

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 August 1982

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

PETITION: TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 303 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to give serious consideration to the installation of traffic lights on Diagonal Road for a pedestrian crossing to assist aged and physically handicapped residents of Masonic Village, St Anne's Housing Trust units and the Southern Cross Homes to ensure their safe crossing on this road was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

OLD REYNELLA TOWNSHIP SEWERAGE SCHEME

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

Old Reynella Township Sewerage Scheme.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In answer to a question asked yesterday by the Hon. Martin Cameron in another place, the Attorney-General undertook to provide information about the conditions applying to the Parliamentary pension received by the former Premier, D. A. Dunstan. Both he and the Government have been surprised to note the undue prominence given to this matter in the press and especially the suggestion of a Government 'probe' into Mr Dunstan's entitlements. No such probe was envisaged by the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General has taken advice and now informs me that there is no provision in the Parliamentary Superannuation Act to cease paying superannuation to a retired member except in limited circumstances of appointment to the office of judge in this State or in the Commonwealth, or in the event of his again becoming a member of any State or the Federal Parliament, or for any other office prescribed by regulation. Thus, in most cases former members of Parliament receiving superannuation are free to decide for themselves what occupations, if any, they will take up following their retirement, without affecting their superannuation entitlements in any way.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

By Command—

Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence—Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISONER'S ESCAPE

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: In this House on Tuesday, following a public comment by me on Monday, I announced that the Yatala and Cadell Country Fire Services units were suspended until such time as a review of those participating in the programme at Yatala had been undertaken, and, in the case of Cadell, a review had been undertaken of all those prisoners serving life imprisonment or indeterminate terms, participating in all outside programmes, including the C.F.S. unit.

As a first priority, the Cadell C.F.S. programme was reviewed by my department, and, as a result, no evidence has been obtained which would suggest that anyone participating in the programme should not do so. I have therefore supported the Executive Director's recommendation that the C.F.S. operation be reinstated as from today. In respect of the Yatala C.F.S. crew, the review is continuing and I anticipate that the situation will be resolved next week.

Specific and clear guidelines are currently being prepared, which will allow greater objectivity in the determination of security classifications, and these should be completed within two weeks. I would like to repeat that this review process was initiated on 29 June by the Executive Director following general discussions he had with me on a range of matters, including the royal commission and Touche Ross reports. It was the Executive Director's intention to bring proposed guidelines to my attention once the necessary research and review had been completed. To clarify this aspect, I would like to table a minute that I received yesterday from the Executive Director, and I seek leave to do so.

The SPEAKER: The Chief Secretary does not require leave: he has a right to table such documents.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: Further, in response to an article which appeared in the *News* today, I advise the House that, upon being informed of the unsubstantiated allegation that prior warning had been given of an impending escape, I immediately requested the Executive Director to investigate the matter. I also requested that an officer from the Government Investigating Office immediately review all evidence and material which had been collected with regard to the escape of prisoner Smith, and undertake such investigations as may be necessary.

It is important to realise that the allegation is as yet unsubstantiated and that some prisoners, or former prisoners, are often not reliable informants, and allegations by anonymous informants are to be treated with some caution. The investigation which is being conducted from the Attorney-General's Department will enable an assessment of all the facts, including unsubstantiated allegations. It will provide a factual report for me upon which it can be determined whether or not any action is warranted, and it will also identify whether or not some prison officers have been unfairly criticised.

QUESTION TIME

EMPLOYMENT

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier explain to the House the basis for his statements to the media yesterday following release of the State Budget that the large cuts in public sector employment were being more than made up for by private sector employment growth, given that the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics employment survey that was released today shows a huge drop in South Australia's employment over the past 12 months, which includes job losses in the private sector?

The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures that were released today show that, over the 12-month period since

July 1981, South Australian employment has declined by 4 500 jobs in total, at a time when employment throughout Australia as a whole has increased. This is completely at odds with the statements that were made by the Premier both outside the House and in the Budget speech yesterday that this State is moving against national economic trends. On 15 June the Premier told the House the following:

The private sector has absorbed the reduction in the public sector employment and gone on with strong growth itself.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, that is entirely true, and I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has confirmed that again. I am trying to think of the exact question that the Leader asked. The basis for my statement that the cuts in public sector employment have been more than made up for in the private sector is entirely in the figures that I have quoted. The Leader said that 4 500 jobs have been lost in the past 12 months, but let me point out to him yet again that more than 20 000 jobs were lost in the last two years of the Labor Government—in other words, 10 000 jobs on average, a year.

Certainly, when we came to office we were able to build up the levels of employment very satisfactorily. Since that time we have faced economic conditions both internationally and nationally which were quite unexpected and which could not have been foreseen in any way at the time. Despite that, we are still holding our position and maintaining a very satisfactory line in regard to unemployment. I find it rather interesting that at this stage the Opposition seems to have changed its tack almost completely.

It is almost as much of a shemuzzle as the Opposition's statement on State taxation has been in the past few weeks. There was a time when, in this House, the Deputy Leader used to talk about unemployment figures, and when we talked about employment figures we were told very vociferously that we could not rely on the figures for employment and that it was unemployment that mattered. We heard that story over and over again. Nevertheless, I now make the same point to the Leader and the Deputy Leader as I made then. My thrust at the time was that the unemployment figures would confirm that jobs had been created in South Australia.

Let me repeat that the unemployment figures confirm the tendency that has been shown in preliminary figures issued earlier this month. These figures are now confirmed. South Australia was the only State to have a drop in unemployment in the past 12 months. I remind members of the percentage changes. In Australia the percentage of unemployment went up by 20.15 per cent, in New South Wales by 35.3 per cent, in Victoria by 18.7 per cent, and in Queensland by 7.2 per cent. In South Australia we had a drop of 5.9 per cent. Western Australia went up by 40 per cent and Tasmania went up by 18.6 per cent.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Really! Since August 1979, certainly, we have had a growth in unemployment, but that has been 1.32 per cent, compared with the Australian figure of 20.47 per cent, New South Wales 33 per cent, Victoria 21 per cent, Queensland 12.6 per cent, Western Australia 11.4 per cent, and Tasmania 32.8 per cent. We are holding the line, when in other States the level of unemployment is increasing very, very markedly. I am very pleased that we are no longer at the top of the unemployment ladder as we were when we came to Government, having inherited that position from the former Government.

Mr Langley: That's not true.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is true. We had the highest level of unemployment in Australia when we came to office, and that was a position that we inherited from the former Government. We now find ourselves second to Tasmania and, because of the way the level of unemployment, regret-

tably, is going in New South Wales, it looks very much as though we will be moving down that ladder at their expense. That is something that I am not pleased about from the point of view of those States, but at least it shows that South Australia is more than holding its own.

TOURISM PLAN

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Tourism state the value placed on the recommendations of the Tourism Development Board's task force in its blueprint for the tourism development plan for the next five years? Last Sunday, the Minister, although sick in bed, launched, together with the Premier, the task force five-year plan for tourism for the State.

Members interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: I have worded that carefully. In view of the fact that the membership of the task force was basically drawn from a wide variety of people and professions and that the recommendations of the group were not linked with or influenced in any way by decisions of this Government, tourism industry members are interested to know what value the Government places on those recommendations framed in the task force five-year plan.

The SPEAKER: I call the recovered Minister of Tourism.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. She has recovered very nicely, thank you very much. The launching of the tourism plan, performed on Sunday by the Premier, I understand, went with a great swing and was an enormous success. If the Government were to place a monetary value on the tourism development plan, that would certainly run into many millions of dollars, because tourism in South Australia is a multi-million dollar industry and is growing literally by the month.

The principal value, I believe, would be that for the first time in what was previously an unco-ordinated industry, made up of very diverse components, we now have a co-ordinated approach that is endorsed jointly by the various sections of the industry itself and also by the State Government. The fact that the State Government has formally endorsed the objectives of the plan means that together over the next five years we will be able to work to achieve those objectives. Whether the strategies, as outlined in the plan, are the precise means by which the various objectives will be achieved is a matter that will have to be decided progressively as we move towards achieving the objectives.

At any rate, the objectives are there. I refer to the objectives dealing with an increased awareness of tourism, minimising the effects of cyclical demands, improving visitor access to South Australia's tourist attractions, the need to foster good industrial relations in the tourist industry, and the creation of an environment that is conducive to investment. All those issues have now been jointly addressed by the industry and the Government. Nothing creates a climate of positive encouragement better than the recognition of achievement. It is worth noting that, in the years since the Government has come to office, the creation of jobs in tourism in this State is measured in thousands.

It was estimated that in 1978-79 in the tourist industry in South Australia 11 600 people were employed. There are currently estimated to be 14 600 people employed in the industry. When we came to office, the industry was reckoned to be worth about \$223 000 000 annually to the State. It is now reckoned to be worth in the region of \$370 000 000 annually to the State. The plan itself sets targets for growth which, if they are capable of achievement, will certainly mean an enormous boost in employment over the next five years. Whereas we currently employ about 14 600 people in the industry, if we can achieve a growth target of 10 per

cent, we will create additional jobs, so that the total number is 22 500. If we do not achieve that very high target of 10 per cent, but achieve a target of 7 per cent, there will be 19 600 jobs in the industry in South Australia by the year 1987.

So, all in all, the goals of that tourism plan are worthy goals. The value of the plan lies in the fact that the goals have indeed been established and jointly endorsed by the Government and the industry. I am grateful that the Opposition was represented at the launching of that plan by its Deputy Leader. I am sure that he could not have failed to be impressed (and the Deputy Leader is signifying that he was indeed impressed) by the enthusiasm shown by all who attended. I look forward to a continuation of that kind of bipartisan support.

Mr DAVID HOWARD

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier personally intervene and examine the current position of Mr David Howard, formerly of 24 Scott Street, Pooraka, with a view to assisting him in his period of crisis? I inform the House that I am asking the Premier this question with the full understanding and authority of the member for Playford, who has been involved in the past in this rather tragic circumstance.

Last night, and again this morning, I was contacted by a Miss Dorothy McGregor-Dey who works for an organisation called 'Humanity in Touch' and who advised me of the rather tragic circumstances in which Mr Howard presently finds himself. I will not go over the whole history of the matter, as I am sure that the Premier would have files on the case or he might know personally of past events. It is the current situation that concerns me, as well as the member for Playford and Dorothy McGregor-Dey.

Miss Dorothy McGregor-Dey has reported to me that Mr Howard was evicted from his home at 8 o'clock last night, after a 60-day stay of execution which she personally had arranged with the tribunal. It was agreed between the organisation Humanity in Touch, Crisis Care and the bailiff who were responsible for evicting Mr Howard that he would immediately be taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Mr Howard, as the Premier may or may not know, has been on a starvation diet for a period of three years, and his health is at present at a very low level. It was the understanding of Miss Dorothy McGregor-Dey that the Crisis Care Unit and the bailiff, after evicting him from his home, would take him to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where it was agreed that the Crisis Care Unit would arrange for his hospitalisation. However, this did not occur. No-one would admit the man to hospital. He was turned away from the hospital into society on his own, with no assistance. It was not until midnight last night that the Humanity in Touch organisation was able to arrange some accommodation for him. I understand that that accommodation is of a temporary nature only and that today they are working vigorously to try to locate somewhere for the man to live.

During the eight-week period in which Miss Dorothy McGregor-Dey and other people from Humanity in Touch have been involved with this person, they have sought all aspects of emergency housing. Crisis Care and all other organisations have been approached to try to find accommodation for this person. It is a difficult humanitarian situation when a person in this plight is found to be homeless, and it is in those circumstances that I ask the Premier personally to intervene to assist.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very much aware of the difficulties that are associated with this case, and I know that the honourable member is, too. It is one of extraordinary

difficulty. The history goes back, I think from memory, to a period long before this Government came into office, and there have been various reports in the media from time to time of the so-called 'hunger strikes' on which this unfortunate man has embarked. Unfortunately, the basis for the activities until recently (I do not know the details of this latest episode) has been directed at obtaining a low interest loan from the Government to enable him to carry out cottage industry activities at home.

Unfortunately, there has been no way at all in which he has qualified for any such loan, even if a specific loan was available from Government sources for that particular thing. He certainly does not qualify for a loan from the State Bank. Every effort has been made to assist him. There have been numerous calls and visits by social workers from the Department for Community Welfare. There has been constant supervision of the situation by the department, and I have come into the matter on a number of occasions when I have been asked to intervene because I have been told that he would accept a statement of the situation, as it exists, in relation to Government assistance, only from the Premier himself.

The officers of the Department for Community Welfare have done everything possible and, indeed, my own Director-General and an inquiry officer have visited the house and spoken to Mr Howard. The tenor of the assistance basically is that if Mr Howard were to apply himself and not take the line of action that he has taken—if he were to move out and try to better his own position—he might perhaps be able to qualify for a loan from the State Bank.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It involves housing.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I realise that—and therefore take care of his housing problem. From what the honourable gentleman tells me, quite obviously the situation has deteriorated still further. At this stage, I am not aware of the details of the matter, but I shall obtain a detailed report from the Minister of Community Welfare and ascertain what steps have been taken. I would be very surprised if the department is not aware of what has been happening. Certainly, I will do what I can, as will anyone else. Unfortunately, I suspect that the basic root cause of the problem is that Mr Howard needs help of a kind that cannot be given either by the Department for Community Welfare, Crisis Care, or by Humanity in Touch.

An honourable member: Struck by lightning!

