

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 June 1982

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

## PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 455 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, 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 J. D. Corcoran, D. O. Tonkin, and M. M. Wilson, and Messrs Evans, Hamilton, Mathwin, Slater, and Whitten. Petitions received.

## PETITION: TAPLEYS HILL ROAD TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a public transport service along Tapleys Hill Road between Trimmer Parade, Seaton, and Target shopping centre at Fulham Gardens with a view to extending that service to Glenelg was presented by Mr Hamilton. Petition received.

## QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

## LINEAR PARK

474. Mr **CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. When is it proposed that there will be public displays at local government offices or other appropriate venues of the final landscape plans and recreation proposals for the River Torrens Linear Park from Lower Portrush Road to the Hackney bridge?

2. Why has no public comment been sought on the proposals for landscaping and recreational uses proposed for the River Torrens Linear Park where there has been a departure from the recommendations of the Hassell and Partners Report?

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: The replies are as follows:

1. The construction of the River Torrens Linear Park is being carried out by two implementing authorities, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the State Transport Authority. The stretch of the river between Lower Portrush Road and the Hackney bridge is being developed by the State Transport Authority in conjunction with the north-east busway. The Minister of Transport has advised that the public display of detailed plans of earthworks and tree planting is a continuous process, and occurs each time work is programmed to commence on a new section of the river. These public displays are set up in the offices of the riverside council within whose area the work is to take place.

2. The River Torrens Study Report is a general concept only and serves merely as a guide for the development of the linear park. Public comment on the detailed plans drawn

up is sought as part of this planning process in line with the answer to 1. above.

## 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 (Amendment).

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Accounting Provisions for Schools.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Cooper Pedy Registrations.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—

i. Snorkel Tube.

ii. Swimming Equipment.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1980-81.

## QUESTION TIME

## EMPLOYMENT

**Mr BANNON**: Will the Premier say why the number of persons employed full time in this State fell by 8 400 in the 12 months ended April, resulting in a fall in total employment after the inclusion of the number of persons employed part time, and will he say why this State is now more dependent on part-time work than is any other State or Territory?

The Premier and other senior Ministers of the Government have repeatedly claimed that employment is increasing. Last Thursday the Deputy Premier told the Deputy Leader of the Opposition twice that in the latest 12-month period more jobs had been created. The facts do not support the claim. Not only did the total level of employment fall, but the number of full-time jobs—I would suggest that the Premier might find the question a little more interesting than the briefing being given by his Minister.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr BANNON**: Well, much has been made of this rise in employment. Not only did the total level of employment fall, but the number of full-time jobs fell by 8 400. There was, however, a rise in part-time jobs. As at April 1982, 19.1 per cent of all jobs in this State were part time, compared to 16.4 per cent for Australia. This was a higher proportion than the proportion in any other State. Since April 1981 the proportion of part-time jobs in South Australia has increased from 17.6 per cent, making South Australia the part-time employment State.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: The fact is, of course, that South Australia has always had a large number of part-time employees. That was something I was checking with the Minister about. I think probably more than any other State we have had part-time employees. This is particularly so in the retail trading industry. That, it seems to me, is nothing of which we need be ashamed in any way. Part-time employment is something that, as a Party, we have supported very strongly. Job sharing schemes to allow people, particularly

those who had commitments at home, to work part time have always been supported by this Party and always will be. I cannot really understand why the Leader is so worried about an increase in part-time employment. I would have thought that that was very much better than having an increase in full-time employment and an increase in part-time unemployment as well. I do not quite see what point he is making.

On the unemployment question, of course, there are quite a number of factors that could be stated. It is true on the general employment scene that, since this Government came to office, overall employment in the private sector in South Australia has risen by 16 300 until April 1982. If one takes into account the fact that public sector employment has fallen by some 4 000 people since this Government came to office, that makes an approximate total figure of about 20 000 jobs created in that time, since August 1979. In other words, the private sector has absorbed the reduction in the public sector employment and gone on with strong growth itself.

**Mr Trainer:** Didn't they teach you maths at school?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the member will just look at 16 000 plus 4 000, he will see that it comes to about 20 000. If he wants the exact figure, it is about 16 300. That shows exactly how strong the growth in the private sector has been. The Leader has quite cheerfully ignored some other points. I do not know quite why: perhaps it does not suit his case. It is true that since August 1979 unemployment in South Australia has risen by 1 400 people, or 3.1 per cent, but unemployment has risen across Australia by 74 500, which is 19.9 per cent. So, although our unemployment has increased by 3.1 per cent since 1979, the Australian figure has increased by 19.9 per cent. That seems to me to have some advantages.

There is still far too much unemployment. No-one suggests for a moment that employment is at a satisfactory level yet, but I do wish that the Leader of the Opposition would place his professed concern about unemployment on to a practical footing. Once again, there are many projects which could go ahead in this State, one of which is currently before this Parliament and which I will therefore not mention, that could receive his Party's total support. I point out that jobs can be created as a result of the project at Roxby Downs, which, even in the short term, will significantly benefit the people of South Australia. Indeed, there are some 200 people working on the site now and jobs are being created throughout the community because of that.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** There will be 1 000.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Probably, with the multiplier effect, there are at least 1 000 people currently in employment because of the activity at Roxby Downs. That is something that the Leader and his colleagues should consider very carefully indeed. The professed concern about unemployment comes very strangely from the Leader of a Party that is currently considering denying the employment benefits of that development to the people of South Australia. It does not square up with the current attitude being shown by the Opposition towards Roxby Downs.

### JOB-CREATION SCHEMES

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Will the Premier say whether there has been any change in the Government's attitude towards job-creation schemes as a means of reducing unemployment? First, I refer to an article in yesterday's *Advertiser*, headed, 'France facing squeeze after chop in franc'. The article went on to outline that public sector spending had not achieved the French Government's aim to invigorate the economy. Part of the article states:

Attempts to boost employment by pumping public money into the French economy proved unsuccessful, contributing instead to higher inflation and monetary instability.

Another point made in the article was that the French Government, which we all know is a socialist Government, is going to change its approach to unemployment and reinstating the economy in France. Also, we have seen recently reports of the A.L.P.'s economic plan, which proposes a job-creation scheme by the State Government to reduce unemployment. The present Government has reduced the number of public sector employees as a budgetary measure. What effects would these contrasting policies have on the South Australian economy, and I refer to the example in France, also?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No, this Government certainly has not changed its attitude toward job-creation schemes. As I have just said in answering the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, in the last two and a half years the South Australian public sector employment has been reduced by nearly 4 000. That has resulted in savings of many millions of dollars for South Australian taxpayers. I think that is an initiative that has been welcomed by them. I may also say that, in cutting back on that public sector employment, the very firm policy of no retrenchments has always been followed. Not one Government employee has been sacked in achieving that reduction, and that is a record of which we can be very proud.

The entire reduction has been achieved by natural causes, natural attrition. It is a tribute to the Public Service managers who have been faced with this challenge. They have done a superb job. I would like to put on the record my appreciation of the job done, not only that by the Public Service Board, the Chairman of the board, and the officers of the board, but also by all the other managers of the various departments who have accepted that challenge.

They have met the challenge of reducing manpower while maintaining the public services. That has been done very well indeed. On the whole question of creating artificial job schemes, I was very interested to hear the report about the French Government, because quite obviously those artificial job-creation schemes have been found wanting in France also, just as they were found wanting in South Australia and in Australia.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** When the money runs out, the jobs run out.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That is quite right. I remember the Opposition predicting doom and gloom (there is nothing new about that, of course) when we announced the plan to reduce the public sector employment and the size of government. I think that the Opposition has not recognised the fundamental approach that the public is now taking to these things. The latest document that came from the Labor Party about a week or so ago, its economic plan, proposed the resurrection of the job-creation scheme. I think that is probably what has prompted the member's very excellent question.

*Mr Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Is the honourable member not well? The resurrection of that scheme has been proposed, and I recall very vividly how it cost the South Australian taxpayers about \$50 000 000 when it was in force. I think the figure was \$52 000 000.

I think that came from the railways money that came back to the State. It was immediately wasted. The question that has not been answered in the Labor Party's economic policy is where it will get the money this time, if ever it gets the chance to bring in its job creation scheme. There is no more railways funding available. There is no question that the matters revealed in that economic document would cost about \$200 000 000. There is no indication at all of

where that money is coming from. To the average family of four—parents and two children—that would mean an additional \$12 a week to be found in State taxation. If that is what the Labor Party wants to put forward, that is up to it.

Coming back to the honourable member's question about the two job creation proposals and the policy that we have always followed of stimulating development in the private sector, there is no comparison at all. The French Government has now found, to its cost, that artificial job creation schemes add to the difficulties of financial management, not solve them. Even Mr Wran has found that it is necessary to cut down on public sector employment, not to increase it. The whole policy of trying to deal with unemployment problems by artificial schemes which expand the size of the public sector is being found wanting both overseas and within Australia.

In the *Financial Review* of 8 June, Mr Wran was reported as saying that the reorganisation of the Public Service would mean an eventual rundown of 600 employees and an average staff cut of 5 per cent. A staff freeze instituted last February had resulted in a reduction of some 2 200 positions. He said that the Government would do its best to ensure that staff would not be retrenched and that reduction would be by way of attrition and natural wastage. In other words, the Government of France (certainly a socialist Government) and the Government of New South Wales (also certainly a socialist Government) are now moving away from the artificial public sector expanding schemes and are so doing because they have found those schemes wanting.

The honourable member asked me what effect the contrasting policies would have on the South Australian economy. Let me say that, if there were any change away from the tight policy followed by this Government of stimulating employment in the private sector, it would once again be a disastrous change for the State's economy. Public sector expansion and artificial job creation schemes cost the taxpayers a great deal of money. More to the point, they cause interest rate problems, inflationary tendencies and general chaos in the financial system.

#### WATER AND SEWERAGE CHARGES

**Mr KENEALLY:** Will the Minister of Water Resources confirm that substantial increases in water and sewerage charges are proposed by the Government? Will he inform the House and the people of South Australia what those increases will be and the date on which they will become effective, so that consumers will know what the new charges are before they receive their rate notices?

I understand that large increases in water and sewerage charges are in the pipeline (and that is not meant to be a pun). The 1979 Liberal policy stated that a Liberal Government would seek to arrest increases in the price of water. In two years the price of water has increased by 33½ per cent, from 24 cents a kilolitre to 32 cents a kilolitre, a huge increase of 8 cents a kilolitre. People are now receiving less and paying more.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The matter has yet to be considered by Cabinet. When Cabinet has considered it, the result will be made public.

#### ST JOHN AMBULANCE

**Mr RANDALL:** Will the Minister of Health inform the House of the consequences of the implementation of an A.L.P. resolution passed this weekend concerning the St John Ambulance service in South Australia? This resolution

was reported from the A.L.P. State Convention, committing a State A.L.P. Government to holding a public inquiry into the St John Ambulance service. In particular, it was reported that the A.L.P. spokesman on health expressed concern about the volunteer staffing arrangements in that organisation. I would like to read part of the report which appeared in the newspaper, as follows:

The inquiry, put forward by the Opposition spokesman on health, Dr Cornwall, would pay particular attention to:

The organisation's business management and finances of the State Ambulance Service.

Legitimate career aspirations of professional staff. Standards of training and service.

The extension of advanced casualty-care ambulance services, particularly to country areas.

The implications of such a far-ranging inquiry must be considered.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take this opportunity to advise all members that they may not comment or seek to debate by way of explanation.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I saw the report in the *Advertiser*, and there is no doubt in my mind, having read it, that the proposed inquiry is nothing more than a blind to cover a future Labor Government's intention of killing off the voluntary aspect of the St John Ambulance service. Indeed, it is a matter of record that, in the life of the previous Government, there were very strong efforts to do that, and it is to the credit of the former Minister of Health, Mr Don Banfield, that he resisted enormous pressure from the former Minister of Industrial Affairs and Employment (now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) and refused to allow that to occur.

It is well known that the unions have been putting enormous pressure on the Labor Party in an effort to develop a fully salaried ambulance service in South Australia. The inevitable effect would be to kill off the voluntary component of what is, without any doubt, the finest and most cost efficient ambulance service in the whole of the Commonwealth. It is also known that, in New South Wales and Victoria, where a fully salaried service has been gradually introduced, the service now costs those States much more than the St John Ambulance service costs in South Australia.

Members might be interested to hear the figures. Comparing the ambulance call-out costs in South Australia with those in Victoria and New South Wales, where a fully salaried service applies, we find that the call-out cost of an ambulance in New South Wales is \$75, plus \$1.92 a kilometre; in Victoria, the call-out cost is \$73, plus \$1.70 per kilometre; and in South Australia, the call-out cost is \$54, plus 90c per kilometre. So if we were to replace our mix of volunteers and salaried officers with fully salaried officers, the estimated additional cost to the South Australian health budget would be about \$5 000 000 per annum.

Not only would the economic cost to the State be enormous but also there would be social and other costs which the House should take into account. The fact that we have a voluntary service which is of a very high standard, and the members of which have to submit to the same stringent examination and meet the same high standards of service as do salaried members of the St John Ambulance, means that the State is equipped with a large and ready-made pool of volunteers should a disaster situation occur. If the pool of volunteers were done away with by the introduction of a fully salaried service—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** It is quite clear that members opposite are anxious about what they are hearing, because they know full well that, if their Party were to bow to union pressure, which it virtually committed itself to at the weekend, there would be an uproar among the hundreds

and thousands of volunteers and their supporters in the State. Members opposite also know that the political and economic implications would be serious indeed for the Labor Party.

Another aspect of the resolution that was passed at the weekend was the patently ridiculous assertion that there should be a free ambulance service and that we should do away with subscriptions and charges, even for those who can afford to pay. Again, the Labor Party might be interested to know that, if it were to put into effect that proposal, it would cost the South Australian taxpayers about \$5 000 000 annually. That is a cool \$11 000 000 annually that the Labor Party would have to find as the price to pay off the unions and kill off the volunteers of St John.

I believe it is important that everyone who values volunteerism in the South Australian community (and that certainly involves every member of the Liberal Party and a large percentage of the population), should be aware of what the Labor Party plans and should do their utmost to ensure that volunteerism in the St John Ambulance service continues to prosper and survive, to the benefit of all South Australians.

### MORPHETTVILLE FIRE

**Mr SLATER:** Will the Chief Secretary advise the House of, or obtain a report on, police investigations into the circumstances surrounding the fire in the early hours of the morning of 28 May which damaged a section of the grandstand at the Morphettville Racecourse?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** I will obtain a report from the Commissioner of Police and make it available to the honourable member.

### FATAL ACCIDENT

**Mr RUSSACK:** Will the Minister of Health advise the House whether the report in today's *Advertiser* of a fatal accident which occurred at Snowtown yesterday is correct and, if so, was there any deficiency—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable member for Goyder to bring the question to the Chair.

### TAX EVASION

**Mr MATHWIN:** Will the Premier be instituting a State investigation into tax evasion in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MATHWIN:** I think the member for Napier needs a doctor, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Trainer:** Who put up that question—Hugh Morgan?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MATHWIN:** It has been reported that both the Victorian and New South Wales Labor Governments are to investigate certain aspects of tax avoidance in their respective States. The Federal Government recently announced tough action that it proposes to take to clamp down on tax avoidance. Will the Premier inform the House of the attitude of the State Government to this matter?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I was interested to hear that the Leader of the Opposition said, or implied, that I had changed my mind. There has been no change in the attitude to which he referred. I think this could best be exemplified by my reading to the House a copy of the letter that I sent to the Prime Minister on 8 June. There is no question but

that the Government will of course co-operate with the Federal Government in any way.

