the actual expenditure in 1979-1980 the \$132 790 listed in the Budget papers and what was the actual cost in 1980-1981?

2. What is the allocation for 1981-1982?

3. What was the cost of the extensions to the jetty at Cape Jervis to accommodate the *M.V. Islander*?

4. Were any works carried out by the Government on Kangaroo Island to accommodate the *M.V. Islander* and, if so, what was the cost?

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

1. Dredging and desnagging of the Murray River has been carried out since 1979-1980 mainly for the benefit of the *M.V. Explorer*. The expenditure on this work amounted to \$132 790 in 1979-1980 and \$30 449 in 1980-1981. The latter was a carry over from the work which was completed the previous year.

2. Responsibility for this work has now been transferred to the Minister of Water Resources.

I understand further dredging and desnagging work was found to be necessary following the high river expenditure in October 1981, and it was estimated that an expenditure of \$200 000 would be necessary to carry out survey, inve-

sigatory, dredging, desnagging and supervisory work during 1981-1982.

3. \$128 400

4. Two small mooring bollards were installed at a cost of \$215.

### STUART HIGHWAY

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

1. How much money was spent on the Stuart Highway in each of the years 1978-1979 to 1980-1981?

2. What is proposed to be spent in 1981-1982?

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

1. 1978-1979, \$2 399 000; 1979-1980, \$5 753 000; 1980-1981, \$9 905 000

2. 1981-1982, \$13 273 000 (Est.)

### LEIGH CREEK ROAD

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

1. How much money was spent on the Leigh Creek road in 1980-1981?

2. What is proposed to be spent in 1981-1982?

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

1. 1980-1981, \$3 663 000.

2. 1981-1982, \$2 565 000 (Est.)

### METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT

600. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Following the report to the Director-General of Transport entitled *A marketing study of needs for mobility and attitudes to transport in metropolitan Adelaide*, of July 1976:

(a) what improvements have been effected or are proposed (specifying which) since then in 'post peak homeward services' in the Salisbury electorate as recommended in paragraph 7.3.1. of that report;

(b) what parts of the electorate of Salisbury have been identified as 'areas of special need' under paragraph 7.3.2. for consideration of services for school/study purposes where such areas are deemed not 'to be an economic market but lack of service may trigger second car purchase' and what transport service changes have or will result from such denomination of those areas;

(c) under paragraph 7.3.4. what 'local' offpeak bus routing to neighbourhood centres has been introduced in the Salisbury electorate and what further improvements in this regard are being considered; and

(d) under paragraph 7.2.1., was any new outer suburb selected as a choice for the experiment for trialing new types of public transport service and, if so, which types and which suburb was chosen as the 'control', how were the choices arrived at and is the experiment still in operation and if not, what were the results of the experiment?

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

(a) The following improvements in 'post peak homeward service; (i.e. week days after 6.00 p.m.) have been effected since July 1976:

Early 1978—a week night service was introduced on the then circular bus Route 400 from Salisbury Station to Salisbury North. This service was retained on the two existing Salisbury North bus Routes 400 and 401 when introduced in October, 1978.

Late 1978—bus Route 501, City-Parafield Gardens, was extended through Salisbury Downs and Salisbury to Elizabeth, and a 6.40 p.m. service from the City was introduced.

Late 1978—bus Route 503, City-Northbri Avenue, Salisbury East, was extended via Brahma Lodge to Salisbury and provided with an hourly week night service.

Mid 1980—the week night Adelaide-North Gawler train timetable was improved from an irregular service to a regular 45 minute service.

No further improvements in 'post peak homeward services' are proposed at this stage. However, the situation is being kept under review.

(b) No areas of 'special need' have been defined.

(c) All bus services in the Salisbury electorate focus on Salisbury Town Centre, and improvements are proposed in this regard. For example, improvement of access to the main part of the Shopping Centre by extending Salisbury North Bus Routes 400 and 4001.

No local services have been introduced under the community bus program. However, if a proposal which affects the Salisbury electorate is received it will be considered on its merits in competition with other proposals for the funds available under the community bus program. Although some discussions with the Corporation of Salisbury have taken place I understand no firm proposal has been received.

(d) No suburb was selected.

### NORTHERN CORRIDOR RAILWAY

601. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Department of Transport keeping options open for a new train service from a new Salisbury North railway station (at Whites Road) via Hilra station to Adelaide as recommended in the Final Report of the Northern Corridor Railway Service Study completed in July 1979?

2. Has planning of the standard-gauge railway from Crystal Brook to Adelaide permitted this option to be kept as a possibility for future development?

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

1. Yes. The options are being kept open should future conditions favour the provision of a rail service in the vicinity of White's Road, Salisbury North.

2. Yes.

### HOSPITAL ACCESSIBILITY

602. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport—Is the Minister aware that the hospital accessibility study completed in July 1980 by the South Australian Health Commission reveals a number of public transport trip times to various health facilities from that part of the Salisbury local government area containing the electorate of Salisbury which are longer than the trip times in many other areas and that the times were calculated on a formula designed to provide 'useful . . . measures of "expected" trip times and provide good indicators of the relativities of times' and if so, what action is underway or proposed to improve the public transport trip times to health facilities for residents of the Salisbury electorate and if no action is underway or proposed, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The hospital accessibility study was prepared by the South Australian Health Commission in conjunction with the Highways Department and the Department of Transport. The time selected to represent each local government area (e.g. Salisbury) was the trip time, based on 1976 conditions, from the centroid of the zone

most representative of the area. It was not, therefore, a real indication of the trip time by public transport services. The State Transport Authority advises that when planning new routes and timetables, every endeavour is made to provide passengers with good quality and reliable public transport services. The authority has no plans to improve transport services in the Salisbury area at this time as the existing services, including those to health facilities, are considered adequate for the patronage offering.

#### **BLACK FOREST SCHOOL**

603. **Mr LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—When will upgrading of the Black Forest Primary School be considered?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Stage II upgrading of Black Forest Primay School has not been included in the 1982-1984 program, because of funding constraints.