

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday 4 August 1983

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. T.M. McRae) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.9 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.47 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.48 to 2.15 p.m.]*

**GOVERNOR'S SPEECH**

**The SPEAKER:** I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

**PETITION: FLOOD RELIEF APPEAL**

A petition signed by 84 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allocate an additional \$2 000 000 to the District Council of Angaston Chairman's flood relief appeal was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

**PETITION: ELECTRICITY CONCESSION**

A petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to extend the electricity account concession to single unemployed persons was presented by Mr Trainer.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: POLICE HANDGUNS**

Petitions signed by 506 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject any change in policy on the wearing of exposed handguns by the Police Force were presented by Messrs Becker and Meier.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: BUS SERVICES**

A petition signed by 227 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to direct the State Transport Authority to implement route 552 as a full service and redirect either route 541 or 542 to travel from St Agnes to Tea Tree Plaza and return via Hancock and Smart Roads was presented by Mr Ashenden.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: PRESCRIBED CONCENTRATION OF ALCOHOL**

Petitions signed by 222 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reduce the prescribed concentra-

tion of alcohol to .05 per cent were presented by the Hons B.C. Eastick, J.D. Wright, and D.C. Wotton, and Messrs Lewis and Rodda.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: ALCOHOL ADVERTISING**

A petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to ban alcohol advertising from commercial television and radio was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

**PETITION: RUNDLE MALL EATING FACILITIES**

A petition signed by 2 266 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to maintain the outdoor eating facilities in Rundle Mall as they currently exist, rescind its decision to terminate the licence of Mr Peter Tam, and investigate the establishment of further outdoor eating areas in Rundle Mall was presented by the Hon. T.H. Hemmings.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: MARIHUANA**

Petitions signed by 167 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation which will legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana were presented by Messrs Becker and Evans.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: DOVER HIGH SCHOOL**

A petition signed by 344 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Education not to close Dover High School was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

**PETITION: WALKERS FLAT TO MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD**

A petition signed by 97 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State and Federal Governments to provide finance to seal the Walkers Flat to Murray Bridge road on the eastern side of the Murray River was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: MEAT SALES**

Petitions signed by 2 733 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by the Hons R.K. Abbott, D.C. Brown, W.E. Chapman, B.C. Eastick, R.G. Payne, J.W. Slater, M.M. Wilson, and J.D. Wright, Mrs Appleby, and Messrs Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Evans, Gregory, Groom, Gunn, Klunder, Lewis, Mathwin, Mayes, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, and Trainer.

Petitions received.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

North Adelaide School of Art and Craft—Upgrading.  
Stirling-Heathfield Water Supply—Augmentation.  
Ordered that reports be printed.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*By Command—*

- i. Australian Constitutional Convention, resolutions adopted at Adelaide, 26-29 April 1983.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1982—Regulations—Deduction Levels.
- ii. Trustee Act, 1936-1982—Regulations—Trustee Status.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—
  - i. Roof Tiling.
  - ii. Roof Tiling (Amendment).
- iii. Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1982.
- iv. Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1983—Regulations—Prescribed Forms for Wages.
- v. Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1983—Workers Compensation Rules—Consent.  
Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—
  - vi. Asbestos.
  - vii. Asbestos Signs.
- viii. Commercial Safety Code—First Aid Boxes.
- ix. Construction Safety—First Aid Boxes.
- x. Industrial Safety Code—First Aid Boxes.
- xi. Removal of Asbestos.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Planning Act, 1982—