Mr Trainer: He tempts fate often enough!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is an interesting interjection from the honourable member, but it certainly adds very little to my answer. Certainly, I think that Mr Howard needs help. I am not too sure what help he needs, but I will certainly make further inquiries to see what can be done. It is a very sad case indeed. I am sure that the Minister of Health would also be delighted to make available assistance from the point of view of help. I think that that is where the best form of assistance can ultimately be given. The Government will certainly look at the situation to see what can be done.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Education explain to the House the extent of the damage caused to the Cummins Area School in a fire at the school during the early hours of this morning, and when can it be expected that normal school activities will be able to resume?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The sad news that quite a serious fire was started at Cummins Area School during the early hours of this morning reached me a little while ago. I am still awaiting a formal departmental report, but the early

evidence indicates that the fire was deliberately lit and that a young man was apprehended. He is, allegedly, the person who started the fires, and he will probably be charged with that offence. It appears that a number of spot fires of quite a serious nature were started throughout the building, damaging the junior primary school, the foyer and the geography classrooms.

I am quite familiar with the pleasant surroundings that appear to have been destroyed, as I had the pleasure of visiting that school a few months ago. There is no doubt that, although the damage to the exterior of the building appears to be comparatively slight, in fact the heat within the building was so intense that some steel framing was damaged, and it is quite possible that the building may be out of commission, at least in part, for some considerable time. I can assure the honourable member that I will make a point of getting a personal report to him as soon as I can. Meanwhile, departmental officers are making a complete assessment of the damage and action will be taken to replace the useless classrooms as soon as such action can possibly be effected.

ATCO HOMES

Mr HEMMINGS: Is the Premier aware of the rapid decline in the work force at Atco Homes, Elizabeth West, over the past two months, and can he say whether the Government intends in any way to assist that company by providing it with Government contracts to offset further retrenchments? On Monday, I received a copy of the proceedings of a meeting held on 16 August at Atco Homes attended by the combined unions representing those employed in that company. I subsequently contacted the convener, who told me that copies of the proceedings of the meeting had been sent to the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, you, Sir, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and my colleague, the member for Elizabeth. Atco Homes is strictly observing the last-on, first-out, rule, but the convener has told me that, whilst he appreciates that attitude, it is only aggravating the low morale of the remaining workers. His words to me were, 'How would you feel if you knew that you were in the next lot to go?'

As a result of that meeting, the members present expressed their concern at the severity of the recent retrenchments at Atco Homes, Elizabeth, which reduced its work force by 65 per cent over the past two months, the work force having decreased from 243 to 85. This, and many recent closures such as the Kenwood establishment at Elizabeth, puts the already depressed Para districts in a far worse situation. In past years Atco has had a number of State Government contracts, but these have dropped considerably during the past three years. For example, from July 1979 to June 1980, 54 units were produced for the State Government; from July 1980 to June 1981, 45 units were produced; and from July 1981 to June 1982, 11 units were produced. The resolution passed at that meeting stated:

We urge the State Government to give full consideration to its requirements in transportable structure-type units and, further, that consideration be given to giving the contracts to a manufacturer in an area where employment is desperately needed.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am happy to say that we will certainly do what the honourable member has suggested in his last statement: we will certainly give consideration along those lines. The Atco operation is a most important one to South Australia, and the State Government did a great deal to make certain that Atco stayed in South Australia when in fact it wound up the Demac division of the Public

Buildings Department. That was of enormous benefit to the makers of transportable homes.

The Atco situation has worsened in the past few months, and this has happened for two main reasons. First, of course, is the war which is currently going on in the Middle East and which has caused the cancellation of contracts there. The other major reason has been the cancellation of coal projects in New South Wales. Both are matters that are totally outside the control not only of the company but also of the State Government. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has been closely involved with the management of Atco, and his officers and Atco personnel have been having detailed discussions to see what can be done.

If it is possible to find contracts for which Atco would qualify, naturally under normal conditions they will go to competitive tendering. However, knowing Atco as I do and knowing the quality of its work and its ability to tender, I have no doubt that it will be able to compete for such contracts without any difficulty at all. Certainly, this is closely in the mind of the Minister of Public Works and his officers. The best thing that can happen for the future is not only to make certain that Atco can continue its export activities and look for new markets (in that regard the Agent-General in London has already been asked to look around the Middle East to see whether alternative markets can be found) but also to get on with the job of resource development in South Australia.

The degree of exploration activity and the degree of development not only at Olympic Dam but also at Moomba and other sites around South Australia will as it increases enable Atco, together with other supply and service companies, to maintain its employment levels. At the present time, I am well aware of the problem to which the honourable member referred. We will certainly give full consideration to the motion which the honourable member has read out, and he can be assured that the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Public Works will keep in close contact with the company.

PRISON ESCAPE

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Chief Secretary explain the latest situation regarding the recapture of the escaped prisoner Smith, who seems to be existing pretty well on a packet of yo-yo biscuits and—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to ask the question and not to comment.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I have been advised by the Police Department, which is conducting a search for the escapee, that there was a break-in at a homestead in the Riverland recently and that food was taken from the premises. There is evidence that the prisoner Smith is in the area and resources are therefore being concentrated there, as well as the search being maintained in other areas. As a result of the reports on the break-in, the Police Department has deployed, as at first light this morning, other resources into the region.

BUDGET PAPERS

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: Will the Premier comment on the possibility of copies of the Budget documents being made available to a nominated member of each of the non-government Parties at the same time and under the same conditions as they are made available to the media? Furthermore, will the Premier make available to all members of this House a copy of the summary of departmental spending that was made available to members of the media

with their copies of the Budget papers? Elected members of this House are disadvantaged by not having information that has been given to the media, and in addition non-government Parties are disadvantaged in not being given an opportunity to study the Budget papers before being asked by the media for their comments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I sympathise to some extent with the honourable member in what she says about the Budget. I remember that, when I first came into this House, it took me at least two years (and other members will probably share my feelings) before I could find my way around the Budget documents very well at all. I am afraid that that can only come with practice, and there is not much substitute for practice. The Budget documents are properly introduced into this Chamber, they are subject to an embargo lock-up procedure, and they are studied by the media for an hour or two beforehand so that a report can be written up in an appropriate way, because deadlines have to be met.

In the case of members of this Chamber, as the honourable member will have realised, the debate on the Budget will not take place until next Tuesday, quite deliberately, to afford all members adequate time to study and seek informed advice, if that be their wish, on the contents of the Budget. That has been the practice in this Chamber for as long as I can remember. Indeed, it has been the case in the past that the Budget has been introduced just before show week and that the whole week off has then been available for members of the House to study the Budget and form their conclusions.

Of course, the appropriate time to make informed comment (and I am sure that the honourable member will find that that is the only time when people expect informed comment) is during the Budget debate. As to releasing the summary of the contents of the Budget, that is something that I have not considered doing, because I thought that members would be able to go through the Budget documents themselves to find out what they need to find out. However, if the honourable member would like a summary of the contents of the Budget for her own help and guidance, I can quite appreciate why, and I would be delighted to make it available to her.

DROUGHT

Mr LEWIS: I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the effects of the drought on South Australians overall, and I refer in particular to the problems that the drought may be causing, seeking from the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please restate his question?

Mr LEWIS: I seek from the Minister of Agriculture information on the effects of the drought on people in South Australia in general and particularly in relation to the supply of rural products to shops and households, and on whether or not there will be adequate supplies of milk.

A report on page 8 of today's *News* mentions, among other things, some possible effects, including the claim by the South Australian Dairymen's Association quotation that milk production almost certainly would drop because of the drought. The report notes also that Mr Grant Andrews, General Secretary of United Farmers and Stockowners, has called on financiers not to over-react to the plights of farmers. Mr Andrews is reported as having said:

We expect those who finance rural producers to stand behind them in this time of crisis.

That is in keeping with the kind of request made of them about a month ago by the Premier in his conference with them and finance houses.

The Hon W. E. CHAPMAN: The report on page 8 of the *News* today does outline to a great extent the impact that will occur on the South Australian community, and I believe that that information, taken with reports I have given to this House in the past several days on the situation in the field, outlines the general position and, indeed, substantiates the general part of the honourable member's question.

In relation to his reference in particular to the supply of milk in South Australia in this current dry situation that we are experiencing, it is as clear as a neon sign that in the areas that do not have access to irrigation and depend upon paddock feed for their dairy cattle there will progressively be a shortfall in supply. As with most products, supply is a significant factor in the ultimate price of the product. In this State, the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act provides the board with authority to fix the retail price of whole milk and only a matter of a few weeks ago there was a price increase of some 3c, bringing the price in South Australia to 60c a litre.

I think it appropriate to indicate to the House that our milk, at 60c per litre carton delivered, is the cheapest whole milk in Australia. The price in New South Wales per litre carton is 67c, in Queensland 69c, in Tasmania 61c, in Western Australia 65c, and in Victoria 62c. Under the Act that I have mentioned the Metropolitan Milk Board is required to have regard to cost factors associated with the industry from the paddock to the table and in that context it is obvious that an early assessment of the position will be required. I believe that we can expect an adjustment before the time when ordinarily it would be expected to be forthcoming from the board.

Obviously, in the interests of all concerned, not the least being the consumers of milk in this State, the Government will carefully consider each submission that comes from that direction. However, I repeat that we have the lowest price in Australia and I hope that, whatever price adjustments are sought by the board in the interests of dairymen, processors, and those involved in the delivery of whole milk collectively, the board will have regard to costs and an appropriate margin of profit for all parties concerned. As far as quantity is concerned, obviously we can expect, during the spring flush period this year, a shortening supply of whole milk as against what we would ordinarily expect during this period.

RADIUM HILL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Health advise what action, other than sending a questionnaire, is proposed by the Government and the Minister in relation to former workers at Radium Hill involving any possible injury to their health they may have suffered as a result of their employment? The Minister will be aware that a questionnaire was sent to those former workers at Radium Hill who I understand have been able to be located up to this stage. The letter that accompanies the questionnaire is what one would expect and is in standard form, and the only possible interest that the House has in my explaining the question is that three out of the five main operative paragraphs refer to smoking. I have been told by a former worker at Radium Hill of some of the conditions applying in that work.

My informant said that during lunch or crib breaks firing of bore holes occurred and that the smoke from explosions used to leave a film of substance all around, even on the pannikins of tea. He added that the smoke on occasions was of a yellowish colour and that complaints about this to management resulted in Venturer fans being installed to try

to remove the smoke. He said that he did not know what was worse—the smoke or the noise of the high speed fans similar to a modern jet plane—and that they used to switch them off because they could not hear. My informant stated that mostly where he and his colleagues worked the atmosphere around them resembled fog caused by compressed air driving machinery such as boggers, radial drills, etc.

He explained that these machines ran on high pressure compressed air and that a special container was placed near them and was kept filled with an oil lubricant to stop seizure. He then said that an oil film always covered the exposed skin and clothes. My informant went on to say that the medical officer was told of the high radio-active reading, taken on the Geiger counter, of hands, clothing, etc. They were told that it was harmless, but even after a shower the reading on the counter was still in the red. I believe that the explanation and information I have provided will indicate to the Minister the reason for the question.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Radium Hill study to which the honourable member refers is an epidemiological study which will be of considerable value in world scientific literature. As such it should be seen as being separate from any other action which might be taken in relation to the former workers at Radium Hill. I can ascertain what other action, if any, is envisaged as being necessary or desirable for those workers. I am working only from recollection, but I believe that my predecessor, the Hon. Peter Duncan (and he may correct me if I am wrong), indicated that any of those people who had been working at Radium Hill and who wanted a check-up could present themselves at a hospital in South Australia and that that check-up would be undertaken. That was reinforced by me shortly after we came to office. As I recall, not many people availed themselves of that opportunity.

The honourable member referred to a survey in which questions were asked about smoking. Of course, it is essential, if one is trying to trace evidence of disease in a given population, to examine all factors which might have contributed to that disease. Notwithstanding the conditions that the honourable member has described, the reality is that the chances of persons contracting lung cancer are immeasurably enhanced if they are smokers. It is necessary, in epidemiological terms, to obtain the information in question. I am quite certain, because of my knowledge of the Epidemiology Branch of the Health Commission, that information sought would be regarded as being scientifically necessary and would stand up under any scrutiny as being such. In regard to other action, I will seek information from the commission and advise the honourable member.

EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr RANDALL: Has the Minister of Education heard complaints made by the President of the Institute of Teachers in relation to the Budget announced yesterday? A report was presented to my office this morning which states:

Outlandish claims had been made by Miss Leone Ebert that this is the worst Budget for education yet presented by this Government.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, I am aware of the comments that were made by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and I really do find them hard to understand. One of the reasons is that I believe the institute itself does not really understand the Budget. The reason that I indicate this to the House is that in the preceding three years I have, as a matter of courtesy, made available to the executive of the Institute of Teachers senior officers of the Education Department to walk them through the programme performance Budget. I understand that this is

something which has never been done before and which, in fact, other institutions may not be privy to.

The question that the member for Mitcham asked of the Premier a short while ago is certainly relevant to this and partly for this reason: that members of this House have not been taken through the programme performance Budget papers in detail, as they are obviously not yet available. I did, this year, decline that former customary procedure, at least customary as far as this Government is concerned, and suggested that the institute would have to do as the rest of South Australia does and that was to await its turn so that it could see those papers and then be guided through them. So, for the President of the institute to be forwarding to me a letter yesterday evening asking for a 'if not, why not?' response indicates there were a number of things contained in the Budget that the institute itself had not understood. The allegation that this is the worst Budget that has been handed down is, of course, blatantly untrue. In 1970, education in South Australia received a little over 20 per cent of the share of the State's finances; that is 20 per cent of the Budget. This year, by the end of the 1982-83 financial year, with the inclusion of a round sum allowance for the anticipated increase in salaries, the share will be 33 per cent. In other words, there has been a 13 per cent increase, steadily increasing under whichever Government was in power. The increase has been almost an incremental step (one might say), but the Education Department has increased its share of the total State Budget allocation year by year by year.