**Mr Bannon:** Page 4187, I would suggest, John.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not quite sure what is wrong with Opposition members today, but they seem to be very odd. There is no question at all about the fact that the State Government will co-operate with the Federal Government. I shall now read into the record the letter to the Prime Minister, which is as follows:

My dear Prime Minister,

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that tax avoidance within Australia must be brought under control, and the resulting benefits passed on to the broader community. Retrospective legislation is not an acceptable solution, but my Government will support your Government taking strong measures against the tax avoidance industry.

The majority of taxpayers are honest and pay the Federal and State taxes assessed to them. However, on the evidence it appears that across Australia between \$1 000 000 000 and \$7 000 000 000 of tax is avoided each year. This scale of lost revenue simply means that the average salary and wage-earner bears an unfair proportion of the income tax burden.

I have not hesitated in the past to take up the call for tax cuts on behalf of all South Australians, but to reduce substantially the income tax burden we must reduce the level of tax avoidance or cut Government services. On this point I note with concern that, while the South Australian Government has reduced its employment by nearly 3 000 in the last 2½ years, Commonwealth employment has increased by 10 000.

The Victorian Government and now the New South Wales Government have indicated they will investigate tax avoidance within their respective States. My Government sees this investigative function as a Federal responsibility, but you have my assurance that we will co-operate with your Government in any way appropriate to ensure that tax avoidance is minimised.

I simply conclude by suggesting to the Leader of the Opposition that he should not jump so rapidly to conclusions and fire from the hip. I did also hear by way of interjection the name Mr Hugh Morgan raised by a member opposite in respect of this and there is, in fact—

**Mr Hamilton:** Who was the member?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think the honourable member knows full well who it was. I make the point that I noticed in the *Financial Review* that the South Australian Labor Opposition was making inquiries to see whether or not they could find any evidence that Mr Hugh Morgan was involved in the tax avoidance schemes which had been publicised in Victoria. It was just another little exercise, I think, in trying to throw mud. As it happens, Mr Morgan took great exception to that report that the South Australian Labor Opposition were out to get him. He could not understand that.

As he explained it to me, certainly companies are sold from time to time and he was the director of a private family company that had been sold and used subsequently as one of the so-called bottom of the harbor companies. As he put it to me, it is rather like having owned a car and sold it, and it is then taken by a criminal and used to commit a bank robbery. It is rather like trying to implicate the original owner in a criminal activity. The reason I bring this up is to put on record that I am perfectly satisfied that there is no truth whatever in the imputations which have been made by the Opposition, and it does them no credit at all.

I simply repeat that it is the sort of tactic which we have seen repeated in this place in recent months, and it is something for which I have no stomach at all. I have lost a great deal of respect for members of the Opposition over this and similar matters.

## AMDEL

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware of any plans or proposals for Amdel to establish a tailings dam and/or other nuclear waste storage facilities at Technology Park Adelaide? A constituent of mine who works at The Levels campus of the Institute of Technology has come to me expressing his concern at certain plans which were distributed around the institute apparently dealing with Amdel's proposals to establish at Technology Park or thereabouts. He told me that those plans included a reference to a tailings dam on that site of which, to my knowledge, no mention has been made in the past, and I am sure the public would be anxious to hear the Minister's comments on that matter.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Government has made no secret of the fact that for 12 to 18 months it has been negotiating with Amdel for the possible relocation of some of its facilities from Thebarton to Technology Park. In fact, I said in a speech I made recently in the United States, and I have mentioned in numerous speeches in Adelaide, that the Government sees Amdel as playing a key part in trying to attract mining research and development to South Australia.

I remind the honourable member that in connection with Amdel it was the Labor Party that brought in a new Act in 1973 which had the full support of the then Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr Hudson), and the honourable member, as a member of that Government at the time, as I understand it, fully supported the measure. Amdel is probably one of the most unique mining research and development groups in the world. There is probably only one group that would equal it in the whole of the United States. It is a body that is recognised in many countries, and—

**Mr Keneally:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I will come to that shortly. In fact, I continue to be amazed at the number of overseas Governments that pay for the services of Amdel, and its technology is now being sold to companies in America and other countries, such as Russia. We have had talks with Amdel on relocating some of its facilities from the Thebarton plant. We expect to use Amdel as the nucleus for a mining research and development precinct within Technology Park. To my knowledge, there is nowhere near the sort of fear and scandal that the member for Elizabeth is always trying to dredge up. He is a bit like that Federal member, Mr Scott, who jumps at any possible scare and suggests that the name Amdel automatically means yellowcake or radioactive material being widely thrown around our community. We have seen the extent to which Mr Scott, playing on the emotive reaction from the community and the news media, has tried to build up a public fear of Amdel and its activities.

It is rather unfortunate that members opposite do not give credit to Amdel and acknowledge its international reputation. However, talks with Amdel are still proceeding: they have not been finalised, although it has been well known (and the local council and people involved in Technology Park have been fully involved in those discussions) that the Government is hiding absolutely nothing. As I said earlier, we have released the material in speeches we have given over the past 12 months. I would have thought that the honourable member would have read his local newspaper as far back as December 1980, when this so-called scandal was first suggested by someone in the northern suburbs saying that a major nuclear industry was about to be set up in Technology Park Adelaide.

I think the member for Salisbury even got into the act at one stage, although I am interested to see that he has had the common sense to lie low at this stage, knowing that his colleague in the adjoining electorate of Elizabeth has made

somewhat of a fool of himself in trying to raise any threat or scare over the possible location of Amdel at Technology Park.

## SNOWTOWN ACCIDENT

**Mr RUSSACK:** Has the Minister of Health seen a public report released this morning concerning a fatal accident which occurred near Snowtown yesterday? If so, can the Minister inform the House of any details surrounding the accident and, in particular, say whether there was any deficiency in the ambulance response time in attending the scene of the accident? There was a report that a Dr D. C. Goel, Medical Administrator of Port Augusta Hospital, said that he had stopped at the two-car accident on National Highway 1 about 7 kilometres north of Snowtown at about 3.30 p.m., He said he had been helping the fatally injured man when a Snowtown ambulance and doctor arrived about 4.15 p.m., but two other ambulances called by radio had arrived 1¾ hours later.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, I did see the report, and I asked for details from St John of what had occurred at the scene of the accident and the ambulance response times. I have not had the opportunity to contact Dr Goel, so I do not know whether he was accurately reported, but St John Ambulance has provided me with the following information. The accident occurred at 3.30 p.m. At 3.40 p.m., 10 minutes later, a regular St John Ambulance officer arrived on the scene. He happened to be passing the scene and was not attending the accident in response to a call. But, nevertheless, he did attend the accident at 3.40 p.m., 10 minutes after it occurred. At 3.45 p.m. advice of the accident was given to the Snowtown Hospital by a local resident. At 3.55 p.m. the Snowtown ambulance departed the depot, together with four volunteers who were ordered to the scene. I repeat what I said earlier, in reply to a question, that the St John volunteer ambulance officers are subject to the same examination and provide exactly the same level of service as that involving the salaried officers of St John, and to suggest otherwise is wrong and insulting.

Between 4 p.m. and 4.5 p.m. the Snowtown ambulance arrived at the scene, and four volunteers also arrived. At 4.10 p.m. the ambulance radioed the Snowtown Hospital for further assistance, as is customary in multiple accidents in country locations. At the same time, the ambulance departed for Snowtown Hospital with the two seriously injured patients. At 4.45 p.m. the ambulance arrived at the scene of the accident from Crystal Brook. At 4.55 an additional ambulance arrived at the scene of the accident from Port Pirie. At 5 o'clock the Port Augusta ambulance, returning from Adelaide with a patient, stopped to give assistance, and at 5.30 all victims had been taken from the scene of the accident.

I should add that, contrary to newspaper reports, all patients received speedy treatment on the site and were made comfortable and kept warm in sleeping bags and blankets, and in this regard the assistance of two passing doctors and the local people was of considerable help. I have ascertained from St John that they regard the response times, particularly in regard to the first ambulance, as acceptable in the circumstances of an accident that occurred some distance from the nearest country town.

## PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

**Mr WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House whether a site has been chosen for the petro-

chemical plant that may be established in Port Adelaide by the Japanese chemical company Asahi? If a site has been chosen, what is its location? The Minister was reported in the *Messenger* press in April as saying:

A decision is expected in Japan next month on whether Port Adelaide is the preferred site for a petro-chemical plant.

I have waited throughout all of May and half-way through June without seeing any announcement of a proposed site for a petro-chemical plant that may be established in my electorate of Price.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I must confess that I did not see the report in the *Messenger* press, but I would be very much interested in it. The fact is that Asahi has made clear that it intends to pursue a feasibility study on the basis of a port somewhere in that region, with Port Adelaide as a preferred site, but no decision has yet been taken.

### LEIGH CREEK ROAD

**Mr GUNN:** Will the Minister of Transport make representations to the Highways Department to see whether it can alter its programme and have the sealing of the road south of Leigh Creek included in this year's activities? The Minister would be aware that the sealing of the Hawker to Leigh Creek road has now reached the stage where the construction will leave the alignment of the existing road, and it will be a considerable time before the public will be able to use this new section. I have had concern expressed to me by my constituents that it would be beneficial to the town of Leigh Creek if some work could take place in the new town of Leigh Creek south to a point where the alignment will leave the old road. I would be pleased if the Minister could have this matter investigated with the Highways Department, as I understand that the department camp is about to be shifted. Further, I should like to know whether the Minister could have some urgent maintenance carried out in the meantime on the old road.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I will certainly have a look at that matter for the member for Eyre. I visited the road myself late last year and travelled along it. The member for Eyre is quite correct when he says that the work is now at the stage where, if it is to go on to a new alignment, traffic will not be able to use that section of the road until it is completed. I will have the matter investigated and get the honourable member a report.

### HOME LOANS

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Will the Premier say whether the Government will introduce means-tested assistance for intending home buyers who cannot get concessional interest loans through the State Bank but who would still be unable to meet repayments on an ordinary commercial loan?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have noticed that that policy has been espoused lately. The Commonwealth has already gone through a package of measures to help existing home owners who cannot meet their interest repayments. That matter has now been brought forward into the public arena by way of a means-tested loans scheme for young people. It is a matter that I have referred to the State Bank for a report and I will be delighted to speak to the honourable member about it after I have received that report.

### TOURISM

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Tourism elaborate on why so much emphasis has been put on the New Zealand

tourist market that it has prompted the Minister to lead the tourism marketing delegation to New Zealand? I have been told that South Australia's share of the overseas tourism market has greatly improved over the past 2½ years to approximately a 10 per cent share. The question has been asked whether or not the South Australian Government can really expect to gain any greater share of what is available. The Minister's reply will therefore be of interest to us all.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The reason why strong emphasis has been placed on the New Zealand market by the Department of Tourism is simply that New Zealand represents the largest source of overseas visitors for the whole of Australia and, indeed, for South Australia. In the past, our share of the New Zealand market has not been what it proportionately should have been. The purpose of this promotion, which is to take place in Christchurch and Auckland early in July, is to alert New Zealand tourist and travel operators to the potential of the South Australian market, to sell package tours to our State, and to increase the level of New Zealand visitors to South Australia.

If we could increase the current level by 10 per cent, the result would be an additional \$2 000 000 in tourism expenditure in South Australia alone. That is the reason why the Department of Tourism has had such broad support from a wide range of bodies, including Qantas and the Federation of Travel Agents, and the City of Adelaide is sending representation to this conference.

I believe that the presence of a State Minister at that meeting will demonstrate to the New Zealand travel trade that we are determined to enlarge the number of visitors coming to us from New Zealand. As I mentioned in a press statement earlier this month, the great attractions for New Zealanders visiting Australia are largely to be found in our State. They include, particularly, Australian flora and fauna and, as I have said previously and as the Minister of Environment and Planning can bear out, South Australia is better placed than any other State in terms of ready access to conservation parks. Cleland Conservation Park, in particular, can be reached in less than half an hour from the G.P.O. and visitors there can see Australian flora and fauna at close hand.

Also, New Zealand visitors are anxious to take advantage of superior shopping facilities in Australian capital cities, and Rundle Mall represents, to the New Zealand tourist, a shopper's paradise. I was particularly pleased at the expansion plans for John Martins, which will enhance the facilities already available in Rundle Mall. I hope, in a year's time, to be able to report to the House (I am confident that I will be able to do this) that we have increased our share of the tourism market, with the resultant benefits for South Australia.

### CONTRACT STAFF

**Mr ABBOTT:** Will the Minister of Education say what steps are being taken to avoid the loss of contract staff in recently established and socially significant areas of study in colleges of advanced education such as Aboriginal studies, women's studies and community languages? I understand that the former Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr Fife) wrote to his State counterparts expressing concern about the possibility of such areas being unduly penalised by the loss of contract staff and saying that this should be avoided at all costs. Four of the six academic staff in Aboriginal studies at the Underdale college, for example, have one-year contracts that expire this year. These jobs will be placed in jeopardy because of the pressures on tertiary institutions, resulting from drastically reduced funding from the 1982-84 triennium.

Contract staff are hired because their expertise is unavailable in the employing institution, and their loss will have a very severe effect on the areas of study to which I have referred. What steps have been taken to avoid the loss of contract staff? What is the Minister's response to the concerns expressed by his Federal colleague's letter?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member has highlighted a problem that is nothing new to any sphere of education where there is any winding down of employment, and this, of course, is related not simply to the economy, as the honourable member suggests, but also to the number of students who apply for admission to Government and non-government schools, colleges of advanced education, and universities.

The specific problem to which the honourable member refers is certainly one that we have attempted to redress in some means by the continued amalgamation of colleges. This process was started by the previous Government and has been continued to the point where all colleges have now amalgamated under the umbrella of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. One of the aims of that amalgamation was to ensure that, in the event of any replacement of staff being necessary, the staff would be able to apply to transfer from one college to another and, in fact, since there is now one united college, there would be no obstacle to that occurring. Previously, staff would have resigned and then transferred to another completely different college that was autonomously controlled. There is freer movement of staff in the amalgamated colleges now than there has ever been before.

That is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is more speculative than real at present. The letter to which the honourable member has referred was received in my office a few weeks ago. We were unaware that there was any specific possibility of retrenchment of contract staff; in fact, we had received no report or complaint from either individual staff members or from the Director of the college that this may be so. However, I think the honourable member would realise that the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, Mr Kevin Gilding, liaises between the Federally funded colleges and universities and the Education Department, and he will investigate whether any of the contractees will have their appointments terminated while their services would still be needed within the colleges.

The major issue, of course, is that attrition does not necessarily occur in the areas where one would like it to occur, and it is quite possible that tenured staff whose services are not required are nevertheless entitled to remain. This problem is being monitored month by month and year by year. So far, we have not been made aware of any acute problem. Now that the honourable member has signalled a few specific areas of possible complaint, I will make quite sure that this issue is investigated quickly and I undertake to bring back a report.

#### FUEL EQUALISATION SCHEME

**Mr BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, advise whether the Government is currently examining the practicalities of a State fuel equalisation scheme and, if it is, when it is expected that such a scheme will be introduced? If it is not, will the Government undertake such a feasibility study?

The House would be aware that the Federal Government is funding a fuel freight equalisation scheme, which ensures that the freight component of petroleum products and pricing is within .4 cents per litre anywhere in Australia. As there

are differences of more than 3 cents a litre between some outlets within South Australia, and because these differences are sometimes incorrectly justified as being due to freight, it would appear that a study is justified. Upon further inquiry I was informed that there are five possible reasons why differences could occur, and all charges except freight are within the jurisdiction of the State Government.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I shall ask my colleague to provide a report.