Regulations—

- i. Mining Production Tenement.
- ii. General Amendments, 1983.
- iii. Dredging Programme to Widen the Shipping Channel and Enlarge the Swinging Basin at Port Pirie—Report.  
Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—
- iv. Proposed Acquisition and Transfer of Land by Commissioner of Highways (4).
- v. Proposed Land Division in District Council of Waikerie.
- vi. Proposed Land Division by Department of Lands, Section 526, Hundred of Mobilong.
- vii. Proposed Acquisition and Transfer of Land, Hundred of Talunga, District Council of Gumeracha.
- viii. Proposed Redevelopment of Birdwood Primary and High Schools.
- ix. Proposed Borrow Pit Operation.
- x. Proposed Erection of Visitors Centre at Salt Creek, Coorong National Park.
- xi. Proposed Beach Access Ramp, Brighton.
- xii. Proposed Land Division for future road purposes—North East Road, Tea Tree Gully.
- xiii. Proposed Division of Land Irrigation in Perpetual Lease 1217, District Council of Murray Bridge.
- xiv. Proposed Acquisition of land at Hundred of Talunga.
- xv. Proposed Land Acquisition for Dyson Road.
- xvi. Proposed Land Division by Department of Lands—Section 71, Berri Irrigation Area.
- xvii. Proposed Construction of Single Transportable Classroom at McDonald Park Primary School, Mount Gambier.
- xviii. Proposed Upgrading of Residence and Administration Area at Mundulla Primary School.
- xix. Proposed Division of Land at Allendale.

xx. Proposed Erection of a Police Radio Tower and Associated Structures at Waikerie.

- xxi. Proposed Development at the Port Augusta College.
- xxii. Proposed Erection of Community Library at Keith Area School.
- xxiii. Proposed Alterations and Additions to Mount Gambier Court House.
- xxiv. Proposed Development at Port Augusta Memorial Park.
- xxv. Proposed Storage Shed at Berri Slipway.
- xxvi. Proposed Land Division at Section 378, Hundred of Loveday—Cobdogla Irrigation Area.
- xxvii. Proposed Division and Transfer of Land by the State Transport Authority—District Council of Clare.
- xxviii. Proposed Land Division, Part Section 925, Hundred of Yadnarie.
- xxix. Proposed Garage at Wudinna Area School, Wudinna.
- xxx. Proposal to Construct a Boat Storage Yard and Travelling Straddle Carrier at Lake Butler, Robe.
- xxxi. Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Act, 1981—Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Highways Act, 1926-1983—Highways Department Properties—Approvals to lease 1982-83.  
Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations.
- ii. Traffic Prohibition (Enfield).
- iii. Small Bus Standards.
- iv. Traffic Lights and Motor Cycles.
- v. Weighing Devices.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Harbors Act, 1936-1981—Regulations—Wharfage, Tonnage Rates, Conservancy Dues and Pilotage Fees.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*By Command—*

- i. Australian Fisheries Council—Resolutions of the 12th Meeting of the Council, held in Hobart, 15 October 1982.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Country Fires Act, 1976-1980—Country Fire Services Board—Report 1981-82.  
Fisheries Act, 1971-1982—Regulations—
  - ii. Licence Fees.
  - iii. Zone E Prawn Fishery.
  - iv. Kindergarten Union of South Australia—Report, 1982.
  - v. Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1982.
- vi. Seeds Act, 1979-1982—Regulations—General Regulations, 1983.
- vii. South Australian College of Advanced Education—Report, 1982.
- viii. South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister for Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*By Command—*

- i. Data Processing Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Hon. R.G. Payne, for the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Chiropractors Act, 1950-1973—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Fees.
- iii. Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1981-82.  
Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments of General Laws and Rules—
  - iv. Independent Order or Rechabites Friendly Society, S.A. District No. 81.
  - v. The Independent Order of Odd Fellows Grand Lodge of S.A.
  - vi. Manchester Unity.
- vii. Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978—Regulations—Dispensing Returns.
- viii. Nurses Registration Act, 1920-1970—Regulations—Fees.
- ix. Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1979—Regulations—Registration Fees.  
Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—
  - x. Cyanide.
  - xi. Eretinate.
  - xii. Food and Drugs Advisory Committee Fees.
  - xiii. Sale of Poisons.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, 1982—Regulation—Water Haulage Track.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