Let me also say that I believe that this claim that is made by the President of the Institute of Teachers is far more politically emotional than it is realistic. It is directly in line with a statement that was made to the Premier, the Deputy Premier and me by the Acting President of the Institute of Teachers (Mr Gregory) that the present South Australian Institute of Teachers campaign is part of an all-States campaign. In other words, all Governments are being attacked as having the worst funding for education when, in fact, South Australia has the best. What source do I refer to for that sort of information? I believe two reasonable sources should be adequate: one is the source that the institute itself is quoting, and that is its own A.T.F. survey. And it is significant, I think, to members of the House and the South Australian public that the person from the South Australian Institute of Technology who compiled and interpreted the A.T.F. survey for the South Australian Institute of Teachers did complain formally to the institute that it was misinterpreting and misusing the A.T.F. figures.

Of course, the breakdown which my departmental senior officers have done clearly indicates that the A.T.F. survey supports South Australia as leading the field in education in Australia. Where else would we look for supportive comments? We should look to probably no greater or more reliable authority than the Chairman of the Schools Commission himself, Professor Peter Tannock, who came to South Australia. Although he did not confer with the present Minister of Education, he did visit one or two South Australian schools in company with the Director-General of Education and volunteered the comment, I think it was to the *News*, that South Australia's education system was among the best and could be compared with the best in the Western world.

It really does beggar all description for the Institute of Teachers to come along and make this sort of criticism in an uninformed way without having the precise, analytical facts of the Budget before it, and coming out in an emotional way and saying that the Education Department is very badly funded or the worst funded. What is the end result of such criticism from a professional body? It must be that parents' confidence in the system, which the institute professes to

be supporting wholeheartedly, must be undermined, and the transfer from the Government system into the non-government system would be accelerated. That is an utterly disgraceful state of affairs. The institute should be standing alongside the teachers and the Government and saying that it really does have the best system and that there is no need for anyone to transfer or to look elsewhere for a fine standard of education.

The real situation is also relevant to the excessive wage demands that have been made by the institute in the past year: 37½ per cent was sought, and 16 per cent was granted. That increase of some \$48 000 000 in the 1981-82 financial year represents the equivalent of 2 500 full-time teaching positions. Let us also have a look at the institute's arithmetic. Just before the President of the institute, Ms Ebert left for her overseas study tour in Geneva, she was quoted in the *News* of 27 July as saying that the Budget would lead to a cut of 300 permanent jobs for teachers and that over the past three years 900 jobs had been cut. A few days later the acting President (and it was an unusual step that the immediate past president should be appointed as acting president instead of one of the vice presidents, but that was done), Mr Gregory stated that 400 teachers would go (an increase of 100 on the earlier prediction) and that 1 200 jobs had been cut in the past three years. Therefore, the executive itself was in dispute over the figures, and as I have said, perhaps those involved just do not understand the Budget.

The S.A.I.T. appears not able to get its act properly together. In fact, the present Budget indicates not the \$8 000 000 reduction which was alleged by the executive of the institute but a figure which was very much smaller, representing the amount that has actually been lost in real terms to the staffing section of the department, but that reduction has been returned in new initiatives which are clearly stated in the Budget and which will become patently obvious when the programme performance budgeting papers are made available, namely that in fact some 216 staff, not 300 or 400, will be lost to the system.

Another blatantly untrue statement was also made, and I refer to the statement that 900, 1 000 or 1 200 (one can take one's pick from the institute's figures) people had been sacked. Of course, none of those people have been sacked: the losses are by attrition and I point out that there is a greater attrition rate than is required in order to lose staff, so year by year the department has been appointing fresh contracts, short term and long term, and fresh permanent appointees and, therefore, providing jobs for unemployed teachers who are constantly applying for positions. The situation is far from being as grim as it is in States such as New South Wales where great inroads into the general education area and into the technical and further education sector are threatened.

South Australia has been prudently managed and the education system has come out quite handsomely dressed in comparison with the other portfolios and other States. Some of the positive aspects of the Budget handed down yesterday are that the Education Department, which is under attack from the institute, has an increased share, in real terms, once again. The Government has increased the expenditure per student in real terms in the Education Department.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What does that mean? Is it that some of your colleagues have been a bit weak in their approaches to the Treasurer and they have not done as well?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is a very good question, and I can simply say in response to that suggestion of weakness among my colleagues that it is a recognition of all members of the South Australian Cabinet of the importance of young people to the present and the future of South Australia. I thank the honourable member for drawing my

attention to that. I welcome the support that has been given to education by the Treasurer and by Cabinet colleagues. Surely the honourable member must have been tongue-in-cheek when he asked that sort of question.

The fact is that staff losses to education this year are the smallest for several years, so the department itself can hardly consider it to be the worst Budget. Apart from that, there is a strange irony in the allegations made by the institute because requests from the institute and requests from the Primary Principals Association regarding the September staffing, regarding the maintenance of class sizes, were acceded to. In fact at the eleventh hour an additional sum was added to the Budget so that the South Australian education system could not only maintain but slightly improve staff ratios in a number of areas. What sort of criticism is this that is coming from the institute? What is its motivation—to undermine the teachers and the very system it represents by bringing allegations against staff not only in the Government but also in the non-government sector? I suggest there are three possibilities, only one of which I will accept. One is that it is a case of gross ingratitude; secondly, it might be a case of gross ineptitude; but I think the real reason is that it is politicking along the lines of the Australian Teachers Federation all-States campaign to undermine the Government education system wherever it may be in Australia.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING COURSE

Mr PETERSON: My question is to the Minister of Education and a short answer will do this time. Will the Minister investigate the exceedingly long delay in the provision of some formal award for graduates of mechanical engineering courses? I have received a letter from a constituent which clearly describes the situation. The letter states:

In 1976 the mechanical engineering course studied at Regency Park Community College was upgraded from three to four years part time. Since that year about 100 graduates have been waiting for a new official award with a new name to be issued to them, parallel with similar awards in other States. As employment interstate and overseas depends on receiving a recognised official award, many graduates are being seriously disadvantaged.

It has been put to me that after the years of work put in to obtain this award and the importance of either a diploma or some formal certificate, it is ridiculous that the graduates should have had to wait so long for some form of award.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The answer will be brief. I discussed this shortly with the honourable member yesterday and indeed with a number of my colleagues on this side of the House. It has apparently been dragging on for several years. The matter has been drawn to the immediate attention of the Acting Director-General of Further Education, and the Chairman of the Tertiary Authority of South Australia, both of whom claim the responsibility has been largely within the other's field. I have asked them for an immediate resolution to this long-standing problem.

LOCHIEL COAL DEPOSIT

Mr RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say how significant to the State is the new coal find near Lochiel that has been announced today? I understand that consideration is being given by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to the building of a new power station in the near future. I ask whether the find at Lochiel will have any bearing on the decision that will be made as to whether a new power station will be built.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The announcement I have made today is significant indeed for South Australia.

The Electricity Trust has been drilling in the Lochiel area and it has proved a deposit of about 500 million tonnes of coal of superior quality to that of the Wakefield deposit in that it does not have the same degree of sodium impurity. Moreover, it is nearer the surface: it lies between 20 and 60 metres below the surface and one of the significant factors in open-cut mining is the overburden to coal ratio, so that in that sense this would be a cheaper mining operation than would be the Port Wakefield deposit.

Combustion tests have been carried out on the Port Wakefield and Kingston coal deposits which were discovered by Western Mining Corporation. The final results of those tests have not yet been assessed, but a decision has to be made soon in relation to our next major source of fuel for power generation in South Australia. This is a significant find indeed. I think it is appropriate to point out that this will in no way affect the gasification studies being carried out by Sumitomo into the Wakefield deposit. The Wakefield deposit is a considerably larger discovery. The coal deposit at Port Wakefield is large and I am quite sure that with its fairly low-grade lignites, it will be of commercial significance to South Australia at some time in the future, but just precisely when we cannot say. As time goes on I am sure that these coals will be utilised.

I think it is also appropriate to point out the aggressive policy this Government has in relation to exploration. In the last calendar year we have spent on exploration in this State more than was spent in the decade of the Dunstan Government. In one year the expenditure about matched 10 years of Labor expenditure and this is starting to bear fruit. I am quite sure in my own mind that we will find other significant minerals and hydrocarbons which will be of enormous value to this State in the future because of the policies of this Government. We do not suffer from the ideological hang-up of our Labor opponents in relation to trans-nationals, as they now call them, and those who have money that they wish to spend in this State. This find was made by the Electricity Trust, which has an aggressive exploration policy, but nonetheless—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In those 10 years of Labor Government we had no power problems.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member's interjection is ill timed, because one of the major problems facing this State and me in particular as Minister of Mines and Energy is the legacy we inherited in relation to future plans for power generation because, as I have already pointed out, we generate well in excess of 70 per cent of our power by burning natural gas, and our predecessors sold our natural gas to New South Wales.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And you're trying to take the credit for it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Labor Party in 1973 wrote contracts which sold gas to New South Wales to the year 2006 and our own contracts expire in 1987. One of the major challenges facing me as Minister is to renegotiate those contracts, which I am actively seeking to do at the moment. I hope Mr Dunstan shows some rather more entrepreneurial skill and business skill in his new position as Director of Tourism for the Victorian Government than he displayed in writing contracts for the South Australian public when he was in office. This (along with a very long list of failures in the business sense during those pace-setting years) is another case in point where contracts were written (the interjection of the member for Baudin asked for this answer) to make viable a petro-chemical plant. Enough gas had to be sold to make viable a petro-chemical plant. We had the spectacle of the petro-chemical plant being announced and reannounced *ad nauseam* at every State election, and finally the Dow Chemical Company said good-

bye to South Australia. We have no plant, but we have sold our gas to Sydney.

It ill behoves the shadow Minister to remind us of the record of our predecessors in relation to their business acumen in seeking to secure the future of this State. The aggressive and forward looking policies of this Government in relation to ascertaining what resources we have and exploiting those resources will, I believe, overcome the enormous problems that we inherited in this area as a result of the deprecations of 10 years of pacesetting Labor. The current coal find is a useful addition to the energy sources that will become available to the State in the fullness of time. However, it is a bit early to suggest that this will be the source of fuel for a future power station. As I said, further work must be done.

I repeat again that one of the high priorities and, indeed, probably the most important priority in which I, as Minister of Mines and Energy, am actively engaged at present, is to salvage something from those appalling contracts (which are sillier, indeed, than the railways contracts) that were written by our predecessor, the Labor Party. That Party presently aspires to office with a set of policies that are about as ridiculous as its record in relation to business deals in the past.

At 3.14 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister of Environment and Planning:

That, pursuant to section 40 of the Planning Act, 1982, the development plan laid before Parliament on 17 August 1982 be approved; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 564.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): At first blush, what the Minister is asking the House to do this afternoon appears to be a very straightforward exercise. It arises from an amendment which was proposed in another place by the Hon. Mr DeGaris and which, with the support of the Labor Party and, I imagine, the Democrat (although I could not be absolutely certain about that), was, in fact, carried and accepted by the representatives of this Chamber at a conference of managers.

What was uppermost in the minds of the members of the other place at the time was that the Planning Bill then proceeding through the Parliament envisaged an amalgamation into the one document of various forms of planning document that were being used under the Planning and Development Act by the State Planning Authority and local government as the basis for determining various forms of planning application. The point that was made with some cogency by members of another place was simply that the development plan would include zoning regulations that had been given statutory force under the normal arrangements for subordinate legislation and also other planning documents, for example, authorised development plans, that had never been subjected to that system of Parliamentary over-view.

Accordingly, it seemed only logical that some piece of machinery should be adopted to provide for Parliamentary over-view of those documents, which had never had such over-view, because, from the proclamation of the relevant portions of the new Bill, thereby making it part of the new

Act, these documents would have statutory force. It was therefore determined that a motion that would provide the necessary statutory force would be put to both Houses of Parliament.

That would appear on the surface to be a fairly straightforward exercise. It is necessary, under the provisions of the Planning Bill, that the Minister's department go through all those planning documents, do a very elaborate scissors and paste exercise, and come up with a consolidated document. This it has done, and the document has been placed before us. It is then necessary that the Parliament give statutory effect to that matter.

It is also true that, in the spirit of the amendment that was carried and of the motion that is currently before us, this document or set of documents (the six volumes) should mirror exactly the contents of the parent documents, that is, the authorised development plans and the zoning regulations that they replace. The Minister has made perfectly clear, and reiterated to me at a briefing session which we had at his initiative (and for which I thank him), that this is not the occasion on which to amend any of those documents. Indeed, it would be contrary to the spirit of the Planning Bill (the new legislation) should we undertake any scheme of amendment by what we are doing here and now.

The new documents must mirror faithfully the old documents, and that is that. If there are deficiencies in those old documents, either deficiencies that are yet to be picked up, that have been picked up and not yet addressed, or perhaps that have been partly addressed but the machinery has not gone right through, that is too bad. The machinery is still available under the new Bill for those amendments to occur. So, what we are being asked to approve today purports to be an exact mirror of the documents that it replaces. That is the task before us, and at first sight it appears to be quite straightforward. One of the problems that the poor, struggling Parliamentarian must face is, of course, in regard to the sheer mass of material that is presented.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: The poor Minister had that problem, too.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed. Not only are there the six volumes which comprise the new plan but also there is the enormous amount of documentary material that these documents replace. I am the first to admit that I have not had time to go through all the documents to determine whether the job has been done fairly and faithfully and that what we have before us is an exact mirror of the documents that these volumes now replace. Therefore, it is necessary that we take on faith from the Minister the assurance that this is what has happened or, alternatively, that we obtain advice from those who are skilled in the area and/or have had time to do this job.