#### TRANSPORT FARES

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will the Minister of Transport give this House a categorical assurance that bus, train and tram fares will not rise by 20 to 30 per cent by the end of August, compounding the burden on public transport users who have already faced an average increase in fares of 50 per cent since the Government was elected?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

#### COORONG CHANNEL

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether he recalls seeing an article in the *News* of last Thursday, 10 June, headlined 'Cut Coorong channel or else, says farmers'? If he did, what information can he give members of the House about the action that the Government has taken since it was elected in 1979 in connection with the salinity problem that has arisen in Lake Albert since the barrages were installed (in the first instance) and in connection with the permanency of the water in the lake being ensured thereby?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Soon after we came to Government I had discussions with the progress association at Meningie in relation to this important matter. At that time I indicated to the association that a study had been initiated to determine the benefits of cutting a channel from Lake Albert through the Coorong. This work is progressing. I believe that it is work that would have to be done under the authority and approval of the River Murray Commission, as the barrages are all under the control of the commission: they are managed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for and on behalf of the commission. If the work was carried out as a commission works, naturally the cost sharing would be on a quarter basis each by the Commonwealth and the three State Governments involved.

I assure the honourable member that as soon as the necessary studies into the benefits of such a proposal and an environmental impact assessment have been done on the effects that it would have on the Coorong, the proposal will be referred to the River Murray Commission for consideration as a River Murray Commission works.

#### OLYMPIC DAM

**Mrs SOUTHCOTT:** Will the Minister of Water Resources inform the House of the effect of the Olympic Dam project on the water resources of South Australia, and in particular, on the availability of an assured supply of water to other users, particularly in times of water shortage? Senator Don Jessop has called for the establishment of a national water authority. A report of what he said is as follows:

The threat posed by the availability of water to secondary industry in Australia was the greatest we face. The much touted 'resources boom' which has been heralded as the development that will restore this country's economy and lead us out of our present economic situation could collapse because of a lack of water.

Without exception, the resource projects that have been identified are within areas in which water is either severely limited or is already committed to other developments. One need only think of the Olympic Dam project at Roxby Downs in South Australia. Lack of water, not of capital, skilled labor, coal or minerals might be the major constraint on the development boom.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The fact that the project is in the Far North does not in itself produce any real problems. The water required for processing will in all probability be obtained from the Great Artesian Basin. As far as domestic water is concerned, principally for the use of the town, it makes absolutely no difference whether water is for the development at Roxby Downs or whether the water is to supply further expansion of suburban activities here in metropolitan Adelaide.

The usage of water is no greater, and the availability from the Murray River for further expansion in the use of domestic and industrial waters is assured. However, we are not assured of and cannot allocate additional waters for further irrigation development in this State. The amount of water required for industrial and domestic expansion is comparatively small compared with the volume of water required for additional irrigation expansion. There is no problem in that regard.

### WATER STORAGE

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister of Water Resources give the current holdings in the metropolitan water storages?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** I am sorry the member for Unley is not here to direct the question, as he did for the previous Government. I know my constituents are most concerned at the storage capacity of our reservoirs, as is the member for Fisher, and the quality of water—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister of Water Resources.

**Mr BECKER:** I have not yet finished.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Silence can have many meanings.

**Mr BECKER:** My constituents have expressed concern over the past few months at the impact of the purchase of rainwater tanks to try to conserve water in South Australia. For many years I have been advocating the purchase of rainwater tanks in an attempt to save water. I wonder whether the increased use of rainwater tanks is having any impact on our holdings in our metropolitan storages.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I can assure honourable members that I have the latest metropolitan water storage figures on file in the House every day and readily available at any time any member wishes to ask for them. The current volume in storage is 43 per cent of capacity, which is satisfactory for this time of the year. At this time last year the figure was 32 per cent, and I believe the 43 per cent held currently is a clear indication that Adelaide is well safeguarded with the reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Range, and also the availability and capacity to pump from the Murray River. We have about 208 000 megalitres total capacity in the Mount Lofty Range, to service the metropolitan area, but we also have a pumping capacity of 300 000 megalitres annually, which gives Adelaide probably one of the safest and most assured water supplies in Australia.

The percentage of storage held in the various reservoirs varies dramatically, but the total distribution system in the metropolitan area is interlinked and the water can be transferred from one reservoir to another. The present storages are: Mount Bold reservoir 18 per cent, Happy Valley reservoir 38 per cent, Clarendon weir 94 per cent, Millbrook reservoir 25 per cent, Kangaroo Creek dam 17 per cent, Hope Valley reservoir 59 per cent, Little Para reservoir 60 per cent,

Barossa reservoir 98 per cent, South Para reservoir 66 per cent, and Myponga reservoir 49 per cent, giving an average total storage of 43 per cent for the metropolitan area.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TAX AVOIDANCE

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

Leave granted.

**Mr BANNON:** In answer to a question concerning tax avoidance today the Premier picked up a reference (by way of interjection, I think) to Mr Hugh Morgan and proceeded to say that the Opposition had been making investigations into Mr Morgan's status in relation to this matter and that Mr Morgan had told him that he took great exception to the Opposition's statements. I cannot give the exact words because, of course, *Hansard* is not available as yet.

I feel that those statements are grave ones, and I would like to make a personal explanation about them. The matter of the McCabe Report was widely reported on 28 May, and in a front page story in the *Financial Review* a number of names were mentioned, including that of Mr Hugh Morgan, in connection with the \$200 000 000 tax avoidance scheme, the so-called 'bottom of the harbor' scheme mentioned in that report. The following day in pursuit of inquiries we were making about tax avoidance generally (matters which had been raised in this House by the Opposition previously), I requested a member of my staff to ring both the Premier's office, in Victoria, and the author of the *Financial Review* article, to see whether or not we could obtain full copies of the report and full details of what these schemes involved. In the course of those inquiries mention was made of Mr Morgan's name, because he had been named in this front page story. That reference presumably is what was used in the article that appeared on 3 June in the *Financial Review* referring to the South Australian Opposition's 'seeking information on the nature of the involvement of Western Mining Corporation Director Mr Hugh Morgan in a company named in the McCabe-Lafranchi Report'.

In fact, we finally did obtain copies of the report and found the appropriate references. In the general part of it, at page 13 volume 1, it is mentioned that the vendor was not a party to the arrangements to avoid tax, provided there was no knowledge of the activity of the purchaser subsequent to the sale. The report states:

The lack of knowledge of later activity enabled the vendor to assert he neither knew of, nor assented to, nor ratified any of the subsequent events. That decision was the basis for advice given by counsel and accountants, that a vendor should make no inquiries whatsoever as to the identity or intentions of the purchaser.

In volume 2 details appear of a company called Trison Pty Ltd of which, at the time of sale to the dealer, one of the two directors was Hugh Matheson Morgan. Details were given of when that sale took place, the amount involved, and the sale to Henry Kowalczyk, an unemployed labourer, and a firm called Pocita Lisa Pty Ltd, one of whose directors was a convict in Pentridge gaol. At no time did we raise these matters in Parliament. In fact, I asked a question about the scheme on 1 June, and no mention at all was made of Mr Morgan's name.

I would say further that on 7 June I had a message from Mr Morgan's office that he would like to speak to me. I responded to that call, in fact, anticipating that it was about this report in the *Financial Review* which had appeared on 3 June that he was concerned, and that he would like to take it up with me. I had the information available with me for that call, together with an article which appeared in



the *Business Review Weekly*, in which Mr Morgan explained how it was that he felt he came to be named in this report.

However, it appeared from Mr Morgan's conversation when he contacted me that that was not the matter he wanted to discuss with me. In fact, he did not raise the matter and, as he did not raise it, I did not see fit to do so. So, far from taking exception to the Opposition's statements on that contact, on that occasion, speaking directly to him, the matter was not even mentioned, so either the Premier is misrepresenting his position over this and the way in which the Opposition has handled it, or Mr Morgan is. I would like the matter cleared up, either by the Premier now, or by contacting Mr Morgan, which I intend to do immediately after this Question Time is over.

*At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 June. Page 4556.)

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I have been involved for more than 30 years in the administration of fund raising for various voluntary and sporting agencies in the community, so I know how hard it is to raise funds. I appreciate the gestures made by the member for Fisher during my speech. He was becoming uptight because he believed that I was reflecting on service clubs. I see the honourable member's difficulty. He may have believed that I was attacking service clubs, but I was pointing out the difficulties of small voluntary agencies. Similarly, service clubs receive numerous requests from most worthwhile community groups and organisations, and from many sporting organisations wanting assistance, particularly in the purchase of equipment and in sending teams to carnivals.

This legislation goes a long way towards assisting voluntary agencies and service clubs to make up the difference not covered by various Governments. It is difficult enough for the Government to recognise the many voluntary agencies. Often, there is a problem about whether services are duplicated, but, there still is a need for professional organisations, such as those representing the medical profession, and those representing the people who are affected. There will always be a need in the community for a lay organisation to undertake a community education programme on the various disabilities and to assist people in overcoming associated social problems. Professional organisations will always need to undertake research and to purchase necessary medical equipment. So, I foresee the difficulties that some voluntary agencies could experience in future if they are not given support and recognition by the Government.

Of course, I was most perturbed yesterday when I read in the press of the problems that could be forced on the St John Ambulance organisation if there was a move to discourage voluntary members. No doubt, if that were to happen all the volunteers who help at various levels with fund raising would also disappear. That would be an absolute tragedy for that or any other organisation. The problem in co-ordinating is that many volunteers are loath to raise money to pay wages or salaries; sometimes when service clubs need funding, people want to know whether the funds will go into wages or salaries.

No voluntary organisation could exist unless it had some paid clerical or co-ordinating staff. Those wage and salary commitments have to be met. We cannot expect the Government to pay them all the time. In most instances a

voluntary agency has had to survive for at least three years on its own merits before qualifying for Government support. In other cases we find that, where voluntary agencies are established overnight, they immediately clamour to get on to the band wagon of the Government hand-out. If they do not get it they denigrate the Government, no matter what political Party is in power. They believe that the Government should fund them totally. I do not support that system at all. I believe that these organisations have to help themselves, but they have to be encouraged initially to become viable. Then they can establish themselves and be totally independent.

I was most interested to carry out a quick check with some voluntary agencies and organisations that will benefit from this legislation. I understand that last financial year the channel 9 telethon paid \$8 483 in tax, as mentioned in this legislation. Currently, the Multiple Sclerosis Society can expect to pay \$5 000. In the past five years it has had to pay \$26 000. Using the multiplier effect, if that goes towards medical equipment or bricks and mortar, as the Multiple Sclerosis Society is relocating its premises, that \$26 000 could be worth substantially more, in the region of \$100 000. Losing that income makes matters extremely difficult. Other organisations, considered to be small, may not pay very much. The Epilepsy Association paid about \$100 last year, but it will be considerably more in this financial year, but that little extra helps if it gives incentive to volunteers to go on trying to do the best that they can for an organisation.

By incorporating service clubs in this legislation, no doubt we will give them the encouragement that voluntary agencies look for. We always appreciate support from service clubs, but we also look again to the Government of the day to give that lead, to give service clubs a little initiative to help smaller organisations. Real benefits can flow from this, whether for the Diabetic Association, the Asthma Foundation, the Kidney Foundation, or the Epilepsy Association. It is always appreciated that the Government recognises those organisations.

I believe that most voluntary agencies have responded to the Minister following the announcement of this legislation. As President and foundation member of the Epilepsy Association, I want to publicly pass on to the Minister our appreciation and thanks for his introducing this legislation. We are grateful to know that in some small way the Government supports the work that we have undertaken. For that reason, I have much pleasure in supporting the legislation, and commending it to all members.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** In supporting the legislation, I concede that it does not go as far as perhaps any Government would like in the area of voluntary work by community groups. I would not be speaking today, except that the member for Hanson said things that I thought at the time, and still believe, were unfair to some service club organisations. They are not all made up of business men. That should be clarified. Many are made up of people from all walks of life. Some have, as part of their charter, one person from each profession or occupation, but that does not mean that they are all business men. Younger people, particularly those in Leos or Apex, are not all business men; in fact, the vast majority in those two organisations is not people who own their own businesses. They come from all walks of life and employment areas, although some are in business.

I can understand that the member for Hanson has a very keen interest in one worthy and important organisation helping a disadvantaged group in our community that was, in the past, to a large degree neglected. I congratulate him and the people who work with him and who form that organisation to help those suffering from epilepsy. One of the problems often when one forms a new charity or con-

cerned committee is that service clubs and other organisations already have a set criteria and priority in funds allocation. It is not easy, when making funds available, to cut out one area and support a new group. It takes time to establish what one might call a clientele.

This penalty—I believe it can only be described as such—which has applied to those voluntary agencies and charitable bodies that have had to pay the Government, regardless of which Government is in power, for the privilege of raising money through raffles is a very unfair imposition. I think every politician would agree with that, acknowledging, of course, that the Government has to spread funds throughout the community. It is to the credit of the present Minister and his Cabinet colleagues (I know he had to convince them of the change) that they have accepted that at least charitable bodies and service clubs should be exempt from that charge. It is a big step in the right direction. It may not be possible to cover the areas of concern, involving those people who are raising money voluntarily for community projects, by reducing their obligation in the near future. I cannot predict that; that is up to the Government of the day.

It is very easy in Opposition to say that this imposition is unfair. I did so in Opposition, and I know that the member for Gilles has done so since he has been in Opposition; maybe he did it in his own Party room when in Government and, of course, there would be members of this Government who have raised the same subject, because we believed that it was unfair. However, the end result is that Cabinet has to find the opportunity to make the variation in the distribution or collection of money, and so I congratulate the Government in this regard.

I wish to clarify the position regarding my own area in case some of my constituents read the debate and see the concern that the member for Hanson has expressed. I can understand his concern about the television set and the request to sell tickets. If a group went to a service club in my electorate (one such club previously had only nine members, although it has more now) and asked it to raise money for them and that service club found something of substantial value to raffle and said to that community organisation, 'We have had the raffle books printed, and we will sell a few, but because your agency is bigger, with the interests in it and bearing in mind the number of people who are disadvantaged, we want you to go out and sell tickets,' I believe that that would be fair.

For example, four members of that service club that at one stage had only nine members recently pushed bikes from Adelaide to Perth, not for the joy of doing it but because they thought they could help the Flying Doctor Service, and they raised many thousands of dollars. That was a real effort, and that same club in years gone by raised the money in one doorknock on a Sunday to build the Meals on Wheels kitchen at Aldgate. Another service club (Rotary) set out to build aged cottage homes alongside the hospital; it carried the debt burden and took the risk involved in a big investment, and it made this accommodation available to aged people to buy on a similar basis to that available to many others in the city area. Even though they had difficulty in the early stages, it is to the credit of these people that they stuck to the task and provided that facility, one into which the Government would have had to put a lot of effort otherwise.

So, one could go through the list. The Blackwood Lions and the service clubs there, including those involved in St John and the community recreation centre, have raised thousands of dollars on all sorts of projects, Service clubs, although I admit they are not charitable bodies, are fellowship bodies trying to work for the benefit of the community, and they raise a vast amount of money for community projects and charitable organisations. They even go out and cut

wood for aged pensioners, clean up gardens and do work in that area. They buy electric wheelchairs for people who are not able otherwise to push themselves around the hills. They go out on a regular basis and replace that machine for one person whom I know.

Nearly all service clubs were formed when their communities were experiencing tough times, for example, in the 1930s with the depression, when the community was suffering and looking for somebody to go out and try to help those who were disadvantaged. It was the young men and women who went out and formed these service organisations and helped to achieve these things, and I say 'Congratulations' to those who have carried on the tradition today even in affluent times when they could quite easily go boating, fishing or golfing and not spend their time selling books at bookstalls or working at fetes on stalls, or going around in vehicles selling raffle tickets. These service clubs can be as proud of their record as can any other body in the community that raises money for charity.