*By Command—*

- i. Statistical Return of Voting—Bragg District By-Election, 14 May 1983.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Companies (Administration) Act, 1982—Regulations—Companies Auditors and Liquidators Disciplinary Board Fees.
- ii. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1982—Regulations—Appearance Forms.
- iii. Coroners Act, 1975-1981—Rules—Post-Mortem Fees. Cremation Act, 1891-1981—Regulations.
- iv. Coffin Materials.
- v. Identification of Deceased Persons.
- vi. Justices Act, 1921-1982—Rules—Appearance Forms.
- vii. Rules of Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1983—Supreme Court—Legal Practitioners' Costs.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Racing Act, 1976-1983—Betting Control Board Rules—Port Pirie.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Dog Control Act, 1979-1981—Regulations—Extension to Coober Pedy.
- ii. Local Government Act, 1934-1982—Indenture between the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and the South Australian Jockey Club Inc.—Victoria Park Racecourse.
- iii. District Council of Mannum—By-law No. 16—Parks, Parklands, Recreation Reserves.  
District Council of Paringa—By-laws—  
No. 10—Bees.  
No. 14—Inflammable Undergrowth.  
No. 19—Water Reserves.  
No. 20—One Way Traffic.  
No. 22—Garbage Bins.  
No. 25—Water on Roads.  
No. 27—Bees.  
No. 28—Repeal of By-laws.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FINANCIAL SITUATION

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** On two other occasions I have reported to the House on the serious financial situation which faces South Australia. On 14 December last year, I tabled a review of the Budget which had been conducted by the Under Treasurer. This review detailed the financial position at the date of our election to office and indicated that the Budget outlook was far worse than had been publicly revealed by the former Treasurer.

On 3 May, when I introduced the Supplementary Estimates, I gave details of the impact of the drought, the bushfires and the floods on the Budget, and reported that the overall deficit on Consolidated Account could reach \$72 000 000. I am now able to report that the final outcome for 1982-83 is better than the result I indicated last May, in part because of the strict expenditure controls on recurrent and capital expenditure by my Government. Also, claims for natural disaster relief have been somewhat less than anticipated, but this means that we will have to carry over claims into 1983-84. The final result shows a deficit of

\$57 100 000 on the Consolidated Account for the financial year ended 30 June 1983. It is made up of a deficit on recurrent operations of \$109 000 000 and a surplus on capital works of \$51 900 000. That deficit of \$57 100 000 has increased the accumulated deficit of \$6 100 000 as at 30 June 1982 to \$63 200 000 as at 30 June 1983. I will, of course, give members a more detailed account of the factors which have resulted in that position when I present the 1983-84 Budget to the House in the next few weeks.

The seriousness of the financial position which now faces South Australia cannot be overstated. The ability of the State Government to carry a large deficit is severely limited and the recurrent deficit of \$109 000 000 is a matter of grave concern. If left unchecked, the State's cash reserves, already depleted, would be very quickly exhausted. This is a prospect which no responsible Government could contemplate. As I made clear to the House during the debate on the Supplementary Estimates in May, I will not allow South Australia to be weakened by the destruction of its reserves, nor will I allow the problem to be put off with future Administrations being made to pick up the bill.

South Australia must come to grips with this problem now. As a Government, we have taken steps already to ensure a tight control over all expenditures and to reduce any unnecessary spending and improve efficiency. However, it will also be necessary to introduce a number of measures to increase the State's revenue. Unfortunately, South Australia, like other States, suffers from the dual problem of an extremely restricted revenue base and the reliance on revenue measures which either directly affect employment, such as pay-roll tax, or which impact unevenly on the community.

As members would be aware, the Government is setting up an inquiry into the best means by which it can raise the revenue to satisfy the demands placed upon it by the community. It is also participating in the working group, set up by the recent Premiers' Conference, to examine the revenue powers of State and Federal Governments. However, our immediate problems are urgent and pressing, and it is necessary that we take action now. In deciding what that action should be, the Government has determined that there should be no change to the level of pay-roll tax, as this would act as a direct disincentive to employment, nor should there be any change to the current arrangements concerning land tax, as this may adversely affect the important housing industry. The measures which we propose to increase are as follows:

An increase in the licence fee under the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act from 12.5 per cent to 25 per cent with effect from 1 October 1983. This measure is intended to bring in about \$13 000 000 in 1983-84.