I indicate at the outset that the Opposition does not intend in this debate to oppose the motion in any way, but we will pose some questions for the Minister to answer, and that might indicate the attitude that people in another place might take to the passage of the motion. I do not want to put anything more on it than simply that statement.

First, I think it is important that the Minister should know, if he does not already know, that there are concerns, particularly in local government, about what we are being invited to do today. Again, it is not too clear to me how soundly based are some of these concerns. I think that there are people in the community who have doubts about the whole of the scheme of legislation of which this is, as it were, the culmination. That is too bad, of course. The Parliament has already spoken about that, and they cannot have another bite at the cherry at this late stage. Indeed, I would suggest that honourable members would be involved in a misunderstanding of the nature of what we are being

asked to do if they were to regurgitate a lot of the concerns that were placed before us when the Planning Bill had its original passage.

It is significant to see just how many councils are very concerned. The Minister may possibly be aware that the executive committee of the Local Government Association only this morning passed a motion in which it indicated that it could not at this stage support the passage of this motion through both Houses of Parliament without a good deal more consideration. Indeed, I understand that there was a report to that same meeting to indicate that, as late as today, further discussions were taking place between the Minister's office and a person who is skilled in the jurisdiction in relation to one of the matters that I will raise in this House shortly.

Perhaps before I get into some of the detail of what I want to speak about (and I will not delay the House for too long), I first reiterate that I think it is important that the Minister, in replying to this debate, give the House some assurances as to his understanding of the thoroughness of the system of consultation that has existed between his officers, local government and people who otherwise have quite a proper interest in the field, including people in the law involved in the jurisdiction. Given that this is a very specialised area of the law, there are precious few of those people. I do not know whether any members have children of university age studying law, but they may well consider specialising in this field, because they would not have too many competitors. At any rate, we would hope to have that assurance from the Minister.

Secondly, I mention to the Minister in passing that I seriously considered placing before him the possibility that we should have handled this matter as a Committee debate. I do not know what the Minister's response may have been. I would have been prepared to canvass the possibility of a guillotine in exchange for the greater freedom of a Committee debate. I guess that that would have involved 12 votes on the 12 parts of the regulations. We would not have sought to oppose any of those but perhaps it would have been a way in which we could have got more from the Minister by cross-examination. However, I have decided, in the event, not to proceed in that direction. Perhaps the Government would not have been prepared to consider it anyway.

We did consider it, because I am sure that if this were legislation that we were asked to vote on, people would talk about it, in Parliamentary jargon, as a Committee Bill rather than the normal sort of legislation. That is because no great principle is involved. It is a piece of machinery that the Parliament, in its wisdom, decided some time ago to go for, but there may well be a string of anomalies arising from the way in which the various documents were stitched together.

As to some of the concerns that people have rehearsed with me, if people like to work their way through the development plan (and those who are map nuts like I am will find it a delight: maps abound), they will find that, on the one hand, there are the broad brush maps which are taken from the old authorised development plans, and then there are the detailed maps taken from the zoning regulations that have been approved through the traditional structure.

As I say, previously, if there was any conflict between the two sets of documents, there was no problem. It has long been established in the courts that the zoning regulations take precedence and are law, whereas development plans are merely policy. Now, as a result of the successful passage of this motion through both Houses, the authorised development plans will have the force of law, so the question arises as to what happens if *prima facie* there is a conflict between the detail of an authorised development plan on the one hand and zoning regulations on the other.

I will give the House three examples of the sort of thing to which I am referring. If, for example, we turn to Vol. 3 of the development plan, which deals in the first instance with planning regulations for the city of Noarlunga (a part of the State somewhat dear to my heart), we see on Noarlunga plan, map 1, to the northern boundary of the city of Noarlunga, an area marked in pink being living space, residential, between the general industrial zone and the northern boundary of the city of Noarlunga where it joins with the city of Marion.

If one turns to map 4, city of Noarlunga zones, one finds that the area marked pink on the other map is obviously section or part of section 572 marked on this map and that it is zoned for general industry. That is one example of the sort of thing to which I am referring. If one also turns to volume 2, looks at the city of Glenelg, and examines the zoning at the far western end of Anzac Highway (and this would encompass the former electorate office of the member for Hanson), one finds that either side is marked in blue, meaning some sort of commercial zoning rather than the mood of the denizens of that particular area.

On the other hand, if one turns to city of Glenelg zones map Gle/2, one finds that the zoning is Residential 3. Just to give a third example, in volume 4 of the development plan, city of West Torrens, map WeT/1, in Novar Gardens we see an amalgam of general industrial zoning largely around Novar Gardens and general residential zoning around Camden Park. Then, if one turns to map 11, under the general designation of city of West Torrens zones, one sees an extremely complicated maze of Residential 2, local shopping, general industry, and Residential 1, and there is little correlation between those two maps. The general ingredients of each are common, but the way they spread across the surface of the earth differs from one to the other.

Traditionally, as I say, this did not matter. As I understand, when a district council or corporation set out its zoning regulations, it simply had to have general regard to the planning as set down in the authorised development plan, and it really did not matter all that much if the boundary between general industry and the residential zone varied by a block, or a couple of blocks or so, as long as the council had regard to the general provision of the authorised development plan. Now we are giving statutory effect to both sorts of document. How do we get out of this if there seems to be a sort of conflict? As I understand, the way in which the regulations provide for a resolution of this conflict is that the more detailed documents shall have precedence over the less detailed documents, but all I can say there is that there are people skilled in the jurisdiction who simply ask what that really means in practice.

They say that they do not really believe that the document or the regulations, or, indeed, the new Act, really spells out in sufficient detail what 'detail' means and that, indeed, it may take litigation for this matter to be sorted out. That is just the type of thing that people involved in the area were saying when we first looked at the Planning Bill: that a few solicitors would become rather wealthier as a result of the changes to the Statute that we were making, because a lot of existing planning law, in terms of interpretations made by the courts, would have to be scrapped and we would start again.

One person said to me, 'I do not know why I am advising you against supporting the procedure, because I think I am going to do reasonably well out of it. Nonetheless, in the public interest be very cautious about what is happening here, because it may be that through the courts we are going to have to repeat the history of the past 15 years in terms of sorting out again our definitions and the way in which the judges will ultimately come to those decisions.' So, that is one area over which I believe the Parliament requires

some sort of reassurance from the Minister before this motion finally wins its way through perhaps to its predicted final outcome.

Let us move on from that to a matter in relation to which I referred in a round-about sort of way earlier when I said that there had been some discussions as late as earlier today regarding this matter. I refer to the councils that have zoning regulations and the policy statements regarding certain land uses in part 4 of the regulations. It has been put to me that, although the new plan retains these as a way of distinguishing between permitted and consent development, it abandons them as a guide to desirable features of consent applications. It has been suggested to me that the omission of these Part IV statements leave serious gaps in the policy framework for many types of development. For example, there will be no statement of car parking provision standards for any consent development. It is suggested that, in relation to chapter and verse, we should go to page 48 of volume 3 in relation to the City of Noarlunga.

I suppose that in some ways I owe the House an apology that I continue coming back to the home patch, but it is obvious that these are the portions of the regulations that I understand most intimately. If one is to read the statements set out there, one sees that they are conditions applying to permitted development and that the same sorts of guidelines appear not to apply in relation to consent applications. Again, if the Minister could give us some assurance in this matter it would be very useful indeed. In fact, it may well be that some general procedural changes should occur at the local government level in relation to some of these applications. The suggestion has recently been put to me that, even where there is a permitted use, the proponent should have to go through a system of application, and the council can then indicate to the proponent that it is a permitted use. What often tends to happen is that people are told over the front counter that they do not have to apply for land use permission in relation to a matter because it is a permitted use. If any building is involved, they must still get building approval, so it seems that there may be some advantages in local government at least scanning an application so that a person can have in writing that, indeed, we are dealing with a permitted use.

In any event, it seems to me that in relation to consent use it is even more important that people know exactly what are the guidelines. Again, this seems to be an omission. The question arises whether such an omission really amounts to an amendment to the documents which, in fact, we are not supposed to be amending. In relation to the previous matter that I raised, I was not in any way suggesting that there had been any amendment. Obviously there had not been. Rather, I was saying that we should look at some way in which we can overcome the problem of potential conflict between the two different sorts of documents which are amalgamated into the plan that is before us. I am now canvassing either an amendment or something which is not an amendment. If it is an amendment, in a sense we are being invited to go beyond what was envisaged by the Parliament when the amendment to the Bill itself, which has led us to this pass, was carried. So, I invite the Minister to look at that fairly closely.

One or two other matters arise out of the regulations rather than the plan itself, although I do not want to canvass them in any detail. I may even be out of order in doing so. However, the regulations which have been brought down at the same time, and which will be subject to the normal subordinate legislation over-view, really travel with this plan, and the spirit of those regulations should reflect the spirit of the DeGaris amendment. In other words, it is an exact replica—it is a scissors and paste job.

It is suggested to me that there are in the regulations certain agencies whose development applications will be determined by the commission, whereas in the past they were determined by local government. The metropolitan fire service is one that has been put to me. Instrumentalities such as the South Australian Housing Trust and the Urban Land Trust, although they have usually done local government the courtesy of applying, in fact, strictly by law, have not been constrained by decisions of local government. So, nothing has changed there.

However, in relation to certain other agencies (and I have given one example), it would appear now that they also, strictly by law, will not have to approach local government. Again, that would appear to be some sort of amendment and some sort of departure from the text of the documents that the plan seeks to supplant. Again, it would be useful to the House if the Minister could comment on that matter.

We then come to what I suppose is in some ways an administrative measure, although again it arises out of the exercise that we have before us. Quite a few councils have supplementary development plans approaching authorisation under the Planning and Development Act, which is gradually being supplanted by successive proclamation of the Planning Bill. I understand that these supplementary development plans will lapse on the introduction of the plan. One of the reasons given is that insufficient resources are at present available to put them into the approval format for the new plan. So, for a period councils will have to revert to the use of the plans that they have already discarded as being inadequate and use them and, as it were, begin the whole process of supplementary development plans again, despite the fact that a good deal of this work has been done.

That seems to be a shame. While, again, I am not canvassing that there should be any amendment to what is happening, I would have thought that the normal process of amendment which these councils were working through could continue unabated. I suppose that to the layman a lot of that seems pretty pettifogging, but when one looks at the history of planning law in this State, and when one looks at the way in which from time to time the State Planning Authority has felt that it had adequate controls in this area and has been bowled over before the Planning Appeal Board, one realises just how careful one has to be in the wording of these planning documents.

When one has approaches from local government and from people practising as lawyers in the jurisdiction in relation to these matters, one simply cannot brush them aside. As I say, I believe that some of the concern outside may relate to a misinterpretation of what we are doing here, but I cannot dismiss it completely out of hand, because of the experience and the expertise of the people who are making these sorts of statements.

I have been somewhat critical of the Minister because of the considerable amount of time that was taken in getting these documents before the Parliament. I suggested that part of the problem was that the Development Management Division had lost personnel and that this had been as a result of the configuration of the last Budget, and I do not resile from that position. Given that those contentions of mine have not been denied, and given that they are in fact borne out by the staffing figures that were set down in the Budget papers 12 months ago, I must place on record that the work that has been put in by those people who remained in the division has obviously been magnificent. They have had a great deal of work to do, and I am sure that there have been some Herculean efforts in order to get the document to the stage that it is where we can give it proper consideration.

I would want to join with anybody else who would want to give a good deal of praise to those officers in the Minister's

department who have been given this onerous task. However, I do not resile from my earlier contention that there should have been more people available in order to do the job. If it can be demonstrated that, as some people outside are saying, there are defects in the way in which this piece of machinery has been worked through, I can only say that it would relate simply to that manpower shortage of which I warned the Minister quite some time ago.

In summary, the Opposition does not want to oppose what, after all, as I said right at the beginning, is only supposed to be a machinery measure. We say quite candidly and openly that we are to an extent working in the dark in relation to this matter because of the sheer magnitude of the process that we would have to go through to be able to check out thoroughly the contention that what we have before us faithfully mirrors or copies those documents which it seeks to replace. To a large extent we take on faith from the Minister that the job has been properly done, but there are those outside who beg to differ, who are very concerned and who have talked about a month's delay, two months delay and further consultation before they would be prepared to put their *imprimatur* to what this Parliament is being asked to do today and another place in the next week or so. For those reasons I look forward very much to whatever assurances the Minister can give when he closes this debate.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I wish to comment only briefly on this matter, which is a very important one for the South Australian community. I wish to raise a note of concern about the way in which it has been handled by the Government. I think that there is probably no more important matter that should be more thoroughly considered by our community than the laws relating to planning. Those laws directly impinge upon the quality of life of every South Australian. There is a great deal of interest in the community concerning what happens in any neighbourhood. My experience is that that is the most pressing concern for people in the community: they are concerned about noise in their area, they are concerned about traffic, and they are concerned about the sort of buildings that are to be erected there, as well as being concerned when buildings are to be demolished. People are concerned about a whole range of issues that affect them, one way or another, by our control over development.