I believe that the service clubs never ever ask for a subsidy; they do not ask for that sort of help. They may ask for help for a certain cause but not for the club itself. I understand the Government's position, and I know that it is reducing its revenue considerably by making this provision available to the charities and service clubs concerned, but I believe that in future we need to consider the position of sporting clubs and other community groups and remove the imposition they face in trying to raise money through lotteries and in doing service work or community work. If necessary, we can eliminate the professional sports, if that is a concern, but there is an imposition by way of a tax on the selling of raffle tickets by parent bodies that raise money for junior sports and junior athletics. I know that the Minister is concerned about that matter and that it will be looked at by this Government at the first opportunity.

I thank the Minister and the Cabinet for going this far on behalf of the charities and service clubs concerned, and I trust that the member for Hanson was only expressing concern in one instance when he spoke about service clubs, because in the main they have done a great amount of work for this country and also other parts of the world where people are disadvantaged. I congratulate those organisations and thank them for their efforts.

**Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I was not going to become involved in this debate, but I wish to clarify certain things that the member for Hanson has said. When I first looked at this measure I thought that it was not very important and should perhaps go through without any fuss. It places a member of Parliament in such a situation that if he were to oppose it he could be regarded as being uncharitable. On the other hand, if one supports the amendment, it highlights certain anomalies in the existing Act involving small lotteries, and this amendment does very little to remove these anomalies. In fact, I believe it intensifies the situation to some degree. I want briefly to refer to the member for Hanson's remarks.

**Mr Slater:** He is quite different today—he's tempered down over the weekend.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** My colleague quite rightly interjects; indeed, the member for Hanson has waned a bit over the weekend.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Did you wane over the weekend?

**Mr MAX BROWN:** No, I did not; I am still here. Perhaps at the end of my remarks the Minister may wish that I was not here. Obviously, over the weekend, the member for Hanson had a look at what he said Thursday afternoon and decided to try to rectify the very grave wrong that he did when he went to great lengths to pound my ear about this matter on the previous occasion. Last Thursday the hon-

ourable member attacked the service clubs of this State in no uncertain manner.

**Mr Slater:** And the lotteries, but he doesn't recall that.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I do not know. It amazes me, though, that the honourable member, who is a one-time bank teller, wants to attack a service club. From my experience with service clubs, they seem to recruit members from those sorts of institution. I would have thought that the honourable member would support rather than be opposed to service clubs. I would remind him that, from my knowledge and experience, service clubs in the main play an important role in the raising of moneys for all sorts of charities.

**Mr Becker:** I can talk from personal experience over the past six years.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Perhaps that is why the honourable member has had a new lease of life. On Thursday afternoon he was quick to condemn the service clubs. From my experience I know that they have played an important part in collecting money for charities. I point out to the Minister that, by opening up this section of the Act, he raises a grave question as to what we are doing about the existing position. I put to the Minister that service clubs that raise money for charitable organisations do so by running small lotteries and by using their small lotteries licence number to do so. Perhaps the Minister will explain, when he winds up this debate, how on earth this Act is going to do anything about those service clubs, operating on their annual licence, that raise funds for certain charitable organisations. That is an anomaly that, it seems to me, ought to be looked at. Let us be frank: service clubs do carry out the function I am now suggesting they carry out. I point out to the member for Hanson that service clubs in my area were responsible for recently providing (from funds raised by running small lotteries) a bus for the retarded children's school. I suggest that they used their licence to run those small lotteries. They were also responsible for financially assisting an aged pensioners' home in Whyalla (and at some cost).

I can also remember a service club purchasing a new motor car for the Mothers and Babies' Association. We are talking here about thousands of dollars. The service clubs have done these things because they have wanted to help certain charitable organisations in the community. I ask the Minister whether they have done that by raising that money through small lotteries run under their own licence number. If they have, I suggest that this amendment does absolutely nothing about that situation. If it does, it will be interesting to find out how it is going to work.

I am not looking just at service clubs, but the member for Hanson was on about them previously: many sporting clubs and hotels also run functions or small lotteries to assist charitable organisations. Even if one were to suggest that we could look at that practice through this amendment, I would still be interested to know how we are going to overcome what has been happening. The operation of this amendment is not as easy as many people think it might be. However, if I opposed this amendment everybody would immediately come to me and say that I am uncharitable.

**Mr Mathwin:** They could say worse than that.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** It would not need much imagination at all to anticipate what the member for Glenelg might say. I point out to the Minister that I have always believed that this Act requires, and is crying out for, a complete overhaul, and I will explain why. First, this amendment takes only the tip off a great iceberg, so far as I am concerned.

I turn now to some of the operations governed by this Act, which does not deal only with charitable organisations. The type of licence we are now discussing would cover such things as mini-bingo tickets. I have found that certain clubs and organisations are prepared to run a mini-bingo operation for a charitable organisation. The problem is what licence

this may involve, who puts in the return, and how this operation may be affected.

I think that we are all hypocritical when it comes to the question of small lotteries. Mini-bingo, as everybody knows, is a hand operated device used by clubs and other organisations, as well as now by hotels, which have got into the act and sell tickets over the bar. Somebody is responsible for running each mini-bingo operation, and everybody is supposedly very honest, although I find that hard to accept.

I believe that in bingo operations, the box should be operated by machinery, but once that occurs we come dangerously close to a poker machine. That is why I believe we are being completely hypocritical about the whole thing. We in this House are aghast if someone mentions poker machines. In this operation we have a mini poker machine, because a ticket is sold for money, and a poker machine could be regarded similarly. That operation should be considered.

Even beer card dispensing machines are almost the same. The prize was originally in bottles of beer but, because of the increasing price of a bottle of beer, in certain cases (and unfortunately it is unavoidable) the winning ticket is for \$1 in kind. That machinery in some cases is operated for charitable organisations. We are only kidding ourselves if we think that that is not the case. We are coming dangerously close to poker machines, whether or not we like it. By opening up the section of the Act that deals with charitable organisations, we are being quite crude: the whole matter should be examined.

I make no bones about the fact that I am appalled at the situation in regard to small lottery licences. In the first instance, these licences were issued to clubs, charitable organisations, and other such organisations to raise money for those involvements within our community. Now, social clubs are granted these licences, and what a racket it is!

**Mr Slater:** With not fewer than 10 members.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I do not know how many members these clubs have: perhaps they have none at all, but I am not talking about that. Under what I maintain is a bogus licence number, mini-bingo tickets are handed out from behind a bar, the funds from which are used for a booze up at the end of the year.

**Mr Slater:** Great charity!

**Mr MAX BROWN:** It is terrific charity!

**Mr Mathwin:** You can catch up with them if you want to.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** That is the point I keep making. This Act requires a very close examination. We should not say that, because we are all charitable people, we will consider only that part of the Act. As far as I am concerned, this is chicken feed. This Bill will not solve the problems in any way. The collecting of funds in hotels for charitable organisations commenced only about 18 months ago. I know that hoteliers or other people who read *Hansard* will become very vexed indeed about what I am saying.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** No, they are supporting it.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I do not care about their feelings. I suggest that hotel social clubs have stopped the hoteliers from running sets of bingo tickets for charitable organisations such as St John Ambulance. The social clubs do not want that, because they have their own set-up and will run their own bingo operations. What a joke!

It is a sore point with me that the football club in Whyalla with which I am involved, with four other clubs, was recently attacked by the past judge of the Licensing Court, His Honour Judge Grubb. I understand that next month those clubs will be in the Industrial Court to answer a charge of not paying wages to the mothers of young boys who play the game. They will be made to come into line and pay wages. We talk about charities and increasing licence fees

for charitable organisations, but my club provides about \$9 000 from small raffles, providing counter meals, and so on to keep about 140 kids off the streets. I wonder whether we are being fair dinkum when we consider these matters.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is a good thing if it keep kids off the streets.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I hope that in July the Industrial Court is fair dinkum, as the member for Glenelg apparently thinks it will be. I do not want to take up more time than is necessary. I have referred to the sections of the Act that should be examined. I now want to throw another matter into the ring. Some hotels and clubs have pinball machinery or eight-ball slot machines, for which a licence is not required and from which there is no return. Most hoteliers these days believe that eight-ball machines are a very lucrative business, and some of them would be out of business if they did not provide such machines.

I do not want to oppose the Bill, but I believe that it means nothing for the general public. Irrespective of which Party is in power, the time has come for someone, somewhere to sit down and have a really honest look at this issue and to come up with what may appear to be a proper result. I hope I have answered the query raised by the member for Hanson in regard to service clubs. I have endeavoured to explain certain matters that concern me, and I trust and hope that the Minister or his officers will take time in the near future to consider the anomalies to which I have referred. Rather than considering the amendments contained in the Bill, we should be considering wider amendments. We should consider the matters before a Bill is introduced, so that we would not have to take up a great deal of time in debate.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I did take notice of comments made by the member for Hanson and thought I should say something.

**Mr Becker:** I hope you are not going to over-react, too.

**Mr PETERSON:** I am not over-reacting. In fact many of your colleagues wear service club pins.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the member for Semaphore that there is a slight problem with the clock and so he will be kept advised.

**Mr PETERSON:** I have noticed that many of the member for Hanson's colleagues wear service club pins. I was surprised to read the member's comments in *Hansard*; I read them to make sure that I heard correctly the other day. I have no idea what the service club situation is in the member for Hanson's area or in the Glenelg or Brighton area, but I can assure him and other members of the House that that situation does not apply to clubs of which I am aware in my electorate and in adjoining electorates. I am not a member of a service club but I happen to know a little of them. I am aware that they do sterling work within the community and without them there would be many people who would find it difficult to survive. If the situation is as the member for Hanson says it is in his area, bad luck.

**Mr Becker:** You misunderstood the whole thing.

**Mr PETERSON:** I hear a comment that we have misunderstood; one of the things about this Parliament is that once something is said it is recorded in *Hansard*, which does not have explanatory notes in the margin, so what is recorded there, what appears there, is what one must take into account. The comments are there and that is all I can work on. The Rotary Club in my area does sterling work. It organises Rotagala day in which all the minor groups in the community participate and which is very beneficial to Rotary and all the other service groups, be they charities or small groups that have great difficulty in raising funds.

Mention was made in *Hansard* of school councils, which is another group which benefits from this sort of day. Also,

Lions at this moment is about to donate a car to the District Nursing Society of which I happen to be Chairman, and I am aware of the work that the organisations perform in the community. I was sorry to read what was contained in *Hansard*.

There appeared to be a problem in regard to the definition of charity. I understand that at the moment there is a list that may have to be expanded, as was referred to by some previous speakers. It is a little difficult to define just what a charity is. For instance, there are groups such as pensioner groups which work very hard towards keeping the group alive. Also, when they have a little surplus they give it to charity. Therefore, I think that they could be considered.

**Mr Becker:** Why don't you support what I said—voluntary agencies?

**Mr PETERSON:** It would seem to me that voluntary agencies are just what we are speaking of. I am not aware of anyone in the Lions, pensioner groups, school councils, or local branches of the District Nursing Society receiving one cent. They do not get free bandages from the District Nursing Society, and schools do not get free pencils. I do not know what the definition of a voluntary agency is under that definition.

**Mr Becker:** You did not read my speech.

**Mr PETERSON:** I did read the speech and that is the impression that I gained. I realise that the following matter is outside the State Minister's control but it is a point that I want to raise, because it has been mentioned to me by service clubs in particular; it is a matter that should be raised so that hopefully someone will take notice of it. In the second reading explanation the Minister stated that:

The Government recognises the community services performed by such groups [charitable purposes groups] and seeks to provide relief from the payment of fees that are currently payable under the existing legislation.

That, of course, is relevant to our Lottery and Gaming Act. The point is that many groups do a lot of work and provide facilities, equipment, and other things that hospitals, for instance, would not receive if it were not for their efforts. The one thing that really annoys those groups more than the fees payable under the Lottery and Gaming Act is sales tax. Those groups provide services which would have to be provided by the Government if they did not do so, yet they are forced to pay sales tax.

I realise that it is not within the power of the State Minister to do anything about the matter, but it is one that could be investigated with a view to lifting sales tax on goods which are to be truly provided for the benefit of the community through the actions of a group which receives no payment for doing so and which provides a facility or equipment that could not be provided in any other way. I indicate that I support the Bill. I think it is a starting point and it provides for the removal of a charge from the small groups that are trying to provide services in our community.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I support the Bill, as I think it is a very good measure. The amendments to be made to the principal Act will be of very great benefit, particularly to some of the organisations within the community for which having to pay money for licences and the like has been a bone of contention in circumstances when in actual fact they have been simply raising money for small organisations or local charities.

Some members seem to have some opposition to the word 'charity'. There is really nothing wrong with the word; it is one of the honourable and aged words and there is nothing disgraceful about it. In fact, it is a very important word. There are sayings in relation to charity and other matters.

**Dr Billard:** Faith, hope and charity.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Faith, hope and charity is one, and 'charity' is none the lesser because it is mentioned last.

**Mr Slater:** Part of the Liberal Party manifesto is faith, hope and charity, isn't it?

**Mr MATHWIN:** No, I think the honourable gentleman is mixing it up with one of these religious organisations.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The interjections by the member for Gilles are out of order.

**Mr MATHWIN:** No doubt the honourable member heard it at some hallowed hall.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Glenelg to link up his remarks.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I will to the best of my ability, Mr Deputy Speaker. On a few occasions the matter of the job that service clubs do within a community has been brought up in this place. I want to make quite clear that, as far as I am concerned (and I have a knowledge of a number of service clubs within the community), I believe that they are doing a very good job to the best of their ability. I have been a member of the Glenelg Rotary Club for 16 years. I have also been associated with many other service organisations such as Lions, Apex, Kiwanis, and Jaycees and with women's service clubs which usually belong to a city. I refer to the Brighton Women's Services or the Glenelg Women's Services and point out that they are also service organisations that work for the benefit of the community and assist the mayor of a district to the best of their ability. They do a lot of work in that particular area and they raise much money for the benefit of people who are perhaps not in as good a position as they are in. Women's services do much work in the field of handicrafts, which they sell at trading tables to raise money for charitable organisations in their area. During the five years I was a mayor my council ran a mayoral charity ball by which we raised money to give to different organisations in the community such as Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, and I remember at that time we were trying to build a senior citizens club, to which we were able to donate money. I have also been State President of the Surf Life Saving Association.

**Mr Peterson:** A body of fine men.

**Mr MATHWIN:** They are, indeed, and they are getting better all the time. I believe that the Surf Life Saving Association is a service club. I believe it renders a terrific service to the community generally. It saves lives on the beaches and its main aim is to train its members to become good citizens. As well as keeping these young people off the streets and making them physically fit, they become committed to assisting the community. I hope that that organisation will be enabled to take some advantage of the provisions of this Bill.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Would you separate them from a normal sporting association?

**Mr MATHWIN:** I would indeed. I think their main object is service to the community and their record over the years has proved that. They enter into healthy competition, which enables their young people to train and become fit, but the main object is to keep our beaches safe for the benefit of the community of South Australia and to save the community and the taxpayers of this State an enormous sum. In so doing they are providing a great service to the community and I believe that the Surf Life Saving Association should be included along with Rotary, Lions, Apex, Kiwanis, and the women's service clubs. That is because of the great feeling I have for that organisation. I hope that this Bill will pass with all the speed it deserves. I commend my friend the Minister for bringing this amendment to the House because I believe it is well worthy of unanimous support.

**Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham):** The more I listen the more confused I become. The Bill talks about exempting a person or class of persons. I heard the second reading explanation and I commend the concept, but I am concerned about the definition of terms and what we are doing exactly. I hope that the Minister in his response will clarify some of the issues for me. If 'charity' is to be the definition for charitable purposes, I believe that definition is too narrow. I also believe that 'voluntary organisation' is far too wide a definition. Are service clubs to be included without any qualification, are they included only if they are raising funds for a specified and recognised charity, and what is the position of school organisations and sporting organisations?

I have been Chairman of the Child and Home Safety Advisory Committee of the National Safety Council, which depends to a great extent on the generosity of service clubs. They have provided a great deal of money for us but if they are not included under their own title they would not be able to get any concession for fund raising on our behalf because the Child and Home Safety Advisory Committee is not a recognised charity. I hope the Minister can clarify some of these points for me.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I thank honourable members for their support of this measure. If I do not deal with all of the questions raised during the second reading stage, perhaps I could deal with them more specifically during the Committee stage. The last Bill with which I dealt in this House related to load limits and vehicle dimensions. Members get many inquiries on those matters, and I suppose this Bill is similar in that respect. Members receive numerous inquiries about small lotteries and their effects on particular organisations. This proves that there is much interest and concern in the community about these matters. It is the Government's job to try to deal with these matters of concern.

I think I could perhaps cover a point made by a number of speakers regarding the question of exemption and whether we would extend or intended extending the exemption to educational organisations (and the member for Gilles and the member for Mitcham mentioned these organisations in particular) and other organisations. The member for Glenelg spoke at some length about charitable organisations and service clubs and mentioned particularly the Surf Lifesaving Association. That proves that it is not an easy matter to deal with this subject and that is one of the reasons why this particular Bill has been delayed in reaching this House.

Obviously the Bill is an enabling Bill and the exemptions will be made in the regulations. It is the purpose of the Government at this stage to exempt charities as defined in the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act and service organisations collecting money for charities.

**Mr Slater:** Under that Act?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Not necessarily: collecting money for charities but not for their own private funds. I have to make a reservation here. The drawing of the regulations is not easy because, as the member for Mitcham correctly mentioned, the question of definition is paramount. If a service organisation was collecting money through a lottery for a kindergarten, an educational institution, or a charity, it is our intention at this stage, if it can be accomplished in the regulations, that that particular collection would be exempted from lottery licence fees.

However, if the particular service organisation was collecting for its handover dinner or some particular function that was for the benefit of the club members only, it would be our intention that that should not be exempt. I think that is reasonable. However, it does make the matter reasonably complicated in application. One of the reasons why I particularly wanted this measure through before the House

rises is to get on with the regulations so that the matter can be finalised as soon as possible.

**Mr Mathwin:** They would be on trust, I suppose, to a certain extent.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Negotiations have already been held with the Organisation of Service Clubs on that particular matter. Transport Ministers do not often receive letters of commendation for any particular matter with which they have dealt but the amount of correspondence congratulating the Government on this particular measure is certainly the greatest I have ever received on any matter.

That shows, to some extent, the amount of feeling in the community about this. I apologise to honourable members for not being any more specific than that, but that is how we looked at it. The member for Gilles raised the matter of licence fees. We collect those fees from a number of other areas. Generally, they come from under these headings: sporting, social, charitable, educational, religious, cultural, industrial, patriotic, and political. I can give honourable members at least one assurance: I will not recommend in the regulations that the exemption be passed on to political Parties. I am sure that even my friends opposite would not disagree with that. As the member for Gilles mentioned it, I thought I would, too.

One other thing a service club can do, if it wishes to raise money for a charity, is to use the licence number of the charity. The member for Whyalla, who fortunately is just coming back into the Chamber, mentioned this. A service club can, we understand, use the licence number of the charity for which it is raising funds if that charity approves, which no doubt it would, and if the regulations are adhered to.

**Mr Becker:** That's what I said.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Indeed, the member for Hanson did. I express my appreciation of the work done by service clubs in the community, and assure the member for Glenelg that I will take on notice the question he posed regarding the definition of a service club and whether that embraces such organisations as the Surf Life Saving Association, which has had a very big year this year, this being its seventy-fifth anniversary throughout Australia. Obviously, we would also like to look at the Volunteer Coastguard and the Sea Rescue Squadron, which also provide service to the community. I will look at that area when we draft the regulations, but I cannot give any commitment now. I do again pay a tribute to the contribution of the service organisation.

In all the debate, not much has been said about the charities themselves. Of course, the main purport of this Bill is to assist them. I was not aware that the Child and Home Safety Council was not registered under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. I will certainly look at that for the member for Mitcham. Obviously, there are many anomalies that we have to consider. This is a difficult measure to administer, because the ease of the creation of anomalies will be ever present. That is one reason why it has taken a little longer to get to this place than I would have hoped.

I now want to deal with some points raised by the member for Whyalla, because one is very important indeed. If I do not cover all his points, I assure him that we will look at them. Briefly, pinball machines are exempt because they are not regarded as a lottery, but I point out something that the member for Whyalla may have forgotten. Small lotteries, which have a prize of less than \$50, are also not subject to licence fees. Bingo, where gross proceeds are less than \$200 an afternoon or evening, is also exempt from licence fee charges.

**Mr Max Brown:** The pinball operation is very lucrative.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I understand that, and I am prepared to look at it but, overlaying all the honourable

member's questions is the threat of over-regulation, which is extremely difficult. Let me be quite frank with him. I had hoped that in this Bill we would be able to deal with the question of lotteries and social clubs in hotels, because that is quite a serious matter. The member for Whyalla and many members of this House are aware of problems caused in that area. Indeed, the Government has treated it so seriously that at the moment a working party, chaired by the Director of Recreation and Sport, is about to bring down a report containing recommendations on what action is to be taken. I hope that satisfies the member for Whyalla to some extent.

**Mr Max Brown:** I am on your side now.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I must say that I am surprised how often the member for Whyalla is on my side; it is a cause of great delight to me. No doubt that is why I look at things for him—the question of greyhounds at Whyalla, for instance. He always brings me very difficult problems. My officers and I regard the question of social clubs in hotels and proceeds from lotteries going to social and other purposes—

**Mr Max Brown:** I like the 'other purposes' part.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** 'Miscellaneous'—there is a word for the honourable member and the most astounding allegations have been made. I have to say that the working party is almost ready to report, and that it contains not only the work of my officers but that of community welfare officers. Also, we are being helped by the Australian Hotels Association, which has expressed concern about this matter. I hope that the report will be with us soon and that we can legislate, if necessary, in the next session of Parliament. Other than that, I will deal with any more specific matters in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Regulations.'

**Mr SLATER:** The Minister gave an assurance in his second reading explanation that the amendment is not designed to alter the existing fee structure, in that it provides for a clearer statement of fees charged at present. What difficulties have his department or officers had in interpreting the fees charged at present? Why do we need a clearer statement for that amendment?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** This matter and the next are designed particularly to clarify the existing situation. That is all I can say in answer to the honourable member. There are certain sections, as with all complicated sets of regulations, where clarification is often required.

The prescribing of the scale of fees is to set out clearly the fees that can be charged. I gave that assurance in the second reading explanation because I did not want honourable members to think that this was a back-door way of increasing the fees. That may well happen at some time in the future, but I would not want to do that; I want to assure the honourable member, and that is why I gave the assurance, that this is not a back-door way of doing that. In new section 14b (3), once again we are using that provision for clarification. As has been mentioned before, there are some lotteries where the fees are not set out to the scale required. I mentioned bingo and lotteries of less than \$50, and once again this provision is to clarify that question, where it is possible to relate to a specified percentage of the aggregate of all or part of the moneys. Once again, it is a legal qualification.

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister give an estimate of the cost of this legislation? What will be the full financial impact if this clause is passed? I believe that, wherever possible within Government legislation, we should now attempt to provide the Parliament with the financial impact of legis-

lation, and in this case I think it could be quite easily answered.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** All I can give the honourable member is the amount of total fees derived for charitable purposes for 1980-81. That may not specifically answer the question, because the fees derived from all charities may not embrace the charities (once again, it is a question of definition) registered under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act; in other words, the definition for charities is perhaps much wider at present. The licence fees received in 1980-81 for that category totalled \$191 000 and application fees \$11 000.

**Mr SLATER:** New section 14b (4) is the major provision of the Bill, and I listened with interest to the Minister's reply that it is not an easy matter to deal with. I am concerned about the associated dangers, because I foresee that the definition of charitable situations needs to be clearly defined and it can be done only in the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. I presume that it is intended that service clubs, when collecting for charitable purposes outside that Act, involve some element of doubt in the minds of other organisations. We have all mentioned some of them. I mentioned school parent groups and the member for Glenelg has mentioned surf life saving clubs. No-one would deny that these are worthwhile fund-raising groups of people who raise moneys for their specific purpose. They are all voluntary organisations, providing money for a specific purpose in the community interest. The danger I see is the pressure that may be applied to the Government (whichever it may be) to widen the scope of this amendment. No doubt, as time goes by, other organisations will believe, perhaps quite rightly, that they are entitled to the same considerations as those that we have in mind at the moment.

I want to refer back to 1971, when the Lottery and Gaming Act and minor lottery regulations were changed to provide for the wide groups of people mentioned by the Minister (cultural, political, patriotic, and so on). I think we would be less than honest if we did not say that, before that period, every organisation, club, sporting club, and so on, was raising funds and was forced to do so in an illegal way. The law for a number of years turned a blind eye to that situation. I know, from my own experience in those days with sporting clubs, as a participant in years gone by, that we were required to raise money to provide the opportunity for players to compete, and so on. Those times have changed.

There was some criticism by the member for Hanson in regard to licence fees. I believe it was necessary initially to have a standard fee covering all organisations, regardless of background as far as raising money is concerned and for whatever purpose. I agree that we should have looked at this situation perhaps some few years ago. One obvious reason why that was not done is because the moneys raised go into Government revenue, and every Government is reluctant to give a remission on fees that go into revenue. It is a difficult situation, I admit, and there are some dangers associated with it.

I take it that organisations covered under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act will still be required to make an application, and the service clubs will still be required to make an application to the department and submit a return. I take it that they will still be required to do everything that is required under the regulations, and then they will receive a remission of the licence fee.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The answer to the honourable member's last question is, 'Yes'. I think that it is necessary to monitor the whole situation, otherwise it would get out of hand. The honourable member mentioned the question of definition. I think that is the easiest way to describe it, because what, in fact, is a charity, how far do we extend

the exemptions? New subclause (4) allows the Government by regulation to prescribe any organisation, whether it be charitable, religious, political, education, or whatever, in the regulations and to exempt them from licence fees, but it would be less than honest if we brought in this Bill and did not say what we intend to do.

We have said at this stage that charities as defined under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act and service clubs collecting for charity may collect these funds. As I have said, I cannot give any commitment that we will extend the net any further, because the total receipts from small lotteries is just over \$1 000 000 a year and I certainly cannot commit Treasury or Cabinet to further inroads into that. We are already looking at a figure of \$200 000, or a little less. It will not take long to whittle away the rest of that money if we extend the net. It might well be justified that the net be extended, but certainly no commitment can be given at this stage about that. The member for Gilles is experienced enough to realise (and, indeed, has inferred) that we certainly will get applications from a number of areas, and I agree with him, but I must say that no commitment can be given.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SERVICE CLUBS

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr Max Brown:** You want to square off to all those service clubs you attacked on Thursday.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

Leave granted.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I point out to the honourable member for Hanson that his comments must be only a personal explanation.

**Mr BECKER:** I sought leave to make this personal explanation to reply to the over-reaction to my remarks on service clubs and the Lottery and Gaming Act by the members for Fisher, Whyalla and Semaphore. I gave examples of personal experience and mentioned 'some personalities within some service clubs'. All my life I have fought discrimination. I knew that the formation of the Epilepsy Association of South Australia would be a difficult task; I was warned of that by the Premier. I have always believed it is a good healthy Parliament when lively discussions can be held. As honourable members know, I believe very strongly in accountability, whether it be of service clubs, voluntary organisations or the Parliament. However, I honestly believe that the misdemeanours of a few, and the examples I gave, reflect on many thousands of people involved and taint them. However, I want my warning noted.

I do not regret what I have said. I challenge service clubs to come forward and support the Epilepsy Association and to recognise the difficulties we have had in establishing that organisation, particularly so far as community acceptance is concerned. To further highlight that example, it is with regret that I refer to an announcement in the *Advertiser* yesterday, under the heading 'Mall collector dies', which referred to a foundation member of the association who collected money for us in the Rundle Mall. I am told that the article has upset the family tremendously and is full of inaccuracies. It proves the point that ignorance in the community—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is going far beyond what is permitted in a personal explanation.

**Mr BECKER:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I accept that. In finalising the example I gave, the article in the *Advertiser* highlights the ignorance that the association has to face.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have already warned the honourable member.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AMDEL

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Earlier this afternoon the member for Elizabeth asked a question in Parliament as to whether Amdel was about to establish a tailings dam and/or any other nuclear waste storage facilities at Technology Park Adelaide. The Government has been negotiating with Amdel for some time about relocating part of the facility from Thebarton to Technology Park Adelaide. This was first announced in the media in April last year. Since question time I have contacted Amdel. There is no proposal to establish a tailings dam for nuclear waste material or any other nuclear waste storage facility. However, a conceptual plan did detail a tailings disposal area for non-hazardous, non-nuclear material. I seek leave to table that concept plan.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** This disposal area referred to in the plan is a concrete tank for slurry from Amdel's ore-testing facilities. Any proposal for Technology Park Adelaide must have the approval of the Technology Park Adelaide board. As the Minister responsible for that board, I give an undertaking that no slurries containing nuclear or uranium waste will be allowed to be disposed of or stored in that tank or any other facility on that site. I would also like to take this opportunity to deny rumours that a uranium enrichment plant will be built at the site. No such plant will be constructed within the confines of Technology Park Adelaide.

#### NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 June. Page 4540.)

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** As this is a hybrid Bill and, therefore, will of necessity be referred to a select committee, I see no reason to detain the House for any significant time. We in Opposition will note with a great deal of interest the report from the select committee and will operate accordingly in the Committee stage of the Bill.

However, I make two remarks in relation to the Bill as a whole. First, the second reading explanation is not an easy one to follow. I think that, perhaps, it could have been drafted with somewhat more clarity. One has to dig fairly deeply to get to the real nub of the matter, although I must say that there is, of course, a summary at the end of the second reading explanation. I do not know how widely it has been studied in the community since Thursday. I imagine that there would be a large number of people who are somewhat unused to the peculiar jargon we use in here who would be having one or two difficulties with the Bill. I must say, having taken the opportunity to study the Bill, that I understand what it imports, but I think it would be improper for me to say much more without having had the opportunity of the closer examination that a select committee would give it. Secondly, I hope that there will be an opportunity extended to local residents or their representatives to say

what they think about this measure through the machinery of the select committee. I took the opportunity this morning to ring a person who is active and prominent in the local residents association.

That person was not aware that the Bill was to be introduced. A press release was issued jointly by the Government and the A.M.P. Society last year which indicated some but not all of what is incorporated in this Bill. That gentleman was aware of what I was talking about when I referred to M., N. and P. areas and the buffer zone, but he was not aware of the proposal for the change of procedure in relation to the currently zoned R1 area adjacent to the marina. As far as he was concerned, that matter had not previously been canvassed with local residents.