An increase in the licence fee under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act which will add 1 cent per litre to the price of petrol and diesel fuel at the pump.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave has been granted by the House.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The present intention is that it have effect from 1 October 1983. This measure is intended to bring in about \$11 000 000 in 1983-84. A further measure is an increase in the licence fee under the Licensing Act from 9 per cent to 12 per cent with effect from 1 April 1984. This measure is intended to bring in \$2 000 000 in 1983-84.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The next measure is an increase in the levy on general insurance under the Stamp Duties Act from 6 per cent to 8 per cent with effect from 1 January 1984. This measure is intended to bring in \$6 000 000. The

final measure is the introduction of a new financial institutions duty similar to the duty which has been operating in New South Wales and Victoria for some months. The level of duty, yet to be determined, will be on the transactions of all financial institutions and is planned to be introduced with effect from 1 December 1983.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I repeat that my Government is attempting to grapple with a problem which is largely not of its own making.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We came to office to find a deficit—

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** They won't increase taxes!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We came to office to find a deficit already in place and a problem building up which we simply could not have contemplated from the Opposition benches.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Todd to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We have had to cope with a succession of natural disasters more severe than anything experienced in the State's history, and we have the continuing problem of a national economic decline which is not only reducing our revenue, but increasing the demands upon the Government.

Not to act now would be grossly irresponsible and something for which we would be condemned by future Governments and future generations of South Australians. The basic financial strength of our State must be restored, and the measures that I have now announced will go part of the way towards that end. As far as our revenue base will allow, we have attempted to ensure that all South Australians make a contribution towards overcoming this serious and urgent problem.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SHIPPING CONFERENCE

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The Australian Northbound Shipping Conference has formally advised, following my negotiations with them, that they must delay their decision on a direct shipping service to Adelaide for a further 12 months. The reason given is the drastic down-turn in trade with Australia overall which has occurred in both directions in that particular trade, and which has necessitated the removal of ship tonnage from the service. Ironically, South Australian trade with Japan has dropped only modestly, about 3 per cent in the same period, far less than other major States.

These negotiations followed a progressive series of discussions and negotiations with ANSCON undertaken under three previous Governments. In part, they have been successful, in that the conference has agreed on the basic point that South Australia should be served directly. However, it must be seen as a matter of very real concern that the needs of the State have not been met by the conference at this stage.

The Government is now considering the decision. We remain fully committed and determined to achieve direct shipping services of economic frequency with all of the

State's major trading areas. Unless this is achieved, we are in danger of becoming little more than an inland State, cut off from markets and supplies of raw materials and components by vulnerable and costly land links through other States' ports. The Government is considering what further action it can take. Cargo volumes are being monitored and we have asked the conference for further contact before the March 1984 date they have mentioned.

It is the case that in June a number of Victorian agencies got together to offer a discriminatory discount on South Australian cargo to and from the Far East. This was in recognition of how much progress the South Australian case had made and was a desperate move to save the cargo being lost. They recognise its value as a source of service industry income. I do not believe the offer influenced the conference decision; the down-turn in trade, amongst other problems facing the conference at the time, was the major factor. However, the precedent set by the offer will be a factor in our next discussion and the competition must be met.

One matter being considered is the possibility of our taking an early initiative to acquire a second container crane which, in fact, would change the shipping economics involved in our favour and make the next round of negotiations easier. Internationally, few container terminals commence without two cranes, as any item of mechanical equipment is prone to breakdown. Port Adelaide has become the only capital city port in Australia to attempt to handle modern container ships with a single container gantry crane.

I had hoped to be able to report to the House that the major step of re-establishing shipping services with Japan had been achieved. I cannot do that, but I would assure members of the House that every effort is being made, both by ourselves and leading shippers, to see that this set-back is short lived. I would also assure the conference of the State's absolute determination in the matter: it is vital to our long-term economic development.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the honourable Leader of the Opposition I indicate that, in the absence of the honourable Chief Secretary, questions that would have been directed to him will be answered by the Premier.

**An honourable member:** Where is he?

**Mr Mathwin:** He's putting fires out.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

#### Mr IVANOV

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Deputy Premier say whether his answer on 2 June, 'Absolutely no', given to two questions before he made a statement to the *Advertiser* relating to an approach to him by the expelled Soviet diplomat, Mr Ivanov—was he given information associating Mr Combe with Mr Ivanov—was, as has been reported widely, a lie?

**The Hon J.D. WRIGHT:** I have been subjected to one of the most vicious and unwarranted attacks on any politician in the history of South Australia.

**An honourable member:** Just answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** Questions and answers have been taken completely out of context: pieces have been cut out of questions and pieced together to suit the desire of the Opposition to attack my credibility and my honesty, and I am not accepting that any longer.