The Opposition has had only a few weeks to consider these substantial documents. Whilst my colleague, the Opposition spokesman on planning, has pointed out in some detail the genesis of this legislation, it is nevertheless our responsibility on this side of the House to represent the views of the community where we believe that there may be some adverse result from the bringing down of a new law. My concern is that, as has been expressed by my colleague, we have before us probably the best job that can be done with the technical information within the control of the centralised planning authority but, of course, the repercussions of that in the community have not, in my view, been ascertained or tested. I have received many representations from members of the legal profession, from councils and from individuals in the community who have pointed out to me the problems with this legislation. Indeed, they are matters of grave concern, and I do not know how we tackle them in the process that we have before us. I do not know how a single member or a group of members of Parliament in a given time can properly assess this plan and make a useful contribution on it in this House. That is not our role, but there should have been a proper public consultation process on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr CRAFTER: There have been some discussions, certainly, in the community. But, given the nature of this

matter, there should have been a much more thorough and comprehensive public participation programme. I think members will find that in the months and years to come there will be considerable criticism and considerable cost and an unacceptable degree of uncertainty in our planning laws in this State. I hope that that is not the case but I fear, on the information that has been given to me, which I believe is sincere and objective, that that may well be the result. I would not like to see our planning courts bogged down with litigation. I would not like to see developers, who have substantial investments and who could well bring the sort of development to this State and to local communities that is sorely needed, receive this disincentive and take their investment elsewhere or simply turn their investment into less productive areas in the community. As I said, this matter involves a most important aspect of the life of our community, and it particularly affects the economic activities of this State.

I can only conclude from the representations made to me that the participation process has broken down quite severely. This is apparent also from the substantial volumes of information that have been given to us as members of Parliament, with only a few weeks to consider it and discuss it with not only our constituents but also people in the wider community.

In conclusion, I place on record my disappointment with the way in which this matter has been handled and with the way in which the concerns of people in the community have been gathered and considered and given effect to where their concerns are substantiated.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): This is a most important issue. It was a massive task for any department to have undertaken, and having regard to the changes imposed on local government one can understand their apprehension. As has already been pointed out, it is a very difficult change to make, and it is one that has caused concern. I have received representations from the council, and I have seen copies of the submissions it has made to the department.

I understand that the department has made a substantial number of changes to its document. I have found that some members of the council seem to have been appeased, but that others are not quite so happy. It appears that there is still some discussion about this matter and still some disquiet involving the Local Government Association. I look forward to the Minister's reply and to finding out more about the current concern of the Local Government Association. I pay tribute to the department for the way in which it has attempted to carry out this work. Obviously there are problems, but I hope that in the end they can all be overcome.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): Without wishing to prolong the debate I want to express my appreciation to the Minister and the Government for at last compiling documentation that will help local government. I particularly commend the Minister's department, which I know conferred closely with the Minister in looking at this entire programme. I know that the Minister's departmental officers have spent a lot of time working very hard to achieve the aim that has been reached today, and those involved deserve congratulations and recognition.

I had not intended to speak on this debate but I changed my mind after I had listened to the concerns and disappointments expressed by members opposite which were in very general terms. The member who has just resumed her seat has just expressed her concern about the Local Government Association. However, none of the members opposite spelt out what those concerns were.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Oh, hang on.

Mr RANDALL: Neither of the previous two speakers, whom I was in the House to hear, spelt out the concerns that the solicitors brought forward. No doubt the lead speaker of the Opposition did this, but if the previous two speakers were simply reinforcing those concerns they did not make that clear. It was stated that the legal profession made representations to them about its concern, but those concerns were not detailed. Obviously, there will always be someone coming forward expressing concerns about new legislation.

The challenge relates to whether we are ready to go ahead, whether we are ready to take steps towards change. I believe that the Government has quite rightly taken such steps. We now have an enlightened document in this House which will be of major benefit to developers. From my own experience in local government, as a councillor, I am sure that councils will be glad to at last have a planning document which they can easily understand and which will be of benefit to them in handling inquiries from residents.

I believe that it is time local government took up the challenge that the Government has given it. The Government has passed on to local government some major responsibilities concerning planning, and I believe that local government should take up the challenge. With local government elections coming up, we will see a rise in the number of people aspiring to become councillors and representatives of the wards in which they live. Their main aim would be to make sure that their local councils take up the challenge that the Government has offered. If local government does not take up the challenge, it will soon lose the responsibilities it has been given, because someone else will take up that challenge. Far be it for me to say that the Government should take up the challenge, because I believe that local government should be doing so and that it should be pursuing and grappling with the problems of planning and then recommending to Government what it would like done.

The document produced comprises the challenge to local government. Such a document provides an opportunity for local government to take up the issues involved. I do not want to canvass what is contained in the plan, because I believe that that would be quite out of order. I believe that consultation has taken place concerning the form in which this plan was to be presented. Consultations took place over a period of 12 months involving local government and all other interested bodies. I believe that the plans contained in the books have been thought through and have gone through the whole phase of public consultation before all the material was collated into one package for ease of operation.

There is no need to go through all the complaints concerning local government planning areas, etc. Of course, the good thing is that matters will be made easier for future local council changes and for changes to supplementary planning areas, and the plans can easily be upgraded or removed, thus keeping the situation up to date. That will be a plus for those in the development field who want to know what the latest rules and regulations are relating to development. These will be benefits and will make it easier for major developers to operate in South Australia. I want to commend the Minister and his officers for presenting a suitable plan to Parliament, one which I believe will be of much use to the community at large.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): A criticism that I would make concerns the lack of time allowed to study the plan. Obviously, most of us look after the little section comprising our electorate. I have had a brief look at the proposal, but I have not had time to study it, and I have not had time to discuss the matter with members of the local council in my area. It appears that it has been very well done. The shadow Minister applauded the department, and from what

I have seen of the proposal I would support his comments. I would have liked more time to study it, because I represent a very complex electorate. I suggest that it is one of the most diverse and complex electorates in this State (although I am sure that someone would be prepared to debate that matter with me).

The area that I represent contains industrial areas comprising light industry and heavy industry and there are housing areas coming under all the types of zoning regulations. There are new projects planned and the Housing Trust has just undertaken to construct two large developments on the site of the old Osborne Drive-In Theatre and the Zinc Corporation camp. I would have liked more time to discuss the points involved with the members of the Port Adelaide council, but I did not have that opportunity. I would ask the Minister to provide me with the section of the report that is relevant to my electorate so that I can study it. By and large, it appears that the document has been well produced. However, as I have said, as I have not had time to study it, I cannot criticise it. However, I support the proposal.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the plan as submitted and I appreciate all the work that has been put into compiling it. I realise some of the difficulties involved. I think comments have already been made to the effect that corrections will need to be made because of matters that could not possibly be taken into account in the time and with the material available to those who had the difficult task of compiling the plan.

I have always had a few doubts about the new plan. If there are some errors in the plan I hope they are major enough to cause the plan to be taken back to the agencies of the Department of Local Government to be corrected in the near future. I refer to major errors because I have learned from experience that Governments, Parliaments and departments encompassed together are seldom concerned about errors, faults or omissions that affect a small minority of the community. The attitude towards individual property owners seems to be that they can be pushed to one side, that they are not important, and that common sense should not prevail. I am not saying that as a reflection on any individual; I am part of that process and therefore the reflection is also on me.

There is no doubt at all that unless the faults, errors or omissions are of some significance whereby the community that will be affected adversely is able to bring political weight to bear, there is a tendency to avoid making the corrections to improve the situation. I say this so that it can be put on the record. Problems will arise in the future; that is inevitable, and I hope that anyone handling the process will not deny that, because if they did they would be foolish. If a democracy is to work, the minorities have to be looked after, even though it is the majority that elects the Government.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): At the outset, I thank the members on both sides who have contributed to the debate. It has been pleasing, particularly, to hear the comments made in regard to the magnificent work done by the officers of my department in what has been a massive task to consolidate this plan. I am certainly aware of the amount of time and effort that has gone into this project. When the consolidated plan was first discussed it was recognised that it would involve a considerable amount of effort. We were anxious to be able to introduce the new system as quickly as possible, recognising the need for consultation, but as a Government we were anxious for the new system to be able to work as soon as possible. It was recognised at an early stage that there would be a need for the effort that has gone into this task by

officers of my department, and those people who have been involved in this work, particularly over the last few months, I certainly commend them for their efforts.

Much has been said by those who have contributed to the debate about consultation, and it has been suggested by some members that there has not been adequate consultation; in fact, there has been a lengthy period of consultation. The consultation programme for the consolidation of the development plan was designed to do many things. The first was to stage the release of parts of the development plan over a period of four months to ensure that ample opportunity was given for public comment on each part of the plan, and also to provide the department with sufficient time to assess the comments received. I must apologise to the member for Semaphore if he did not have the opportunity to be able to note his own section. I will be only too happy to make that available to him this afternoon.

The second area with which we were concerned in regard to consultation was to provide each council with five weeks for its comments on that part of the plan pertinent to its area. It has been made clear to me by some councils that they would have liked more time but, as I said earlier, the Government was of the opinion that it was necessary to have the system working within a specified period, and it was felt that five weeks would be adequate.

Lastly, we were keen to ensure that each council had at least one scheduled council meeting two weeks after the commencement of the consultation period for its relevant part of the plan. Furthermore, councils were invited to make direct contact with departmental officers, and the staff of the department had regular meetings with representatives of the Local Government Association. A little later I will refer to a resolution that came out of a Local Government Association executive meeting this morning. I can assure the House that there has been a considerable amount of consultation. A consultative committee was set up at the earliest stage of the proposal to introduce this legislation. I appreciate the involvement of Mr Hullick, from the Local Government Association, on that committee, along with the many others who have been involved.

The department also provided the Local Government Association with funds so that a private planning consultant could comment on the development plan on behalf of the association, and special arrangements were made with councils to accommodate late submissions. In all, 116 written submissions were received. The format and the presentation of a number of policies were amended as a result of the submissions, the majority of which were well prepared. The Department of Environment and Planning is presently conducting an intensive education programme to familiarise councils with all aspects of the new planning system, and to ensure that councils are properly prepared for the introduction of the new system.

As has been said many times, much has been achieved during this consultation period, but one of the areas of great benefit has been the education process that has taken place. I was amazed when we first started this consultation period and when we were dealing with a proposed Bill, at that time, the development plan and the regulations, to find that many people did not have a good understanding of the present system of planning, and that made it all the more difficult to compile the new legislation.

I believe that, as a result of that consultation, various organisations and local government have benefited. I might say that it was not only local government that was part of that consultation: I have been very pleased to be able to work with representatives of the development industry, conservation groups, people with knowledge of financial matters, and many others who have been part of an excellent consultative committee and who have helped during this period.

All in all, there certainly has been a considerable amount of consultation.

The member for Baudin and the member for Mitcham mentioned the present situation in regard to the executive of the Local Government Association. I was notified that a resolution came from the executive of that association this morning to the effect that it could not support the plan until the concerns that were raised with one member council by its legal advisers were satisfied. Since receiving that notification, there have been discussions with departmental officers and the council's legal advisers, and I believe that as a result of those negotiations the problem has been resolved. I was very anxious that that should happen and, again, the officers of the department made it their business to see to that matter immediately it was raised. I cannot say that I have formal confirmation from the association, but I am led to believe that that is the case at this stage.

I want to refer briefly to some of the matters that were raised, particularly by the member for Baudin, so that he can understand the facts. It is a complex situation, and I would be the first to suggest that I have found it difficult in some areas to be 100 per cent certain of the mechanics involved. The honourable member mentioned the possibility of conflict between the subordinate legislation and the development plan. I am aware that that matter has been raised on a number of occasions at the meetings that have been held with local government and various other people and organisations.

I want to emphasise (and I am sure that the honourable member will recognise) that the development plan is a mixture of fact and law. The Act (section 47, I think) refers to permitted and prohibited uses in the development plan and states that, where the development plan states that there are permitted and prohibited uses, that is exactly the situation. All other principles in the plan, of course, are of an advisory nature. For example, they are matters for the planning authorities to consider.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: For consent.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, when making decisions on consent applications. The honourable member also referred to the legality of the plan. I take this opportunity, because this matter has been raised outside the House (and I referred to it briefly when I introduced this motion and in the course of discussions with the Local Government Association particularly and other interested bodies in regard to the draft plan) and concern has been expressed that potential exists for legal challenges to the validity of the plan. I would suggest that this concern stems from the vagueness of the term 'based upon' in section 40 of the Act.

There has been much discussion of this matter, and to ensure that any doubt concerning the status of the development plan as the principal source of policy under the new Act is removed, as I indicated earlier, I intend, following approval of the development plan by this Parliament, to introduce a Bill to amend the Planning Act, 1982, by repealing subsection (2) of section 40 and replacing it with the words 'If the development plan is subject to amendment under this part, the document declared by resolution of both Houses of Parliament to be the development plan'. The advice we have received since the decision was made that that amendment should be made has indicated that that will overcome any of the problems that were first considered in regard to the legality of the plan.

Where in the development plan there is a conflict between a general structured plan and a detailed zoning map, as was indicated by the honourable member, the more detailed map takes precedence. In practice, I am advised that there is no difficulty in interpreting which plan is more detailed where there is some conflict between the two. I can only say that we have sought advice about that. I might add that

we have worked very closely with the Crown Law Office on a number of these issues and that is the advice I have received in regard to this matter.

The honourable member also said that it had been suggested to him by some of the legal representatives that the new plan and, indeed, the new Act may bring about an increase in litigation. I do not believe that anyone would be silly enough to suggest that it will be all plain sailing. I would certainly hope that that would be the case and we have done our homework to ensure that that is so; however, it is a new project and new legislation, and it may be that some litigation will result. When one looks at what happened when the present Planning and Development Act was introduced some 15 years ago and recognises the immense amount of litigation that came from that, one can only hope most sincerely that we do not have a similar situation in regard to this legislation. I do not think for one moment that that would be the case, but I would not be silly enough to suggest that some litigation may not result from the new legislation.