So, to the extent that the Government might have been aware that this was a hybrid Bill, perhaps it has a defence that there was no need for a great deal of consultation prior to its introduction because the select committee procedure will enable that proper consultation to take place, but I wonder whether the Government was aware that it was dealing with a hybrid Bill until the Speaker indicated that that was the case, because I know from the work that was set down for us to do that we were to have completed this debate today, but, of course, that will not now be possible. With those few remarks, I indicate that the Opposition is quite happy to support the Bill through the second reading to enable it to go to a select committee.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** I am amazed to hear the shadow Minister's comments. I was at the annual general meeting some weeks ago, at which a representative from the North Haven Residents Association put the case and explained exactly what was going on. I will be very interested, and I will try to find out who is the representative of the residents association. I was Chairman of that association for some years, my wife was a member for many years, and I know all the members, so I am amazed at that. However, that is politics! I live at North Haven and know the area well; indeed, I was familiar with the area before it was developed. This is the third Bill that has been introduced relating to North Haven: the first, the indenture, was introduced in 1972; in 1979, there was a Bill to set up a trust; and now we have this amending Bill. The development is remarkable, and this Bill will help keep the nature of that development much more amenable to the people who live there.

As anyone who is familiar with the area would know, plans for an area to be developed north of Victoria Road were laid aside. Some 402 houses were to be built in the areas marked M., N. and P. Luckily for anyone who might eventually have moved into that area, that land will not now be built on. I do not know whether the reason for its withdrawal is purely that, for financial reasons, people are finding it more difficult to buy land and to build. However, that plan has been withdrawn, and that is a good thing.

Industry in the area is not generally noted for its consideration to residents, and even in the North Haven development there are problems because of the location of industry at short distances from houses. This Bill is a step in the right direction. In other areas, such as Osborne and Largs North, there are housing developments across the road from very heavy industry, which causes constant problems to residents because of noise from traffic, production and round-the-clock operations. This Bill is a good move. Houses will not now be built adjacent to what is clearly an industrial development area. That land will be part of the Department of Marine and Harbors development area to the north of Victoria Road, around the river and back to Port Adelaide.

I am not sure what the 400 m protection zone involves. That land will not provide a 400 m clear zone. The width



of Victoria Road and the 30 m buffer strip certainly will not provide 400 m of land, unless any development on the Department of Marine and Harbors land allows another area between. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, made the point that we in this State are lucky to have industrial land adjacent to the main channel and that it is important to keep that area as clear as possible. It is also important to be careful in siting industries in those locations. First, they must be conducive to the port generally, and also the nuisance value to people who live in the area should be kept to a minimum. I am sure that all of these things will be kept in mind, especially in the light of what I have said previously.

The second reading explanation referred to the buffer road and Victoria Road, but I am not sure what will be developed there. I must admit that I have never fully read the original indenture, but I believe that the A.M.P. Society had full rights over the development of industry on LeFevre Peninsula generally. I believe that that is an anomaly: I do not believe that anyone should be given that power of veto, but I understand that that power will be removed by the Bill.

The Minister also stated that the interests of the residents of North Haven have been protected. I take some issue with that, and I am sure that the Minister is well aware that I have commented many times that the interests of the residents of North Haven and adjacent areas are not being protected. I am not saying that this Bill will not protect them, because I believe it will. However, for example, the Taperoo Life Saving Club has been forced to move, and there has been a build-up of seaweed and pollution generally. I am still trying to solve that problem. The Minister's statement does not bear out the facts. I say that clearly the residents have not been protected.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is very hard on surf lifesavers.

**Mr PETERSON:** Surf lifesavers have found themselves in a particularly bad situation and are battling against all odds. It is ironic that we are debating this Bill after having debated the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill in relation to collections for charitable purposes, during which debate the member for Glenelg said that this sort of group should be protected. It is to be hoped that the interests of such people will be protected, and perhaps a new facility on the other beach may be provided.

**Mr Mathwin:** A lot of people use that other beach now.

**Mr PETERSON:** The North Haven beach is used a lot, but let us hope that the consideration reflected in the Bill may be put into effect. I refer to a sad aspect of this legislation: one school site will be lost. I do not believe that there is anyone in this State who is not sad to see a school site put at risk. Who knows—we may need more schools in the future. The second reading explanation referred to the population mix. I know the situation in regard to enrolments in other high schools, but it is still sad to see the site go.

However, the good thing is that this area will provide additional recreation areas. As in any developing area, sporting clubs are being formed, but they do not have facilities and grounds, and it is to be hoped that the Minister of Environment and Planning will look kindly upon requests from those groups in regard to facilities, because they need support. They are part of the North Haven project as a whole, and I hope that any approach they make for assistance is looked upon kindly.

The second reading explanation referred to the development of the harbor, and there have been problems in that

regard. Because I live in the area, I know that the sides of the harbor and the ramp have been washed away at times. Problems were experienced and a lot of additional expense was incurred in the development of the harbor. But it is a remarkable harbor now; perhaps the only detraction is the fact that people cannot fish within the harbor, although I am pleased to say that today I have ascertained that people can fish from the breakwater as long as it is from the outside, so perhaps that is a good thing.

The situation concerning the changing of the zones because of market demand has been commented upon; there has been a down-turn in the demand for building sites. The final consideration for the areas M., N. and P. involves a sum of \$1 000 000, but I notice that a further figure is mentioned involving a greater amount.

The first of the 11 points in the summary of the deed refers to the fact that areas M., N. and P. will be deleted. As I have said, I believe that that is a good thing and will be appreciated by everyone who lives in the area. Point 2 concerns the Minister's not selling or transferring the land, and perhaps the Minister will clarify that in Committee. Point 3 refers to freeing the society from the obligation to pay the Minister for that land, which is another matter that I would like cleared up. Does that include the original amount that the A.M.P. paid for the land, and were there any charges made on A.M.P. by the Government? With regard to the landscaped buffer strip, that is well under construction and point 5 concerns the liability for correction of faults.

Point 6 concerns the rights of the A.M.P. Society to dictate any other development on LeFevre Peninsula, a provision that will be removed, and that is a good thing. Point 7 concerns the three hectares of land which were to be used for a school but which will now be used for recreational purposes. I hope that the Government as a whole, its Department of Recreation and Sport and Department of Environment and Planning and all the Ministers concerned will make sure that the area is properly used for recreation. Point 8 refers to a reduction in residential land. As I have said, there are 400-odd sites that will not be included if land M., N. and P. is removed.

Point 9 refers to changing of zoning. As I said earlier, with the Manager of the North Haven Trust and representatives of the Marine and Harbors Department, I attended the annual general meeting of the North Haven Residents Association and I thought a fairly complete report was given. As it was mentioned that the Bill was to come before Parliament during the next session, I am surprised that they were not aware of it. From my own experience with the trust, as a member of Parliament, as Chairman of the Residents Association and as a citizen, I never at any stage encountered any difficulty in obtaining assistance from the trust. I am surprised that such should be insinuated now. Light industrial use is referred to, but officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors to whom I have spoken about this matter have assured me that the department will be very particular about what type of development is allowed in the area, which is very close to residential areas, and also that the department will do its utmost to ensure that any nuisance is minimal.

Point 10 refers to rezoning within the area itself. The point was well made concerning zoning of the area west of Lady Gowrie Drive. It has always been known that there would be commercial development in that area, and it has also been suggested that there would be hotels, shopping areas and ship chandleries and whatever else goes into that sort of development. The issue of townhouse development

has been raised by residents on several occasions, but as far as I am aware that matter has now been settled; it has definitely been settled with the residents association and the individual residents concerned. Perhaps the terminology concerning R1 and R2 caused confusion, but residents are now aware of the facts. As a matter of fact, the matter was raised in one of the bi-monthly newsletters of the residents association. Point 11 concerns the setting out of the method of payment of the principal sum of \$1 225 000. This concerns the point I made earlier, concerning the difference between the sum of \$1 000 000 mentioned before and the sum of \$1 225 000.

I do not see any great difficulty with this Bill. I believe that it is going to a select committee because of the money involved, and I simply want to reinforce the comments that I made concerning the interests of the North Haven development generally, and the fact that development in the M., N. and P. areas should be limited to very low nuisance-value industry so that the situation prevalent in other areas of the peninsula is not repeated because of heavy industries being placed adjacent to residential areas. In regard to the beach at Taperoo, I am still hopeful that we will get some remedial action there concerning the seaweed and the low-lying areas created by the construction of the southern breakwater which must have been obvious before it was built.

**Mr Mathwin:** If you represent an area with a sea coast you are in trouble.

**Mr PETERSON:** But you do not get much seaweed at Glenelg. Also, the Minister, through the North Haven Trust, should ensure that everyone is made well aware of the regulations concerning use of land for recreation purposes. There is a belief at large that fishing is not allowed from the breakwater, so in the interests of residents of the area they should be told what they can or cannot do. With those remarks, I let the Bill go to the select committee.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** There are a couple of matters I want to refer to at this stage. The first is in regard to the second reading explanation and the matter raised by the member for Baudin about the complexity of that explanation. As the honourable member would appreciate, the indenture itself is complex, but I must admit that I have found the second reading explanation fairly easy to understand, although some matters relate to the indenture itself, and some of those complexities are carried through. I, too, like the member for Semaphore, was somewhat concerned to hear that there was some expression of disappointment on the part of the North Haven Residents Association.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** No, it was a statement of fact.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** If it was a statement of fact, I am even more concerned, because I was certainly of the opinion that there had been consultation. I am aware, and as the member for Semaphore has said, there has been consultation, and the fact that the Bill will now go to a select committee will provide a remedy for any persons who feel that they need more information or that they should make any further contribution.

I am very much aware of the member for Semaphore's interest in the North Haven project and the interest of the nearby residents. I can assure the House and the member for Semaphore's constituents that the honourable member has contacted me frequently on a number of matters, many of which he has raised in the House this afternoon. It is not my intention to refer to those approaches now because I will have the opportunity to do so when the report is

brought down at a later time. However, I am aware of a number of matters that need to be rectified in regard to the low-lying beach areas adjacent to North Haven itself. It has been a long time now since I had the opportunity with the member for Semaphore to visit the area. There have been a number of discussions involving the Port Adelaide council, officers of the Coast Protection Board and members of the trust themselves in an attempt to overcome that problem.

I am confident that we are reaching a stage where we will be able to rectify, at least to a certain extent, the problem to which the member for Semaphore has referred. In regard to the member for Baudin's comments about whether or not the Government recognised that this was a hybrid Bill, I must admit that I was not of that opinion until it was pointed out that it should go before a select committee, and I still find it difficult to accept that that is the case. The advice I was given was that that was not the case, but in any case—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I take it—

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am not reflecting on the Chair in any way, shape or form, Sir. We accept the fact that this is a hybrid Bill that must go before a select committee, and on that basis I will say no more other than that I look forward to any involvement anyone might wish to have through the select committee and to the committee's bringing down a report at a later date.

Bill read a second time and referred to a select committee consisting of Messrs Hopgood, Oswald, Peterson, Randall, and Wotton; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 22 June.

#### FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 June. Page 4547.)

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** The Opposition supports this Bill, but I wish to raise some concern about the need as I see it to bring this matter before the House at this time. The measure proposes to prohibit the showing of non-classified films in motel rooms through television receivers, and that is a matter on which the Opposition does not wish to take issue with the Government. However, I notice that in another place the Attorney-General, when explaining the need for this legislation, said:

It is correct to say that this problem was principally drawn to the Government's attention in relation to the access of unattended children in a motel room to a pornographic movie on a television channel.

I presume that by the words 'on a television channel' he means that a non-classified video tape was being shown through the television receiver, not a programmed film on one of the four television channels which operate in this State. However, I ask whether this legislation results from one complaint only, as could be inferred from the Attorney's statement in another place, and, if it does, I wonder whether the Attorney-General indeed sought other alternatives to overcome this problem, because I understand that only one motel in South Australia provides this facility for its patrons, and I think that is a motel in Whyalla. I would have thought that this would be a suitable situation for the responsible Minister to telephone the proprietor of the motel, visit him or ask him to come to Adelaide to see him and try to work out some alternative arrangement with that person.

I recall a situation with respect to the advertising of massage parlours in the daily papers of this State. In that case the then Attorney-General I think telephoned the editors

of those newspapers and followed that up with letters, and an agreement was reached that those newspapers would no longer publish advertisements advertising that activity, in the overall interests of the community. I would have thought that this was another case in which similar action could achieve the same result, thereby not requiring the expense and the time of Parliament to take this action. I think most proprietors of accommodation establishments of this nature are reasonable and responsible people and would abide by a gentleman's agreement with the Government.

I say this because of an experience I had in my own district this week in talking to several persons who sell video tapes. They said that following the publicity that had been given to the introduction of this measure in Parliament by the Attorney-General their sales of this product had risen markedly. In fact, one proprietor told me that he did not stock these non-classified films at all because he did not believe that there was any substantial market for them but that, in the days after this matter had been introduced in Parliament and received substantial publicity, particularly in the weekend press, his premises were deluged by people wanting to buy these video tapes. He went out and purchased a number of them, and now he has them on public display in his premises, and he is selling many of them. I would have thought that this was just another case of where drawing the public's attention to the availability of this material in such a way would have really little redeeming value in the overall state of affairs in our community and in my view it is an irresponsible use of the Parliament.

I refer to another instance where I believe there has been a great deal of co-operation among Ministers, the Public Service, the press and people in the community at large, and that is in the problems associated with the inhalation of glue and other products by young people, where there has been a general agreement that this matter will not be given glaring publicity because that causes more harm than good. It is indeed with some disappointment that we see the Government so eager to bring down legislation and to give that legislation considerable publicity when it would appear from the words of the Minister that there has been only one complaint to him. It is my view that this matter could have been settled by other more satisfactory means. The Opposition supports this Bill.

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

### CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 9 June. Page 4456.)

**Mr ABBOTT (Spence):** The Opposition supports this Bill. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act provides for the appointment of a Children's Court Advisory Committee whose functions are to:

- (a) Monitor and evaluate the administration of the Act;
- (b) Cause such data and statistics in relation to proceedings before the Children's Court to be collected as it thinks fit, or as the Attorney-General may direct;
- (c) Perform any other functions prescribed by the Act; and
- (d) Perform such other functions as the Governor may, by proclamation, assign to the advisory committee.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister points out that the Bill contains sundry amendments that have arisen largely as a result of the Children's Court Advisory Committee's continuing role as monitor of the administration and operation of the Act. Section 85 of the principal Act refers to reports and provides:

(1) The Advisory Committee shall, not later than the thirty-first day of October in each year, report to the Attorney-General on the administration and operation of this Act during the previous financial year.

(2) The Advisory Committee shall investigate and report to the Attorney-General on any matter pertaining to this Act that has been referred to the Advisory Committee by the Attorney-General for investigation and report.

(3) The Attorney-General shall cause a copy of every report submitted to him under subsection (1) of this section to be laid before each House of Parliament as soon as practicable after his receipt thereof.

It is on this matter that I support the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in another place when he referred to there being no discussion on the need for these amendments in the annual report of the Children's Court Advisory Committee for the year ended 30 June 1981. The committee recommended that a number of amendments should be made to the Act and regulations, but it gave no details other than to say that they should be made to clarify the intentions of the original Act and to overcome problems that have arisen in its operation.

The report is, in fact, very brief, but it does not spell out what particular problems have arisen in the operations that need to be overcome. However, it is pleasing to note that the Attorney-General has given an undertaking to refer the Opposition's observations to the Chairman of that committee for consideration in the context of the preparation of the 1982 report, and to explore the possibility of a report containing more information than did that 1981 report.

On the last occasion that the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act was amended, which I think was in 1980, the principal object of that Bill was to provide for a child who had defaulted in paying a fine with the option of spending a number of hours participating in a work programme arranged by the Director-General of Community Welfare in lieu of a period of detention in a training centre; in other words, a system of community work orders. As that was in line with Labor Party policy, we gave our full support to it.