I stand here today ready to debate this matter. There has been a great deal of discussion and a great deal of talk by

the Opposition and by the press that there would be a no-confidence vote in me today. I am waiting for that no-confidence motion and I am ready to debate it, but I have no intention of answering any further questions off-the-cuff in this matter but if—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat. I want to warn all honourable members of the House, on either side, that what I said on accepting the Chair still remains. If there is to be defiance of Standing Orders, then the appropriate steps will be taken without regard to rank and without regard to Party. The honourable the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I was saying that I do not intend to answer any questions about this matter off-the-cuff to this Opposition while it carries on as it is doing with a farrago of fabrications about my integrity and my honesty. I will answer questions; I will give consideration to them and bring down a considered reply to any question the Opposition wants to ask.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Mount Gambier.

### HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning provide any information about the installation of noise control devices at Henley High School? The Henley High School Council is about to install in its assembly hall a device that automatically stops the public address system when the legal noise level has been reached. Several complaints have been made by constituents in this area about noise levels. It is the opinion of constituents in the area that the installation of this new device may well stop unnecessary complaints to the Noise Abatement Branch.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** If the device is as has been described by the honourable member and as I have experienced in another place, I imagine that the school is to be commended for its action. I have had direct experience of one of these devices at what I believe is called the Marion community hall, where I understand it was a condition of permission to build this hall that such a device be installed. From personal experience, I can say that it is very effective because, when I was playing in a band at the hall one evening and our singer launched into her first chorus, everything went out: not only the P.A. system but also the lights. That is how the device functions, and there is no way anyone, whether singer, instrumentalist or whatever, can exceed a certain level because of the in-built safety factor. The Government and my department would like to see more people install such devices.

### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Why did the Deputy Premier tell the House on 13 May that he did not know whether or not Mr David Combe had spoken to Mr Ivanov about the Deputy Premier's interest in visiting Russia, when Mr Combe had already told the Deputy Premier on 25 April that he had spoken to Mr Ivanov about the matter on three occasions?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** As I previously informed the Leader of the Opposition, I shall bring down a considered reply to this question.

### VIOLENCE ON BUSES

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Transport initiate an investigation into the level of violence and intimidation on public transport in the metropolitan area? I ask this question on behalf of several constituents who have approached me recently with allegations of what can only be described as violence on public transport, especially on buses. These constituents have submitted specific cases that I am led to believe are typical of many occurring throughout metropolitan Adelaide. It is important that this House have access to information as to how widespread is this violence.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the honourable member for her question on this important matter. The problem of bad behaviour by some members of the travelling public has always been around, and I agree with the honourable member that it appears to be worsening. The behaviour of some young people while travelling on public transport has been of great concern to members of the public and to officers of the State Transport Authority. I hope to be able soon to place before the House new regulations under the S.T.A. legislation. These regulations are presently with the Crown Law Office, and I hope to have them very soon. When introduced they will allow S.T.A. staff to deal with these problems more effectively. They will provide for a system of expiation fees for certain offences: in other words, on-the-spot fines. That procedure should be effective in the situation currently complained about. As requested, I shall be happy to investigate and review this problem.

### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Why did the Deputy Premier tell this House on 13 May that Mr Ivanov had tried to contact him 'in a quite sloppy manner and without any prior attempt being made to make an appointment', and that he did not know what Mr Ivanov wanted to offer him, when the Deputy Premier well knew the following facts:

1. It was Mr David Combe who attempted to arrange the meeting between the Deputy Premier and Mr Ivanov.

2. Mr Combe did this by telephoning the Deputy Premier's office twice on 21 April to seek an appointment for Mr Ivanov.

3. The appointment was to make arrangements for a visit by the Deputy Premier to Russia because the Deputy Premier had told Mr Combe in February that he was interested in going there and Mr Combe had passed this on to Mr Ivanov.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I thought at least by now that the member for Torrens would have realised that I no longer trust the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Becker:** Is this a dictatorship?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will resume his seat, and I call the honourable member for Hanson to order and indicate that there is no dictatorship. Standing Orders will be upheld, and the Chair will not permit the pandemonium that is going on. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** In those circumstances, the member for Torrens will receive a considered reply to his question.