Regarding Part IV, in relation to standards, in the regulations under the Planning and Development Act standards were legally relevant to permitted uses only. Nonetheless, they were used by some councils as a general guide to the conditions which could be imposed at the discretion of councils upon consent applications. There is nothing in the new Act, regulations or the development plan to prevent councils continuing to do that. However, I must emphasise that an applicant is entitled, as he was under the old Act or under the present Planning and Development Act, to challenge such conditions before the Appeals Tribunal.

The non-inclusion of Part IV standards in the consent use principles in the development plan is merely complying with the legal effect of the regulations under the old Act, notwithstanding the inclination of councils to attempt to use these standards for consent uses. As an example, the member for Baudin dealt with the reference to the metropolitan fire service in the seventh schedule. I suggest that that reference does not alter the policy content of the current zoning regulations in the development plan. Perhaps I may have the opportunity to discuss that with the honourable member further but I understand from what he has said that it certainly does not alter the policy content of the current zoning regulations.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The present position, I understand, is that they have to get permission from local government. The new position, I understand, is that they will not have to formally get it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I can perhaps take that matter up further, but I understand that what I have said is the case. The honourable member also referred to problems associated with supplementary development plans that may be part of the way through the current system or that were authorised too late to be included in the initial compilation. Let me make quite clear that no supplementary plans that were authorised too late, or that were part of the way through the current system, and were not included in the initial compilation of the plan will lapse. I do not know who has suggested that that may be the case, but it is not. They will not lapse. They will either be incorporated in the plan by Parliament, by section 42 (and I indicated that when I moved the motion), or they will proceed under the new provision, under section 5 of the Act. I would not want any misunderstanding by councils. We have attempted to make the position quite clear, because I understand the concern that councils would have if they felt that that was the case.

I believe that they were the main areas of concern raised by members. I am pleased to hear that they will support the passage of this motion and its going to another place. I reiterate that it is a very important part of the new planning

system and I believe that having a consolidated plan for the State of South Australia is a magnificent achievement. Much credit, as I have said, needs to go to the people who have been involved in making this consolidated plan possible. I thank members who have made contributions to the debate and look forward to the resolution going before another place.

Motion carried.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 August. Page 462).

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): The Opposition supports this Bill and has raised a number of matters of concern of a more practical nature in another place. I presume that the Attorney-General is in the process of replying to them. The only further information I seek from the Minister who is handling the Bill in this House is how much it is anticipated this will cost the State. I understand that the Government would carry out some assessment of cost to the State of this measure before it introduced it. The Minister may be able to tell me this during the debate but I would like to know the justification for granting six months paid leave to a master of the Supreme Court before he leaves. I can see the justification for sabbatical leave while he is in office but I see little justification for granting leave prior to retirement, particularly when that leave can be taken out in a lump sum payment. If we are going to be honest about this matter, if this is a gratuitous payment to judicial officers prior to their retirement, we ought to call it that and say it is that. It is our duty to be honest about these things and it should not be clothed under other language. If it is to be a form of sabbatical leave, that ought to be said and it ought to be spelt out as to what that sabbatical leave will involve and how the State will benefit from such a payment. I understand that masters of the Supreme Court are paid the equivalent of judges of the Local and District Criminal Court. The amount involved is substantial indeed: it is not insignificant. I would be pleased if the Minister would clarify this point for the House.

I add my concern about this method of payment or this style of assistance to members of the judiciary, considering that, when persons are appointed to positions such as master of the Supreme Court, they are senior members of the profession or the Public Service and they do not hold office for long periods of time. If there is a provision now that they shall receive sabbatical leave and a further six months leave with pay prior to their retirement, the cost to the taxpayer will be quite substantial. I believe that a master should receive the benefits that other judicial officers of similar status receive and that there should be no difference between their benefits of service as holders of judicial office and those that judges of the Supreme Court currently enjoy. I understand that this measure will bring that about. However, I would like answers to the queries that I have raised, now or in the future.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I am sure that the honourable member would have read the second reading explanation given when this Bill was introduced. He has said that he feels that the masters should be treated as judicial officers. I think the point was made that, with the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Administration of Courts and Tribunals) Act of 1981, and with the establishment of the Courts Department, the status and duties of masters of the Supreme Court were altered.

That meant that the masters were freed from their former administrative duties and did in fact become purely judicial officers. Consonant with that alteration to the status and duties of masters, provision was made in the Statutes Amendment (Courts and Tribunals) Act for the appointment and terms of service of masters similar to those of judges. Those provisions would apply to masters appointed in the future. However, the conditions of service of existing masters are determined as though they were officers appointed under the Public Service Act.

Rather than be considered to be a bonus, I believe the Attorney-General did make it quite clear that since the role of the masters was purely that of a judicial function and to bring the payments and entitlements in line with the entitlements which would be theirs, had they been appointed under judicial conditions, this was simply to redress something which had not been attended to back in 1981 when the amendment to the legislation was effected. I do not consider it to be a bonus; it is something which should have been done back in 1981 to bring members of the Judiciary in line, so as to be treated with members of the Judiciary rather than having a few treated as public servants when in fact their Public Service administrative role was no longer applicable. The second question I am unable to address, as to the precise cost to the taxpayer of this measure. I will undertake to obtain that information as soon as I can for the honourable member from the Attorney-General.

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

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SURVIVAL OF CAUSES OF ACTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): From time to time I have commented in the House on the lack of open space for recreation and other purposes in metropolitan Adelaide, as broadly defined. There are at least two reasons for that. In the more highly developed older suburbs very often our ancestors did not have the foresight to set aside a good deal of open space and that is a problem. An example is the area around the eastern end of the electorate of my colleague, the member for Unley. A good deal of the electorate of Mitchell would be another example, and so we could go on, where there is not the capacity to create open space except by massive purchase of properties and demolition of those properties, which is not a proposition in either economic or political terms.

Secondly, in areas such as the one I represent, where there is a good deal of open space, often that is about all there is. There are acres and acres of area that was once under vines and which is now uneconomic or areas which have been used for pasture or agricultural purposes of one sort or another. They are now sparsely used and often appear to be little more than weedy paddocks. The sort of developed recreation space has not taken place although there is the potential for it. Tennis courts and ovals have not been provided. One could not altogether call it nature's wonderland, as there are neither the trees nor the topography to permit that sort of description and that sort of less intensive recreation use. It therefore seems important that in metropolitan Adelaide, where we do have areas of open space, that we should do whatever we can to retain them in that condition.

This morning we learnt of one of these areas, which, for the most part will, in the next few years, be lost to open space. I refer to the Penfold Grange Estate, an area which has been used for viticulture for many years. This is disappointing to people who are committed to the sort of values I am espousing here, particularly as the Premier, as recently as 16 February this year, expressed his concern that some of the areas should remain as open space and should be retained for its traditional use. On 16 February the Premier stated:

In recent times the Government has had a number of discussions with senior executives from Penfolds on the future of the vineyards. We have indicated strongly that we would like to see the area retained as vineyards.

Yesterday, when the Premier referred to the preservation of the Grange, it became obvious that he was referring only to the Grange cottage on the estate as if that were the only important item requiring preservation. However, he did remark that he would like to see the small area which still remains under vines to be preserved. There is, as I have already indicated, a strong reason why this open space area should be retained in that form as precious little of it is available. It is not simply the recreation or open space value of the area—it is also a matter of aesthetics. There is little doubt that people who live to the immediate west of that area value the open nature of the area because of the vista provided by the vines on those lower slopes of what eventually becomes the hills face zone.

So, I am sure that many people were shocked to learn that developers are now to get their hands on this showpiece property. It is all very well to say that we are glad that the Grange cottage is to be available to the National Trust. I suggest that the area around it is of even greater value for preservation in its present condition than is the cottage itself. Of course, it is true that this area has been at risk for some time. I believe that the zoning of the area is Residential 1 and, therefore, in the event of any sale it was obvious that, unless the Government was prepared to act in some way or another, it would be developed for residential purposes. Nobody seems to have shown a great deal of interest in getting it rezoned.

Mr Evans interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, the zoning in its present form has persisted for quite some time. Maybe the member for Fisher can enlighten me as to whether this area was at some risk for development during the period of the Labor Government. I am not aware that that was the case, but my sense of history may be defective at that point. Certainly, I have to express my disappointment that this area is now to be developed. I think it acts as some sort of warning to us that we should look closely at what remains of open space around Adelaide, whether it be still used for some form of horticultural or viticultural purpose. Indeed, now that the member for Fisher has set my mind working

at a faster pace, I wonder what the study that former Premier Dunstan had initiated about the viticultural areas around Adelaide had to say about this area.

I suppose that I should have checked it before I came into the House and spoke about it, but I imagine that that study said that this area, along with the areas out of St Agnes and other places like that, should be retained for horticultural purposes and not be developed, irrespective of what zoning regulations applied.

As I have a little time left to me, I will raise another matter, because it may be some time before I again get the chance to speak in a grievance debate. There has been an exchange in the House recently between the Minister of Lands and myself concerning the problems that the residents of the Port Parham and Webb Beach area claim to have with the defence establishment and the use of an area adjacent to where they live as a test firing range. I want to probe a couple of the points that the Minister made in response to one or two things that I said. He claimed that it is all the fault of the Labor Government, as Webb Beach was subdivided at the time of the Labor Government. The Minister conveniently forgets that Port Parham has been there almost since Colonel Light first cruised along this coast. Certainly, when I was a youngster, I had friends who had a shack at Port Parham, well before the days of the Labor Government. So, people have been living in that area for quite some time.

The anomaly that has now been shown up is that, when the Army gazettes the area, it gazettes the area in which these people live. It is not simply the traditional range; nor is it the area of the gulf immediately off shore from where these people live; nor is it merely the beach. It is where they live. So, these people are breaking the law if they occupy their homes during a time of testing. I am not too sure whether the testing has yet begun; there was to be a week's delay. The gazetting was to have taken place last week, but that did not occur, possibly because of these on-going matters.

The other thing that the Minister said was in relation to what he would take up with the Federal Government. He said initially that whatever these people put to him he was prepared to put to the Federal Government or that he would support their contention. Then he withdrew from that and merely said that he would act as a channel of communication. I wonder which of those statements he means. I think he owes it to these people on whose behalf he was speaking to the Minister for Defence to make clear whether he will be supporting their contentions before the Minister, on the one hand, or whether he will merely act as some sort of channel of communication between the two. It is important that the State Government makes its real wishes known in these matters. These people on their own—

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): Although I intended to speak about another matter, I will instead discuss the topic of open space, which was previously raised by another member, although I will not necessarily refer specifically to the areas that he mentioned; that can be done at some other time. The honourable member reminded me of the concern which I have expressed in the past and which I still have regarding open space and the cost of maintaining it, the cost of developing it, sometimes for public use, so that it is a reasonable sort of asset for the neighbouring community. One refers also to the problems that it can create for neighbours if it is upgraded. It is like most things in society: most communities want a public toilet so that in case of an emergency they can use it, but they want it far enough away from their own property so that they cannot see it, smell it, or hear the chain pulled or the button pressed.

More and more I am developing the attitude that our present society will be recognised in future years as a selfish one. It is a society that wants everything but does not really want to make a contribution in work effort, in many cases, to develop the community facilities; nor does it want to make any sacrifice about the effect that the development of a public facility might have in its community and on its environment. I am talking now strictly about reserves and playing fields.

The member for Baudin made the point that within parts of the inner metropolitan area, except those parts that abound the city parklands or the north parklands, there is a serious shortage of open space area for playing fields or for recreation purposes, where people might want to go for a walk, sit on a park bench, relax, or whatever. He made the point that that land is too expensive to buy today. I suppose that is true because we are short of money. But, if one looks at the actual cost of keeping that land over the years (in other words, the amount of rates and taxes that those property owners have paid to the Government or semi-government organisations over the years), one would find that there has been a considerable benefit in revenue to those bodies. Some people would argue that they had received a service. The service that those people received as residents of that land as against the service that would be provided if it was a parkland or an open space, in cost to the local government authority involves a very small difference, as they would need rubbish bins, toilets and other facilities that would have to be maintained. So, the argument, if it was advanced on economic terms, would not stand up.

I have been concerned about the way that our city has gone, and I do not think that anyone can change it. The member for Baudin mentioned briefly the vineyards in different parts of the city. Of course, the Land Commission was one of the biggest offenders when it acquired some of the old established vineyards that had started to be neglected and set about subdividing, even though there was not a demand for allotments when the subdivisions were started. So, the Land Commission takes part of that blame.

But, what else have we done with a city like Adelaide in developing it? This goes right back to our forefathers. We had some of the best market gardens on the Adelaide Plains with reasonable quantities of underground water at reasonable depths. What did we do? We built on them. What did we do with the best clays that we had in Adelaide for brickmaking? We built on them. What did we do with some of our best sand for building and concrete work? We built on them. So, we committed an error in taking that approach. But, this has happened not only in this country. We find that in Germany they can get sand only by taking it from the sea and washing the salt out for a lot of their concrete work in order to achieve the supplies that they need. I often wonder whether we have drifted in a similar direction.

We need to take an assessment of where we have got the open space and whether we have got too much or too little to enable the local community to maintain it. I find that in the outer fringe areas more and more of the council ratepayers are starting to ask where their rates are being spent and how much it is costing them to maintain all these facilities. For example, there is one council in the southern area which I believe employs something like 48 gardeners or ground persons. That is a lot of people to be employed when one speaks in terms of pay-roll tax and all the other aspects involved, and when one adds that cost to that which must be paid by ratepayers. When an average householder starts looking, as is the case with most councils now, for an average home in those areas, it involves \$300 a home, and in at least one of my council areas that is the case. That cost for an average home is a lot of money, if one adds on water rates, sewerage rates, electricity charges and all the

other charges that the average metropolitan home owner has to meet.