However, no mention of its success or otherwise has been made by the advisory committee to the Attorney-General's Department or, for that matter, to the Department for Community Welfare. It is that kind of information that I and my colleagues would like to see so that we can gauge how successfully those proposals are operating. Clause 7 of this Bill which enables a child who is remanded in custody in a remote country area to be detained in a police prison, police station or lock-up, was the Opposition's major concern. We believe it is totally wrong for a juvenile to be locked up with any adult person. We opposed it in 1980 and we had intended to oppose it again. However, the Attorney-General saw fit to further amend the clause, which is now acceptable to the Opposition.

I realise that there are problems in remote country areas and that there are difficulties associated with detaining juveniles in such places. However, it seems that all steps will be taken to ensure that adults and juveniles are not locked up together and that children will be transferred to proper children's institutions at the earliest opportunity.

It is also interesting to note some of the statistical tables in the advisory committee's annual report. I just refer to table 11a, a table of country children's courts statistics for the 12 months ended 31 December 1980, excluding minor traffic offences. If we look at some of the townships that serve the remote areas of the State, we see that the figures for juvenile offenders with court appearances are very much higher compared to other country centres. Ceduna, for example, had 98 juvenile court appearances, Oodnadatta 89, Port Augusta 126, Port Lincoln 97, Whyalla 214, and Murray Bridge 107.

If we compare those figures to those for places like Clare with 14, Berri 31, Kimba 3, Millicent 27, Pinnaroo 1, Victor Harbor 11 and Renmark with 30, and the many other places that could be quoted, these figures seem to indicate that in those northern townships of South Australia a great percentage of the juveniles would be young Aborigines. A system of bush sentences for young Aboriginal offenders was introduced some two years ago by the Department for Community Welfare but, again, we have no idea of the success or otherwise of that scheme.

It may be working very well, and it may not be. We just do not know. But, that is the reason why I take this opportunity to refer to those reports. I sincerely believe that they should contain some of that detail as comment on those projects so that we can gauge their effectiveness. As I mentioned at the outset, the Opposition supports this Bill. Our concern was in relation to clause 7, which has now been amended to our satisfaction.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Application of this Division.'

**Mr ABBOTT:** I would like to ask the Minister a question in relation to clause 3, which excludes parking offences from the provision of the Act that requires certain offences to go through the screening panel processes. Such offences, like other traffic offences, will therefore be dealt with by the Children's Court as a matter of course and will not be able to be dealt with by a children's aid panel. I do not know whether the Minister would be aware of just how many of those parking offences were handled by those aid panels.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** We do not have that statistic in the Chamber, but I will undertake to provide it if it is readily available. I was under the impression that it was a very small number but I could be wrong.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Powers of Court upon remand.'

**Mr ABBOTT:** Proposed new Section 4.4 (5) states:

Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (4), a child who has been remanded in custody for trial in a place that is outside the prescribed area may, during the course of the trial and while awaiting sentence, be detained—

I wonder whether the Minister could inform me of that prescribed area. I have searched through the principal Act for that detail and am unable to find that, or to relate it anywhere.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The prescribed area is 40 km from the Adelaide G.P.O.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 June. Page 4548.)

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** The Opposition will support this Bill through the second reading debate and move some amendments. If they are not agreed to, we will oppose the measure. The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act provides very fundamental assistance to those people who can only be regarded as among that group of the most unfortunate in our community to have fallen victims of criminal and anti-social behaviour. In some small way, this law tries to give some monetary compensation to those persons. I think it is generally agreed that no monetary compensation can

adequately heal those who are wounded in this way. However, this is some measure of compensation to those persons.

The reasons given in the second reading explanation do not tally with the substance of the Bill and that is of great concern to the Opposition. This point has been raised in detail in another place by the Hon. Mr Sumner and it would appear very clearly that there is a diminution of rights that are currently enjoyed by such persons who avail themselves of the benefits of the current law. That is of great concern, I am sure, not only to the Opposition but to the community at large.

Indeed, the problems associated with criminal behaviour in our community were an election issue prior to the 1979 general election in this State. This was a matter on which the current Government sought from the people a mandate to take action to first diminish the level of criminal activity in our community and also to provide further rights to those persons who were harmed in some way by such behaviour.

We see the rather startling situation where there has been an overall increase in crime in our community at proportions that are not acceptable to any responsible person. Regardless of the number of attempts by this Government, that level of crime continues to increase. Rather than extend the benefits of Acts such as the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, the Government has decided to decrease those benefits in a very real and startling way.

Fortunately, this measure comes to us in an amended form, because one of the original proposals was to restrict very markedly those who could classify themselves as victims of criminal behaviour. That, fortunately, has been attended to in another place, but there still are other fundamental problems with the legislation and I will refer to those in the Committee stage.

However, it is important to point out to the House that a comprehensive inquiry has been conducted in recent years in this State under the commission of the previous Government and under the commission of the present Government into the working of the current law in this area. That report brought down a considerable number of recommendations as to how the law could be improved. It appears that there is very little relationship, if any, between those recommendations by that committee, known commonly as the Grabosky Committee, and the legislation currently before us.

It would appear that the amendments we have before us are contrary to the spirit of that report. I will be interested to see the Minister table or read into *Hansard* the comments that have been made about this measure by such eminent persons as Mr Ray Whitrod, who has a long-time interest and is the guiding light in an organisation that concerns itself with problems of the victims or crime. I find it hard to believe that he and his association would support this measure. I may be wrong, and that could be clarified if the Minister would table this correspondence or any comments that the Government has received, as I presume it has, from Mr Whitrod.

The Attorney-General, in another place, detailed some action that has been taken on some of the recommendations of the Grabosky report. However, it would appear, first, that there has been little overall public participation in the work of that committee. Indeed, it was not made public until some months after it had been confirmed that that committee had been established. Further, the recommendations that have not been acted on are, in my view, some of the most important recommendations of that committee.

It would seem that this measure is, at best, an *ad hoc* attempt to save the revenue of the State and, indeed, to take a quite pernicious approach to the problems obviously confronted by Crown Law officers with very few of some of those ill-advised claims against the Crown in criminal

injuries compensation matters. To me, to deny what may be many genuine claims by legislation of this nature, and to exclude with a heavy hand what may be described as bogus claims, is the wrong way of approaching this matter.

This measure smacks of an approach to preserve the revenue of the State as against properly compensating victims who have legitimate claims against the State and who have unsuccessfully tried to recover that compensation from the perpetrators of those crimes. I give notice that the Opposition will support this matter to the second reading stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr CRAFTER: I move:

Page 1, lines 17 to 24—Leave out all words in these lines.

This amendment seeks to remove the attempt by the Government to restrict the current definition of 'offence'. I think it is important to read the current definition of 'offence', which states:

'offence' means any offence, whether indictable or not, committed by one or more persons, and includes conduct on the part of any person—

- (a) that would constitute an offence but for his age, or the existence of a defence of—
  - (i) insanity;
  - (ii) automatism;
  - (iii) duress; or
  - (iv) drunkenness; or
- (b) that would constitute rape, but for lack of *mens rea*:

The proposal in the measure opposed by the Opposition is a definition of 'offence' which states:

'offence' means an offence, whether indictable or not, committed by one or more persons and includes conduct on the part of a person that would constitute an offence if it were not for his age, or the existence of a defence of insanity:

That is a clear example of a diminution of rights of victims of crimes. Indeed, how very genuine claims for compensation will be eliminated if this measure passes has been vividly described in debate in the other place. In some of the most horrific and deserving of cases we will find that no right to compensation, small as it is, will be provided. The Attorney argued in the other place, I think in a very shabby fashion, that this measure will correct abuses. However, he gave little evidence that there had been substantial abuse of the Act for such a major revision of victims rights. He produced some legal argument, which he later qualified, as to the existence of the defence at law of drunkenness, and also on the difficulties of proving the existence of *mens rea* in rape cases.

He could produce little evidence, when I would have thought that there would need to be substantial evidence adduced by the Attorney-General to justify the measure before us. Surely it is for the courts, which are in the best position, to decide whether there is a bogus claim or that a claim is not justified at law rather than for us in this institution to make such a sweeping assertion and to provide for it legislatively, or for the Attorney-General to act on the advice of his officers who, after all, are not disinterested persons in this matter.

Further, as I understand this measure, it was not a recommendation of the Grabosky Committee and its subsequent report. I think there was flimsy evidence indeed to justify this drastic measure. I believe that the safest way to approach this matter is to leave the *status quo*.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government will oppose this amendment. Clause 3 gives the definition of 'offence'. Statutorily there is the defence of age where a person is under age or pleading insanity. These are acceptable defences. The questions of duress, automatism, drunkenness, or rape, but for lack of *mens rea*, are matters, which, in this case,

have to be assessed by the jury. The Attorney-General believes it is more appropriate (and I believe he is correct in this) to establish this clause within the terms of present legal procedures.

In fact, in the rape case to which the honourable member referred, an agreement was reached. The Attorney-General believes that it is inappropriate for agreements to be reached in that way and that the alteration of the legislation to exclude automatism, duress, drunkenness and rape for lack of *mens rea*, is more appropriate when addressing this problem, that is, keeping it within the bounds of existing legal procedures.

Mr CRAFTER: I must admit that I do not understand all of what the Minister has just told the Committee. However, I do not intend to pursue that point *ad nauseam*. It is beholden upon the Minister to let the people of this State know whether the Government will try to implement some of the other recommendations outlined in the committee report to which I referred that may go some way to helping people who will be denied compensation if this measure passes.

I refer to one practical area, the provision of funeral expenses. This matter was brought to the attention of the other place, and it was stated there that, in some instances that have received notoriety in this State in recent years, the relatives of the victim, particularly in the case of a murder victim, had to borrow money to pay for the funeral expenses. Will the Minister say whether this Bill is an *ad hoc* plugging up of what the Government sees as some problem with the legislation? If so, obviously, there will be a comprehensive review in the pipeline, and that may be of some assistance to those who, in the interim, will be denied compensation.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I believe that that is an unfair comment. The honourable member is probably echoing similar statements made by the lead speaker in the other place. I refer to the Grabosky recommendations and the Committee of Inquiry on Victims of Crime. A report submitted to the Attorney-General some time ago assessed the recommendations that had been made to 26 November 1981.

It was wrong for the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House to suggest that only one of the 64 recommendations had been implemented. I think from memory, as I read his address, he referred to that recommendation as the District Court recommendation, where the cases were generally to be heard in the District Court unless they were submitted to the court in which the case in question was currently being heard. In actual fact, as at 26 November 1981, 24 recommendations had been implemented; five had been partially implemented; 13 were under consideration or were about to be adopted; seven had resulted in representations to appropriate outside bodies; seven had not been adopted after due consideration by relevant departments or authorities; five were pending, subject to further consideration by Cabinet; and five other recommendations had not been responded to.

So it is wrong to suggest that this is an *ad hoc* piece of legislation. I simply ask the honourable member to consider that the Attorney-General has sought a further report, and I have no doubt that other issues will be brought before Cabinet in the next session of Parliament. I cannot give precise details, but I assure the honourable member that we are not dealing with things piecemeal and that the Attorney-General is well aware of the matters to be brought before the House in the future.

Mr CRAFTER: I want to clarify the statement, as I read it, of the Leader in another place, which was that this measure contains only one recommendation of the committee. The Attorney outlined what action, if any, is being

taken on a number of those 60-odd recommendations and, as I said in the second reading stage, a large number of the recommendations which I consider to be very important have yet to be acted upon. Cabinet has yet to reject or recommend them.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Obviously, I misunderstood one part of the Leader's statement in another place, but I point out that he said that hardly any of the 64 recommendations had so far been implemented. In that, he was wrong.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Proof and evidence.'

**Mr CRAFTER:** The Opposition wishes once again to revert to the current law, and opposes this clause, which would mean that this clause would retain a civil onus of proof, that is, the balance of probabilities. Onus of proof in criminal injuries compensation matters rather than, as the Government proposes, to raise in certain circumstances, in important circumstances, the onus of proof to that which applies in a criminal court of beyond reasonable doubt.

In our view, the effect of this is to clearly provide a further hindrance to victims of crime and it will once again eliminate the numbers of people in the community who are victims of crime and who seek to receive some compensation in this way. Further, it results in what can only be described as a hotch-potch situation for the courts, legal advisers, and victims of crime, to wend their way through in order to provide some justice and compensation to those people who have already suffered, let alone having to go through difficult onuses of proof and challenges to the real meaning of law, which I contend will result if the Government's measures win the day. I oppose the Government's proposal and ask the Committee to support the *status quo* with respect to the onus of proof.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Government opposes this suggestion, on the basis that it does not think it is unfair for the victim of crime to establish that there is a causal effect between the committing of the crime and the nature of the offence that he claims has been sustained. It is quite possible that a victim could allege that a number of things had occurred as a result of the crime which would have to be more precisely established in the eyes of the court, and with this Government amendment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** As I indicated in my second reading speech, this matter has come out of Committee in a form which is unacceptable to the Opposition, and, therefore, I give notice that the Opposition intends to oppose the third reading. In our view, the provisions express a substantial diminution of rights of victims of crime: they are persons who were promised by the Government greater benefits, not less, prior to the last election. We have seen that statistics clearly show that there is an increasing number of victims of crime in our community, regardless of actions taken by the Government and promises made. This in an increasing and continuing problem in our community. The problem is one of widespread concern, and we, as a responsible Opposition, can in no way associate ourselves with the unbelievable situation of a diminution of existing rights for those people within our community for whom we have a fundamental responsibility.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis,

Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter (teller), Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Chapman, Olsen, and Wotton.  
Noes—Messrs Corcoran, McRae, and O'Neill.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus passed.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

## FISHERIES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendment No. 2 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

## JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in this adjournment debate, because I have one or two matters to bring to the attention of the House. I refer to the problems experienced by a number of my constituents, and first I refer to those who operate road trains in the northern part of South Australia. For some time there appear to have been great discrepancies in the existing law. I understand that people operating vehicles in the Northern Territory and Queensland are given far more tolerance than are the people operating these vehicles in South Australia. I have constituents operating basically out of Oodnadatta who want to transport cattle to the nearest railhead, that now being Marree, or across to Marla Bore, or across to the railhead just out of Coober Pedy. However, they are placed at a great disadvantage because they are not allowed to operate the same type of equipment as are those who operate in the Northern Territory and Queensland; therefore they are somewhat discriminated against. Their vehicles are of the highest quality, and anyone of any common sense would agree that they should not be breaking any law and that we should be assisting them to get on with this job.

Considerable numbers of stock are being transported either by interstate firms or are going out of South Australia. I cannot understand the attitude of those persons within the Highways Department responsible for the existing circumstances. These problems are well known to the appropriate people in the Highways Department, and, I call upon the Minister of Transport to take the necessary action and to issue the necessary directions to have this discrimination eliminated once and for all. If the Road Traffic Board is causing the problem, then I suggest to the Minister that if he has not got the appropriate authority he should ask this Parliament to amend the legislation.

For a long time I have had great difficulty making representations to certain people on the Road Traffic Board

on behalf of my constituents. I suggest that the Minister take the appropriate action to abolish the Road Traffic Board and replace it with a body more in line with what is required in this State. I make no apology for having said that, because it appears to me that certain people have an in-built dislike for many people involved in the road trucking industry. Although this Government has done many things for people in the road haulage industry, a number of things in this area still need to be done.

However, there appear to be some people administering these areas who really go out of their way to make life difficult. I cannot understand why. We have to shift the goods around the State, and it is essential that our carriers are in a position to operate economically. Anyone who has to operate vehicles over these rugged northern roads would know what I am talking about.