We need to make an assessment of how much open space we should be preserving, and we should ensure that any open space is kept in good order and not neglected and left for snakes, rats or some other vermin which could be a hazard to children. Also, such neglect could lead to a fire risk. We should be conscious of that.

I was condemned a few years ago concerning my attitude towards the hills face zone, but I am happy to repeat it again, regardless of what community attitudes may be. Mine is a personal conviction which has nothing to do with any other person who might be connected with me by way of a political Party. I have always thought that some time in the future people will come along and wonder why parts of the hills were left bare with no shrubs or trees and why no attempt was made to regenerate plant life on such areas, even by those in the community who actively supported regeneration of plant life. I have thought that they would wonder why use had not been made of some of those areas and why some of our market garden areas on the Plains had not been preserved.

Quite often land which is subject to an argument about saving it, land which is already in private ownership and which is in an area zoned for residential purposes, is adjoining the hills face zone, which is a vast open space already preserved by law. One must attempt to understand the sort of philosophy people take regarding such areas.

Over the years I have maintained a policy of having more open space and more natural bushland. I would not go so far as to say I am the only one who has adopted that attitude, but I cannot be attacked for trying to destroy in total those sorts of areas. I find that it is quite a problem when people come to me and say that they do not want a neighbour to clear a piece of bushland or to build a house on a piece of land because they like to look at the land, because usually that land is zoned for the same purposes as is the neighbour's land.

As a society we should be getting to the stage of exempting privately-owned land from all rates and taxes and all charges if the owner is prepared to leave that land in its natural state. Surely that is a fair proposition, even if such land is used for grazing sheep, cows or goats, or whatever. I am concerned about the fact that there will not be enough open space left to satisfy community needs in the future. However, open space land should not be in quantities that are excessive to community needs which would place a burden on the local community.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): Most likely today is one of the saddest days I can remember concerning newspaper reporting in South Australia. I refer to today's *News* (Thursday 26 August 1982) and to the headlines:

After that \$54 000 tourist job . . . Government to probe Dunstan 'Super'. MP prompts Griffin check on eligibility.

The text continues as follows:

The Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, is to investigate the continued payment of a Parliamentary pension to a former South Australia Premier, Mr Dunstan. This follows the appointment yesterday of Mr Dunstan as Victorian Tourism Commission chairman.

I will not mention the names of the two journalists whose names are given adjacent to the article. I take it that the article was written by those two people, but I am not quite sure whether the top executives of the *News* wanted this article put into the newspaper with the headlines I have referred to, as was the case today. I can assure honourable members opposite that the article was a blatant attempt to run down Don Dunstan, who was a great Premier of this State, as was Sir Thomas Playford—I am not one-eyed on these matters. To think that this should have happened

concerning a person's private life! The fact is that I hope that the *News* will print an apology for the article and place it in the same place in the newspaper. This matter has now become news, and there is no doubt that the *News* will go to any lengths to try to belittle a person. I can assure honourable members that during the period of years that I was in Parliament with Don Dunstan, I, as well as other members from both sides of the House, always found him to be a popular person who was very generous and understanding.

With regard to the attitude of the *News* towards Don Dunstan, there has been a hatred throughout the *News* since he became Premier. He was a person willing to argue his point, and that was what made him Premier for so long. I am sure that this is the first time during the course of my political career that any newspaper has gone as far as this. There is no doubt about what has happened. This newspaper has tried to set him up all along the line. I do not care what is said in the *News* about my speech. I will say one thing: this is so blatant that it just does not matter. It is about time that people did their homework about these types of things. I can assure honourable members that the Premier did his homework today before speaking in this House. Also, I must condemn the Hon. Martin Cameron, a member of the Legislative Council, for asking his question concerning this matter. Surely the honourable member would have known what the outcome would be. This matter is now concerning both sides of the House. All of a sudden someone woke up about how it would affect members on the Government side of the House. I do not intend to name them.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am not worried about that. Don Dunstan now has the \$54 000 job, which he thoroughly deserves.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member always bobs in when I am speaking, but I am not worried about him. However, he should condemn a person asking a question like that in the Upper House and how the Premier came forward to shield one of his own staff. I will not name the person concerned. I can assure honourable members that they should be very careful about these matters. I am sure that this was one of the most disgraceful acts in Parliament concerning a person not doing his homework on a matter. Certainly, that person was a Don Dunstan hater, too. If he wants to go to those extremes, he will not be very well liked as far as the Parliament is concerned.

A person's private life is his own business. Whatever I do after I retire from this House is my business: it is not one else's business. As the Premier said today, it is about time that honourable members woke up to the fact that a person's life in this place is not his own, and the honourable member should ought to know that a telephone can ring at all hours of the night and that, when the House is sitting, a person is lucky to get eight hours sleep. We have late sittings as well, not that I condone them, but after all a member is expected to do all these things unless he is lazy.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: Many members of the community do not know exactly how the Parliamentary superannuation scheme works. They seem to think that when members of

Parliament retire they get their pension for nothing. They do not realise that we have to contribute 11.5 per cent of our gross salary to the fund. I am sure honourable members on both sides of the House would agree that over the past 10 to 15 years being a member of this Parliament has been a full-time job. It is hard for us to do anything other than concentrate on our electorates.

We all know how the *News* blows things up out of all proportion. I do not want to waste the time of the House by commenting on the article that appears on the front page of today's *News*, which states:

Mr Griffin said the inquiry would be in response to a question from Mr Martin Cameron (Liberal) in the Legislative Council yesterday. Mr Cameron asked whether Mr Dunstan would forfeit his pension in view of his new Public Service post. Mr Griffin said it probably would be weeks, rather than days, before he had an answer.

Within hours there was a reply. The article continues:

'It's essentially a matter now of getting background,' he said. 'I'm not an expert on the Parliamentary superannuation scheme.' Speaking outside Parliament, Mr Cameron said he would be 'extremely unhappy' if Mr Dunstan retained his pension.

Of course, the honourable gentleman will not be doing anything else when he retires. He has no interests outside the Parliament! The reports states:

'I do not see how he could take a paid position with one Government while receiving a pension from another,' Mr Cameron said.

The Hon. Mr Cameron ought to look after himself, because in both Houses today he was rebuked by the Premier and also by the Hon. Mr Griffin. He deserves all he gets as far as this is concerned. Surely the Attorney-General would know something about the structure of the superannuation scheme, but he said that he knew nothing about it. He had to get himself off the hook today. He made the statement, and he cannot say that he did not. He can refute it if he likes but that is what the newspaper has reported.

We all know that there are two sides to every argument, and it is a fact that today the Government has had to get some of its members out of trouble. It is wise to look before you leap but in this case those members did not look before they leapt. I am sure the Attorney-General is a hater of Don Dunstan—

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I do not want to get into personalities, but it is about time his attitude changed, and I hope that that will happen. When the Hon. Martin Cameron retires, I will be interested to see whether or not he takes another job after he has said that Mr Dunstan should not have taken another paid job. Don Dunstan is held in high esteem not only in South Australia but in other parts of the world. After all, he was a great South Australian. He and his name are known to people all over Australia. I can assure honourable members that the blemish that Martin Cameron sought to put on him was unjustified.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 31 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 August 1982

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SOLAR ENERGY

8. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development:

1. Is the Minister aware of the findings of the report prepared by Frost and Sullivan Inc. (reported on in the March 1982 Issue of *International Construction*) on the solar energy equipment market predictions for the next 10 years?

2. What action has been taken by the Government to familiarise South Australian industry with that report's findings so that companies can consider investment decisions in order to participate in the expected demand for solar energy equipment?

1.

Year 12 Subject	School					
	Craigmore	Elizabeth	Elizabeth West	Fremont	Playford	Smithfield Plains
Classical Studies	1978-80	1978-82	1978-79	—	—	1978-82
Modern European History	1978-80	1978 and 1979	—	1980-82	1978-82	—
Modern World History	—	1979-82	1978 and 1979	—	—	—
Modern History	—	1978-79 SSC	—	—	—	—
Australian History	—	1978-79 and 1981	1980-82	1978-79	—	1978-82
Asian History	—	—	—	—	—	1978 only
Cont. World History/Curr. Events	—	—	1978-79	—	1981-82	—
Modern Studies	—	—	1981-82	—	—	—
Mathematics	1980-82	—	1980 only	1981-82	—	1979-82
Maths I and II	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-81	1978-81
Maths IS	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-81	1978-82
Maths Experience	—	—	—	1981 only	—	1981 only
Computing	1979 and 1981	—	1982 only	1982 only	—	—
Music	1978-82	1978 only	1978 only	—	1978 and 1982	1978
Instrumental Voice	—	—	—	1979-82	—	1978 only
History and Literature	—	—	—	1979-82	1980-82	—
Theory and Practice	—	—	—	1979-82	1980 only	1981 only
Art	1978-82	1979-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1980-82
Design	1979 only	—	1978-82	1978 only	—	—
Technical Drawing	—	—	—	1982 only	—	—
Science	1980-82	—	—	1979-82	—	—
Biology	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82
Chemistry	1978-82	1978 and 1980-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82
Earth Science	—	1978 only	—	—	—	—
Physics	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82
Human Biology	—	—	—	—	1978 only	—
Physiology	—	—	1982	—	—	—
Agriculture	—	—	—	—	—	1981-82
Geology	1978-80	1979-82	1978-81	—	1982 only	1978-79 and 1982
Phys. Educ.	—	1978-82	1980 only	1978-80 and 1982	1982	—
Rec. Facilities	1978-79	—	—	—	—	1978-81
Tech. Studies Integrated	1981-82	1982 only	1978-82	1978-82	1981-82	1980 and 1982
Woodwork	1978, 79 and 1981	—	—	1982 only	—	—
Metalwork	1978, 79 and 1981	—	—	1982 only	—	—
Plastics	1978, 79 and 1981	—	—	1982 only	—	—
Photography	1978, 79 and 1981	—	—	1982 only	—	—

1. The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

2. The Department of Mines and Energy maintains contact with solar industry manufacturers (specifically in S.A. the firms of Phillips, Beasleys, Braemer, and Gra-mall) and with solar equipment distributors. Information on market potential is exchanged with such companies.

HIGH SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

43. Mr LYNN ARNOLD asked the Minister of Education:

1. What subjects were offered at Year 12 level at each of the following high schools in each of the past five years: Fremont, Playford, Elizabeth, Elizabeth West, Craigmore and Smithfield?

2. How many students have been in Year 12 at those schools for each of the past five years?

3. What are the projected Year 12 enrolments for those schools for each of the next five years?

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

Year 12 Subject	School					
	Craigmore	Elizabeth	Elizabeth West	Fremont	Playford	Smithfield Plains
Power Technology	—	—	—	—	—	1981 only
Home Economics	1982 only	1982 only	—	1981 and 1982	—	1978 and 1980
Clothing and Textiles	1981 only	—	—	—	—	—
Home Economics 'A' Food Nutrition	1981 only	—	—	—	1978 and 1981	1978, 1981 and 1982
Home Economics 'B' Housing Protection	—	—	—	1980 only	—	—
Batchelor Cooking	1978-81	—	—	1980-81	—	—
Economics	1978-82	1978-82	1978-80	1978-82	1978-82	—
Legal Studies	—	—	—	—	1980-82	—
Commerce	—	—	1981-82	—	—	—
Business Calculations	—	1982 only	—	—	1980 only	—
Business Typing Stages 3-6	1979-81	—	1981-82	1982 only	1978 and 1980	1979-82
Clerical Studies	—	—	—	—	1980 only	—
Shorthand (not Pitman)	—	—	—	—	1981 only	—
Advanced Stenography	—	—	—	—	1980-81	—
Pers. Typing Stages 1-2	1978 only	1982 only	—	1982 only	1978 only	—
Business Studies	—	1982 only	—	—	—	1979-80
Australian Econ. Studies	—	—	—	1980 only	1982 only	—
Early Childhood Devt.	—	—	—	1982 only	—	—
Training Driver Education	1978, 1979 and 1981	1982 only	1981 only	—	—	—
Work Experience	—	—	—	1981-82	—	1981 only
Career Education	1980 only	1982 only	—	—	—	1981 only
General Electives	1978-82	—	—	1981 only	1978 only	—
English	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82
Drama	—	—	1981 only	—	—	—
Film and T.V.	—	—	—	1978 only	—	1980-82
French	1978-80 and 1982	1978-82	1980-81	1980-82	1978-80 and 1982	1981 only
German	1978-82	1978-82	1978 only	1981-82	1978, 1979 and 1981	—
Italian	—	—	—	1982	—	—
Modern Greek	—	—	—	—	—	1981 SSC only
Indonesian	—	—	1978 and 1981	—	—	—
Chinese	—	1978-82	—	—	—	—
Social Studies/Science	Int. 1980-82	1978-81 SSC	—	—	1978 SSC	1979-82 SSC
Human Relations	Int. 1980	—	—	—	—	—
Geography	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82	1978-82
Geography	—	—	1978, 80, 81, 82 SSC	1982 SSC	1978, 81, 82 SSC	1978-79 SSC
Anc. Studies	—	—	—	1978, 1979 and 1981 SSC	—	1979 and 1980 SSC
Anc. History	—	—	1978 SSC	—	—	—

2. The following table gives the number of students in Year 12 in the six secondary schools of the Elizabeth sub-region for the period 1978-82 (Note: each year is given as the number present at opening in February (F) and the number present in the mid-year census in July (J)).

Year		Craigmore	Elizabeth	Elizabeth West	Fremont	Playford	Smithfield Plains	Total
1978	F	86	130	79	25	74	31	425
	J	72	102	71	22	45	24	336
1979	F	91	106	51	41	42	42	373
	J	75	92	45	28	27	33	300
1980	F	71	92	69	50	62	49	393
	J	57	71	39	27	37	38	269
1981	F	59	67	64	54	59	54	357
	J	54	66	45	48	53	50	316
1982	F	52	64	48	62	47	33	306
	J	46	40	42	52	41	21	242

3. Projected Year 12 enrolments 1983-87, Elizabeth secondary schools:

Retention rates into Year 12 vary considerably in the Elizabeth sub-region secondary schools, both annually and by school. This makes projection very difficult and any attempt to project Year 12 figures in the six Elizabeth secondary schools can therefore only be regarded as tentative.

Projected Year 12 enrolments—1983-87 Elizabeth sub-region secondary schools

School	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Craigmore	55	39	47	44	
Elizabeth	60	55	56	49	
Elizabeth West	50	37	32	40	*see note below
Fremont	60	74	62	64	

Projected Year 12 enrolments—1983-87 Elizabeth sub-region secondary schools					
School	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Playford	35	40	40	50	
Smithfield Plains	45	45	40	40	
Total	305	290	277	287	

*Note: 1987 figures are not possible to predict, as the children of that cohort are not yet in secondary school—they will be Year 8 students in 1983.

TEACHER ADVISORY POSITIONS

69. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** asked the Minister of Education: Which advisory positions in the Education Department have been created or dispensed with in each of the past five years?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The number of seconded teacher positions attached to Regional and Central Directorates of the Education Department have been reduced in the past five years by the following numbers (full-time equivalents as at June each year):

1978	No change
1979	17.7
1980	17.8
1981	34.8
1982	44.1

These figures include some positions which are not of a teacher advisory role, but which support particular programmes in an administrative curriculum development capacity.

More than 300 seconded teachers remain. It should be noted that they are allocated to have flexibility to change their duties and new requirements may be met in this way at the discretion of the directors. For this reason, it would be misleading to undertake the laborious exercise of attempting to specify the nature of the reductions.

CONTRACT APPOINTMENTS

72. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many full-time equivalent contract appointments have there been in each of the past five years in the Department of Technical and Further Education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The department did not maintain consolidated records of permanent, temporary and contract staff before 1980. Details for the years 1981 and 1982 (to date) are as follows:

	Funding	1981	1982
	State	49.0	32.0
Commonwealth	80.0	51.8	
Total	129.0	82.8	

73. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What proportion of full-time equivalent new appointments in each of the past five years have been on contract in the Department of Technical and Further Education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The department did not maintain consolidated records of permanent, temporary and contract staff before 1980. Details for the years 1981 and 1982 (to date) are as follows:

Proportion	Funding	1981	1982
Full-time equivalent contract appointments	State	$\frac{49}{57} = 86$ pc	$\frac{32}{33} = 97$ pc
	Commonwealth	$\frac{80}{80} = 100$ pc	$\frac{51.8}{51.8} = 100$ pc
Full-time equivalent appointments	Total	$\frac{129}{137} = 94$ pc	$\frac{83.8}{84.8} = 99$ pc

MOUNT BARKER COLLEGE

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

1. Is it proposed to close the Mount Barker campus of the Adelaide Hills Community College and, if so, when and why?

2. Why has the ceramics workshop been shifted from the Mount Barker campus to the Aldgate campus?

3. What are the numbers of students enrolled in courses at that workshop from the Mount Barker and Aldgate communities, respectively, at this time, and what was the situation applying before the shift?

4. How many courses are now offered by the Adelaide Hills Community College at the Mount Barker campus and the Aldgate campus, respectively?

5. What inter-campus transfers have there been within the Adelaide Hills Community College in each of the past three years?

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

1. No.

2. The ceramics workshop has not yet been shifted to the Aldgate campus. The current building at Mount Barker has suffered termite damage to an extent that it is not reasonable to repair. This year's students should be able to complete this subject at Mount Barker.

3. Ceramics is an elective subject in the art and craft certificate and this year of the 32 students still attending this subject, 5 gave Mount Barker as their home address, 4 travel some distance from regions which are closer to Mount Barker and the remainder live closer to the Aldgate branch.

In the art and craft certificate as a whole, of the 175 individuals enrolled in semester 1, 134 live closer to Aldgate. In the leisure interest classes of the 23 current enrolments, 9 live closer to Aldgate.

4. In the first half of the 1982 academic year, 45 and 53 courses were offered at Mount Barker and Aldgate respectively. Of this number 18 and 40 respectively received sufficient enrolments to commence classes.

5. A balanced programme of technical and further education to the whole hills region is the aim of the Department of TAFE and the college administration. The Aldgate branch was first used in 1980 when new classes were commenced at this location and six rural studies subjects and the weaving and upholstery subjects were transferred from Mount Barker to Aldgate.

No other subjects have been transferred from Mount Barker to Aldgate, all have been offered in both locations or are new subjects to the college. Three rural studies subjects have been returned to their previous venue in Mount Barker, the Mount Barker High School which was undergoing a building programme in 1980.

TREE PLANTING

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

1. Why does the Commissioner of Highways not favour the planting of tall trees on median strips less than 10 metres

in width and what particular hazards is it assumed are presented to the motorist by such trees?

2. Are all species of tree used by the Highways Department equally subject to this opinion?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In general, it is not Highways Department practice to plant trees in medians of 5 metres or less in width. The Highways Department considers that landscaping, including tree planting, is an integral part of road design and aims at producing a road landscape appropriate to the particular road project. The decision as to whether to plant trees in a median, and if so which species, depends on many factors, e.g. the underlying soil conditions, damage to the road pavement by the tree roots, and the presence of Telecom, S.A. Gas Company, ETSA and Engineering and Water Supply Department services, particularly where sewers are involved. The following 'risk' factors arising from the presence of trees in medians are also taken into account:

Impaired vision for motorists at road junctions, intersections and other breaks in the median; impaired vision for, and of, pedestrians crossing the road; the likelihood of more serious property damage and/or personal injury arising from accidents involving out of control vehicles; and the risk through falling tree limbs.

GAS FIELDS

92. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How many South Australian firms have won tenders for contracts at Stony Point and Moomba gas fields in respect of current operations, what is the value of such contracts and how many employees will be engaged as a result of these contracts?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Twenty-five South Australian firms have won tenders for contracts at Stony Point and Moomba gas fields in respect of current operations. The value of these contracts is \$65 400 000 and 914 employees have been engaged from South Australia as a result.

STONY POINT AND MOOMBA

93. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How many interstate firms have won tenders for contracts at Stony Point and Moomba gas fields in respect of current operations, what is the value of such contracts and how many employees will be engaged as a result of these contracts?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Seven interstate firms have won tenders for contracts at Stony Point and Moomba gas fields in respect to current operations.

The value of these contracts is \$65 400 000 and 213 employees have been engaged from interstate as a result.

It is significant that two of the seven contracts which account for \$49 000 000 are for specialist work, that is, design and construction of the tankage and jetty. Whilst this expertise was not available in South Australia a large portion of the labour has been from this State.

TOILET FACILITIES

99. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What specifications exist to ensure that adequate toilet facilities exist at public sporting venues such as Football Park and, in particular, what requirements are laid down as to the provision of consumable commodities such as soap, paper towels and toilet paper, what requirements exist for the collection of used paper towel so that the upper

towel receptacles do not overflow onto the floor and when were the facilities at Football Park and other SANFL venues last inspected during a football match to ensure that adequate standards are being met?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Football Park and ovals at Adelaide, Norwood, Richmond, Thebarton and Elizabeth are used as venues for public entertainment other than sport and are licensed pursuant to the provisions of the Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1972. Ovals at Prospect, Glenelg, Woodville and Unley, used solely for sport, are exempt by virtue of Section 4A (1) of the said Act.

The specifications for toilet facilities in places of public entertainment are set out in Regulation 48 of the Places of Public Entertainment Regulations, 1973. There are no regulations as to the provision of consumable commodities such as soap, paper towels and toilet paper or for the collection of used paper towels.

No inspection of Football Park or other South Australian National Football League venues have been made by officers of the Licensed Premises Division during a football match. All complaints concerning public health, safety and convenience in places of public entertainment are investigated and appropriate action is taken. In addition, the Health Act provides generally that insanitary conditions should not exist. This legislation is administered through local boards of health who are the appropriate bodies to approach with respect to inspections under the Act.

CRIME

111. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What evidence has been collated by the police concerning the possibility of a correlation between the existence of pedestrian subways at suburban railway stations and crime and vandalism levels in the localities of those stations?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: No studies of this nature have been undertaken by the Police Department nor is the type of data required to undertake such a study isolated in the normal statistical collection process.

RALPH REPORT

114. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What form of consultation is the Government participating in or initiating with regard to the Ralph Committee Report on Management Education released by the Federal Minister of Education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government has consulted with the Elton Mayo School of Management and the Australian Institute of Management on the Ralph Report. In addition, the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia has tendered its advice. The Government has replied to the request from the Commonwealth Minister for Education for comment on the Ralph Report.

In a joint submission with the Australian Institute of Management (S.A.), the S.A. Institute of Technology, and the Board of Management of the Elton Mayo School, The Government has requested that the role of the Elton Mayo School be developed (i) by means of any special funding which may be applied as a result of the Ralph Report, (ii) by the establishment of the school as a regional management school (if that designation is introduced), and (iii) by maintenance of the school's MBA programme. Further consultation will be held with the Commonwealth Minister when his Government's decisions on the report are announced.

ASSISTED STUDENTS

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

1. How many applications were received under the Government Assisted Students Scheme (or its precursor, the Free Books Scheme) in each of the past five years?

2. What levels of staffing and support were available in each of those years for the processing of those applications?

3. What changes in guidelines have applied to the scheme during the period?

4. How many applications were rejected in each of the past five years?

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

1. The following number of applications were received—

School Year	Applications Received
1977	11 987
1978	14 046
1979	16 229
1980	18 313
1981	20 039
1982 (to date)	20 450

2. The Government Assisted Students Section has been staffed by two permanent clerical officers in each of the years 1977 to 1982 and, in addition, five temporary officers were employed to assist with the peak work load which occurs between November and May. In the past three years, one of the temporary officers has continued to be employed until August.

3. No changes have been made to the guidelines during the past five years. However, the means test level against which applications are assessed has been adjusted each year to keep pace with cost of living increases.

4. Application forms are submitted on behalf of all school going children of a family; therefore, it is students who are rejected and not applications. The number of students approved and rejected in each of the past five years are—

	Approved	Rejected
1977	26 799	2 623
1978	30 569	2 024
1979	33 651	2 282
1980	36 070	2 464
1981	37 078	3 218
1982 (to date)	36 503	3 450

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

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

1. What was the print run and total cost of the first edition of the book *South Australia*?

2. What was the print run and total cost of the second edition?

3. Which Minister authorised the publication of each edition?

4. How many copies of each edition have been sold and how many given away free of charge?

5. Are supplies of the second edition still available?

6. Who authorised the production of a third edition of 100 000 copies?

7. What is the intended distribution of this edition?

8. What was its total cost, including all editorial work, typesetting, colour printing, binding and distribution?

9. Why was the second edition not stocked at the State Information Centre?

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

1. (a) The print run of the first edition of the book *South Australia* was 20 000 soft covers, 1 500 case bound.

(b) The total cost of the first edition was \$71 653.74.

2. (a) The print run of the second edition of the book was 22 500 soft covers, 2 500 Japanese, and 1 500 case bound.

(b) The total cost of the second edition was \$62 355.56.

3. The Premier authorised publication of each edition.

4. The majority of all copies of the first two editions of the book were made available to appropriate bodies free of charge for promotional purposes. A small charge was made to a few people who purchased the book for private purposes (about 100).

5. No. There may be a few in some Government departments, but I am satisfied that all copies of the book have been placed to advantage by the State Promotion Unit.

6. The Premier on advice from Cabinet authorised production of the third edition.

7. This publication constitutes the basis of our promotional campaign overseas, interstate and locally. In its original form it replaced a wide range of Government publications which was produced with intermittent frequency. The book will be distributed widely in accordance with normal practice, i.e. overseas, interstate and locally and will be made available to year 7 school students as well as being used for various promotions in connection with the opening of international facilities at Adelaide Airport.

8. Total cost of production of the third edition was \$155 187. No financial provision has been made for distribution. It has been the practice in the past for those organisations wishing copies of the book to collect them themselves.

9. Copies of the book were not for sale at the State Information Centre. Officers at the centre were asked to refer *bona fide* promotional inquirers to the State Promotion Unit.

BADEN PATTINSON KINDERGARTEN

141. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the reappointment of the half-time teacher aide which has been made to the Baden Pattinson Kindergarten, Glenelg North, for the third term be continued in 1983 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Enrolment data in all Kindergarten Union and affiliate kindergartens will be reviewed in September 1982; 1983 staffing will be based on those data.

APPRENTICES

145. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What findings resulted from the investigation into the attendance patterns of apprentices in the South-East and the Riverland with regard to the examination of the relative contributions of block release or local class methods of apprenticeship training and what action has been or is expected to be taken as a result of these findings?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The investigation referred to is funded by the evaluative studies programme of the Tertiary Education Commission in Canberra, which commenced on 26 October 1981. The project to date has not yet been completed. An analysis of data output of the first of the

project's three surveys has only recently been commenced after a detailed period of questionnaire design, application and coding preparation, and results are not yet available. It

is anticipated that the project will be completed by the end of November 1982. Its findings and their implications will be considered by departmental management at that time.