The second matter concerns a constituent of mine who was put to great inconvenience. He bought a Leyland Mastiff truck with a V8 motor, and was fitted with 10 x 00.20 tyres. When he purchased it, he was advised that the gross combination was 13 600 kilograms. However, he was advised by the Highways Department some time later that he was allowed to carry only 11 710 kilograms. This greatly upset my constituent and, to put it mildly, he was far from impressed. I found the situation most difficult to understand, so I approached the Minister. I understand that the authorities concerned had been in contact with my constituent, because he would have been placed in the situation where it would not have been economical for him to cart the goods for his small business in Peterborough.

I want to highlight the problems for people in the haulage industry. I cannot understand, Mr Speaker, how these mistakes are made. I believe that more care should be taken because the loss incurred on the amount which my constituent would have been allowed to carry was considerable, and when he came to see me he wondered about what the sense of spending a lot of money for a large truck if he was allowed to put only a few sugar bags on it. That may be overstating the case, but I believe that that has happened in other areas.

I want to speak briefly about a matter which I raised earlier today, that is, the need to have the Highways Department programme slightly altered for the coming financial year. I suppose that, if the Minister of Transport had another \$30 000 000 to \$40 000 000 to spend on road construction in South Australia, most of the problems that I bring along to him would be overcome.

**Mr Slater:** He had better have a chat with his Federal colleagues.

**Mr GUNN:** I am coming to that. In my electorate a number of roads need urgent upgrading. One of the problems I have with the Leigh Creek road is that, if the Whitlam Government had not altered the formula, the amount of funds made available for rural arterial roads, the road would have been sealed. Between 1973 and 1976, Mr Jones and Mr Whitlam, in their wisdom, virtually eliminated funds for rural arterial roads. No doubt, Mr Speaker, in the district of Light, which you represent so well, some of the problems you experience, like those I experience, would not be there, because those roads would have been sealed.

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I would like to return to a subject with which I dealt last week, which is the plight of housing for the mentally disturbed in our community. Last week I related some details of a case concerning a constituent of mine, a lady I referred to as Mrs 'C', a 76-year-old lady of South Plympton, and how her plight had been brought to my attention by a neighbor who had complained several times previously. On this occasion he complained again after a Radio Rentals man had attempted to deliver a

refrigerator to Mrs 'C' and had then come in and used his phone to ring the depot to say that it would have taken two hours to clean a space to put the refrigerator in the kitchen and that he was not going to do it. That sparked this other constituent to come and see me again.

I mentioned last week that in this case the lady was a nuisance to the neighbours; that she had a bizarre collection of rubbish piled up to the ceiling creating a fire hazard; that there were corpses of cats littering the yard, because, when her large brood of cats died, she left them where they had died. Also, I related how, in 1977, when her husband collapsed in the yard with a stroke, he received similar treatment, being left where he fell; he died in hospital shortly afterwards.

Eventually the Housing Trust, which is not set up for this sort of thing, traced the sons of this tenant. It was hard put to persuade them to act, as they had disowned their mother long ago. I had a whole series of discussions with various agencies, and at one time had a meeting, involving about half a dozen agencies, in my electorate office. Subsequently, the Marion council put a health order on the house. A Glenside social worker signed a detention order, so the lady was taken to Glenside Hospital for examination. She was to go before the guardianship board, but that board has since said she is sane, which has presented a few difficulties which may need to be resolved.

Meanwhile, the R.S.P.C.A. went into the premises to clean up the problem with the animals, and the Housing Trust attempted to clean up the rubbish. There was confusion as to what could be done with the lady's property. How do you distinguish mementoes from rubbish? Who has the right to touch somebody else's property and throw a lot of it away? The amount thrown away amounted literally to tonnes. I think 15 tonnes of material had to be destroyed. For the benefit of members, I would like to read from some notes I made after I went through the premises shortly after the lady was removed.

There was a small shed outside [which I made brief reference to last week] which contained a large number of birds cramped in small cages. One small budgie cage contained seven budgies; two others each contained two pigeons in battered condition—a pair of fan tails with disintegrating tails, and another exotic pair with their leg ruffs disintegrating. A round 2 ft high cockatoo cage contained three pigeons perched tightly together and badly battered—one had no neck feathers at all, his neck having been plucked bare. All in all, there were 20 or more birds cramped in this small tin shed, as well as a lot of junk which made it impossible to move in the shed, which also held several cats. (Another overcrowded budgie cage, with loose budgie perched on top, was in the back porch along with a cage cramped with two sick-looking fantail pigeons.) A few clothes were draped across a short clothes line, without pegs. An unused wringer-type washing machine dripped oil in the backyard, but was apparently unused.

The outdoor toilet was so cramped with rubbish as to prevent anyone being on the seat without their legs and knees sticking out the door, visible to neighbours. Certainly the door could not be closed, in those circumstances. Entry onto the back porch was difficult—the door only opened about 15 in because of materials piled behind it, consisting of crushed cartons, clothing, piled-up furniture and bird cages. Entry into the kitchen was also very difficult, as one had to squeeze past cartons obstructing the doorway. The only 'clear' space [and I use the word 'clear' advisedly] on the kitchen floor on which one could stand was an area about 4 ft long and 15 in wide covered with newspaper scraps soaked in cat urine and cat faeces. The rest of the kitchen was nauseatingly filled with margarine containers, decaying food, clothing and other rubbish heaped up to table-top level. There was an electric stove, but there was no indication of how anyone could get near it to use it. The kitchen walls and ceiling were black, suggesting a fire had occurred at some time, and there was a space on the wall above the sink (which was concealed by rubbish) suggesting that a sink heater had been ripped off it. There was no sign of a refrigerator for her food and one glance at the kitchen made it clear why the Radio Rentals man had refused to deliver one on 11 February.

The rest of the house, except for a square metre or so of clear floor space by the front door so it could be opened, was a metre or two deep in clothing, cartons and junk. This included the small hallway and the bathroom, and there was no sign of anywhere to

sleep. Clambering over materials piled up in the hallway, and stooping to get through the doorway, I could just peer into the bathroom. Its floor was piled up with rubbish to the level of the bath, with some junk in the bath which was black inside and did not look to have been used for years. There was no sign of soap or towels. Both bedrooms were piled high with clothing and cartons, as was the lounge which included an air cooler almost hidden by rubbish, several apparently non-working black and white T.V. sets, and a pianola with a little clear space near it, presumably so it could be played. In the piles of junk were several digital clock radios still in their cartons and several years accumulation of Christmas hampers (cake, nuts, etc.) from the Central Mission.

To have moved over the mounds of material and get from room to room, Mrs C must have developed the agility of a mountain goat. The lighting was very poor; there was, for example, only a 25 watt ceiling globe high up in the kitchen. Biblical tracts, etc., were included among the litter. The whole scene was indescribable. As we were leaving the premises a skinny ginger cat shot inside. We did not bother to take it out, we left it in there—it certainly could not have made the interior any worse.

It cost the trust \$10 000 to clean up those premises, to fumigate them and upgrade them. As I said earlier, tonnes of rubbish was removed, and, when they were cleaning up, the *piece de resistance* was a dead cat under the kitchen table; the skeleton, which was covered by dry taut skin, must have been there for about three years, putrifying and mummifying. Yet I understand that the lady involved was not declared insane. She is capable of living an independent existence of sorts. It is a bit difficult to say that she can live completely independently back again in this maisonette.

There is a whole series of issues raised which perhaps on another occasion can be raised in more detail. What can the Housing Trust do for someone like that? In the circumstances, despite the way in which she treated the property, the trust is entitled to enter the premises outside, but apparently is not entitled to set foot inside the front door without her consent. The trust cannot just evict somebody like that on to the street, legally entitled to do so as it may be. Where would Mrs C go if she was evicted? Who would take her in? What could she find under her own steam? One could not put her in a group of Housing Trust flats, as the other tenants would be driven to distraction. It is obvious that somebody like this living in an independent living environment needs some sort of support.

I understand that a working party in the Housing Trust is looking into this matter. I hope that it is able to put together a permanent task force of specialists capable of dealing with extreme cases like this. I gather that there are one or two people like this in every electorate in the State, or one perhaps in every suburb. A team is needed of people who are aware of the legal rights of the individual, aware of the legal rights of the Housing Trust and who have developed firm contact points with all the other agencies that could be involved such as, in this case, local government, domiciliary care, the fire department and the R.S.P.C.A.

I refer now to a more political subject in the context of the two disasters that this Government has had with both by-elections held in its time, Norwood and Mitcham. I was interested in the remark made by the Country Party candidate (or someone from the Country Party) after the Mitcham result, that they have seven potential candidates willing to stand in metropolitan seats. I was interested, because I am getting a bit lonely. In my area I do not yet have a Liberal Party opponent; or if there is one there has been no clear announcement. Nominations were apparently called for in October last year when the only response was from a Mr Doug Rowe, a rather colourful personality who featured prominently in the press earlier last year in the 1 March 1981 *Sunday Mail*. It was reported later that the Liberal Party apparently rejected him and then reopened nominations with an advertisement placed on 21 April this year. Mr Rowe pointed out how upset he was by consumer

legislation, and I will not refer in detail to that, but he said in the *Advertiser* of 19 December last year:

I even joined the Liberal Party to try and do something about it by trying to get preselection in October for the (A.L.P.) seat of Ascot Park. But they (the Party) said there was a certain stigma about used car dealers, and that made me an undesirable candidate.

Nominations were apparently reopened and they received three, including Mr Rowe again. Mr Rowe has again been rejected, and an article appeared in the *Advertiser* on Thursday last about that. It appears that he also spoke on the A.B.C. on Friday 11 June, when he said to Peter Rapp that he was pushed out 'because of creeping hammerism, which is close to Communism and which is taking over the Liberal Party'. This mystified me, and I would like to know what 'creeping hammerism' is. I was unable to hear any of the A.B.C. interview, which was related to me secondhand, but I would very much like to be told by someone in a position to comment just what is 'the creeping hammerism' which is taking over the Liberal Party and which is very close to Communism.

**Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson):** I want to reflect on a couple of comments the member for Ascot Park made and on the example he gave of the purported condemned house, which is something we see in every suburb. This does not apply only to people in trust homes: it applies also to people in private dwellings. I had a similar case, and I want to put on record my commendation of the people from the Community Welfare Department who assisted in this matter. Through gentle persuasion and with assistance from the department and local government, they were able to help the woman concerned. I must say that her residence is much better than it was when the matter was first brought to my attention. It is a problem for those people living nearby, especially residents in a street who are very house proud: one such case makes it difficult for those endeavouring to maintain their premises at a desirable standard. By the same token, one must, where there is possibly a way out, find a solution which will be to the benefit of the person concerned. It may involve re-educating these people and making them aware of the basic social skills to be able to look after themselves, if that is possible. Alternatively, there must surely be some mechanism by which we can have such people removed from that area and put into better care. Obviously, we must give a lot more attention to that area in years to come, because there have been a number of such cases.

I refer now to issues that involve my district and highlight the absolute sham of the A.L.P., particularly in South Australia. It is no hidden secret in my district that, for many years, and for many elections prior to the 1979 election, various issues were floated as those that would win office for the Party. Those issues certainly helped the Government of the day get back into office. One of those issues was the provision of a boat ramp in the southern area, and I have asked many questions in this House about that matter. I attended a meeting of the Public Works Standing Committee, at which it was pointed out to those present that the previous Government had an opportunity in 1977 to build such a boat ramp. At that time, the ramp would have cost about \$600 000.

*Mr Slater interjecting:*

**Mr SCHMIDT:** However, because of procrastination and the then Government's desire not to provide that facility for the southern area, and despite the protestations of the honourable member opposite, some sites were chosen. The A.L.P. was so sincere in its endeavours to supply a boat ramp that it sold the chosen site to a refinery prior to the last election. During the election campaign, I got wind of the fact that a huge tract of land was to be sold to the refinery. I rushed around to ascertain what land was to be



sold and for what purpose. I thought that perhaps the Government of the day had a trump card up its sleeve, but of course it did not, as was evident from the result of the election. The previous Government sold off the one site that it had in mind for such a boat ramp. Thankfully, this Government has been far more aware of the problem experienced in that area and has been prepared to give some sort of credence to that problem by reopening the matter, properly examining it, by consulting engineers, and by having the Public Works Standing Committee take evidence in the hope that the proper facilities will be provided for the residents. That is a lot more than the previous Government did since the early 1970s. Election after election, the previous Government used this matter as a propaganda piece to put it back into office, but it did not go about supplying the facility. There is another example of that sort of thing—electrification of the railway lines. That was promised election after election. The then Government bought the equipment and then sold it. How sincere was that Government?

I refer now to the quality of water in the southern metropolitan area. On 2 May this year an article, which was written by me, appeared in the *Sunday Mail*, requesting the Premier, in his negotiations with the Federal Government, to barter on behalf of the people of Adelaide, particularly those in the southern area, and to extract from the Federal Government the necessary funds for the Happy Valley water filtration plant. This programme was instigated by Steele Hall, and was taken up by the previous Labor Government, which deemed that the first such project should be provided in the northern areas of metropolitan Adelaide. When one considers that the Happy Valley residents use 40 per cent to 50 per cent of the water that is used in metropolitan Adelaide, one asks why the southern area was not given No. 1 priority in regard to a filtration plant. Perhaps it was because at that time the Government considered that Mawson and Brighton were safe Labor seats and, therefore, there was no need to look after those areas, so it tried to win northern seats that were not at the time in the hands of the Labor Government. The previous Government decided to look after Newland and to buy votes there. It could not buy votes in the southern area.

Now, the sham of the A.L.P. has come to the fore. As members would know, ever since my election I have continually stressed that the Government should maintain the programme and build the filtration plant. Members will recall that last year during the Budget Estimates Committees I asked that \$80 000 be set aside for preliminary plans for the Myponga reservoir, which acts as a feeder and a supplementary reservoir for the southern area. Since this Government has been in office, it has spent many millions of dollars on site and preparatory work for the Happy Valley filtration plant. I requested the Premier to ensure that sufficient funds are forthcoming from the Federal Government.

However, on 9 May the Leader of the Opposition, with his candidate for my district, stood on the front steps of Parliament House on a Sunday morning, knowing full well that the media has trouble getting stories on a Sunday. Channel 9 came down and took pictures of a bottle of bad water. Those people should have known that, in the southern area at this time of the year, the water is quite good, because there is not a great demand on the southern reservoirs or a push-pull, as occurs in the summer. As there is a heavy demand on the water in the summer, the Happy Valley reservoir is supplemented from Myponga, and that supplementation flushes out the pipes so that there is a regurgitation of sediment, resulting in dirty water.

I did not see the television programme, so I asked channel 9 to show me the video replay. It was interesting to note from the replay that the Leader of the Opposition and the A.L.P. candidate for my district appeared with some residents who were concerned about the quality of the water. The first resident was the campaign manager; the second was the campaign secretary, a female student at Flinders University who, in the student cameo, stated that she is actively working on the A.L.P. campaign in my district; and there were present other local A.L.P. branch members.

How sincere is the A.L.P. in its request for better quality water in that area? In the almost three years in which I have been in office, not one (and I stress that) of those people has telephoned my office or has written a letter complaining about the quality of water. Yet, to support the sham of the A.L.P. in trying to raise this matter as an issue, they appeared on the front steps of Parliament House and seemed to be very irate. They looked so sincere, yet over three years they have made no effort to contact my office or to complain.

I have a file containing the names of a number of people who have contacted me over the years, and I have kept in close contact with those people. Whenever I ask a question, I send them a copy, and I also send them a copy of each reply I receive. Federal Senators have considered the problem to ensure that we receive the funding that we require for the filtration plant. The people who have contacted me are concerned about the quality of water, but those who appeared on the steps of Parliament House were only creating a sham, because they are the organisers for the local A.L.P. member. That shows how shallow they are in their attempts to be serious about certain issues, and I believe that that reflects the absolute sham of the A.L.P.

Motion carried.

At 6.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 June at 2 p.m.