### FRIENDLY TRANSPORT COMPANY

**Mr MAYES:** My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Will the Minister report to the House on the progress of negotiations for the purchase and relocation of

the Friendly Transport Company, which is located on South Road, Black Forest?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** To my knowledge, this matter is currently before the Planning Appeal Board. This followed the failure of negotiations between the management of Friendly Transport and the Highways Department for the vacation of the property currently rented by Friendly Transport on South Road. That property is required for the building of the Emerson over-pass and, as a result of the negotiations failing, the matter is before the Planning Appeal Board. I am confident that this matter will shortly be resolved by this means, and as soon as I have any information I will let the honourable member know the outcome.

#### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Before the Premier made his public statement on 26 July that an official log exists to show that Mr Ivanov rang the Deputy Premier's office on 21 April, did the Premier see that official log?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I did not see the official log. I was advised that it did exist, and in fact it does exist.

#### LICENSING ACT

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from his colleague the Attorney-General in another place when it is likely that the report dealing with the need to significantly alter the Licensing Act will be brought down and, further, when it may be expected that the Government will act on the contents of the report? The Minister will be fully aware of my current concern about the functions of this Act, especially involving under-age drinking. I believe it is important that the current anomalies existing in the Act be rectified quickly, and I would greatly appreciate it if this information could be obtained.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Members will be well aware of his long-standing interest in the operations of the Licensing Act and the authorities in this State. I will obtain a report from my colleague and advise the honourable member in due course.

#### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. At the lunch he had on 2 February with Mr David Combe, who first raised the question of arranging a visit to Russia for the Deputy Premier? The Deputy Premier told the House on 13 May that the question of a Russian visit had been discussed at a lunch he attended with Mr Combe on 2 February and that Mr Combe had first raised the matter. The Deputy Premier gave the following explanation of how the question was raised:

He [referring to Mr Combe] asked whether, if arrangements could be made to go to the Soviet Union, I would go, and I said that most certainly I would.

This explanation conflicts with the information given by Mr Combe in a statement to the Hope inquiry. The statement by Mr Combe, released yesterday by the Hope Royal Commission, states in part (when referring to his discussion with the Deputy Premier on 2 February):

Wright asked me whether I had contacts in the Embassy who could assist him to visit the U.S.S.R. He indicated that he had been to the Peoples Republic of China, that he wished to visit the Soviet Union.

In another part of the statement, Mr Combe referred to his belief that he had been convicted of being a major pawn in

the establishment by Mr Ivanov of a spy network involving, amongst others, Joan Taggart and Jack Wright. He says this proposition is patently absurd because:

The facts are evident that any initiatives for Mrs Taggart and Mr Wright to visit the U.S.S.R. did not come from me [Combe]. I therefore ask the Deputy Premier whose initiative was it—Mr Combe's (as the Deputy Premier suggested in this House on 13 May) or the Deputy Premier's (as Mr Combe suggested in his statement released yesterday)? If it was at the Deputy Premier's suggestion, why did he again mislead this House?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I will arrange for a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### WATER POLLUTION

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister of Marine advise whether the Government intends to review the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act? This morning I was handed a photostat copy of a press cutting which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 10 June 1983 headed 'Oil company fined \$10 000 over spillage'. The article states:

Esso Australia Limited was fined \$10 000 with \$1 133.40 costs in the Adelaide Magistrates Court yesterday over an oil spillage last year.

The article further states:

Some of that oil had subsequently fallen into the water affecting a large area of South Australia's southern coast, particularly near Moana and costing about \$60 000 to clear.

My constituent, who lives along the coastal region of my electorate, has expressed concern as to the large amount it cost the Government to clear up this oil spill and was very concerned about the small amount of the fine imposed upon the company, namely, \$10 000. Is the Minister or the Government considering reviewing the Act to impose stiffer fines upon such companies that breach the Act?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Action was taken in respect to the matter to which the honourable member has referred. I read the article in the media which the honourable member has quoted. I am currently awaiting a report on the outcome of that action. I will be happy to bring down a report for the honourable member when it is to hand. With regard to reviewing the Act as the honourable member suggested, I will be quite pleased to take up that matter also and confer with him about the advantages of any amendment that may be necessary.

#### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Can the Premier say what information is contained in the log (which the Premier claims exists) to which he previously referred in answer to a question? Has the Premier also seen any official log which shows that Mr David Combe also rang the Deputy Premier's office twice on that day?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The recording of the contact contains a reference to a call by Mr Combe and a reference to a call by Mr Ivanov. I cannot give the House the exact details because I do not have them in front of me. However, I will furnish a detailed reply.

#### RADIOACTIVE WASTE

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** My question is to the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, who normally represents the Minister of Health. Is the Minister satisfied with the current arrangements relating to the tailings dam

at Port Pirie, and can the Minister bring down a report assuring the House that the arrangements are in compliance with the environmental protection (nuclear codes) legislation, 1978, and the code of practice for the management of radioactive waste and millings and mining of radioactive ores promulgated under that legislation?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for his question, and I undertake to refer it to my colleague in another place for a report.

#### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Can the Deputy Premier say why, in their telephone conversation on 25 April, did the Deputy Premier immediately agree with Mr David Combe to tell the *Advertiser* that Mr Ivanov had telephoned the Deputy Premier's office on 21 April, when Mr Combe had given no evidence to the Deputy Premier of such a call, and the Deputy Premier had not been told by his office of any such call?

The transcript of the telephone conversation on 25 April makes clear that, at the time he spoke to Mr Combe, the Deputy Premier did not know who had telephoned his office on 21 April. He had tried to make contact with a member of his staff before talking to Mr Combe, but had been unable to do so. After telling the Deputy Premier of his attempts to arrange a meeting between the Deputy Premier and Mr Ivanov through two telephone calls to the Deputy Premier's office on 21 April, Mr Combe suggested that the Deputy Premier should tell the *Advertiser* only that Mr Ivanov had contacted his office on that day. The Deputy Premier agreed to do so. Mr Combe's statement to the royal commission yesterday shows that Mr Combe could have had no way of knowing whether or not Mr Ivanov rang the Deputy Premier's office on 21 April. Clearly, he was asking the Deputy Premier to make a statement, the veracity of which he, Mr Combe, could not attest to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat and bear in mind that he has already been warned. As I have said before, I am not attempting in any way to prevent legitimate questions. However, Standing Orders must be upheld and there must be no argument contained in the explanations.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I will completely abbreviate the remainder of the case which I was putting. I simply say that the Deputy Premier agreed to go along with his request. In view of this, and the fact that, in the telephone conversation on 25 April, Mr Combe's explanation of the approaches to the Deputy Premier's office on 21 April referred only to Mr Combe's telephone calls, I simply ask the Deputy Premier why he agreed with Mr Combe to make a statement to the *Advertiser* when he had no evidence to support the veracity of that statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling the Deputy Premier, I point out that I have no intention of again permitting an argument or an advocacy under the guise of an explanation. I warn all honourable members of that in relation to this or any other topic. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I will arrange a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### PETTY CRIME RECORDS

**Mr FERGUSON:** I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Can the Minister tell the House whether any progress has been made in eliminating all record of

petty crime in police files after a period of, say, 10 years where there has been no further offence?

The 1973 Law Reform Committee of South Australia in its 32nd report considered a British report which recommended that rehabilitated persons should be treated in law as if they had not been convicted. The South Australian Law Reform Committee indicated that it was in sympathy with the recommendations of the British report, but sceptical about the practicality of implementing them. Can the Minister indicate whether a practical way has been found to expunge these records?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to my colleague and obtain a report for him.

#### Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Will the Deputy Premier say who in the Deputy Premier's office spoke to Mr Ivanov on 21 April, what was that person told by Mr Valeriy Ivanov, and when was the Deputy Premier informed that Mr Ivanov had telephoned his office?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I will furnish a considered reply for the honourable member.

**Mr Ashenden:** He doesn't know.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### FUEL PRICES

**Mr BLACKER:** In view of the increase in fuel prices foreshadowed by the Premier, will he indicate whether the Government will now consider introducing a State fuel equalisation scheme to ensure the equality of fuel prices for all citizens throughout South Australia? Throughout South Australia there is a wide disparity of fuel prices, a difference of as much as 6 cents or 7 cents a litre. Many country users believe that the increased prices of the fuel that they are paying enables fuel discounting in the metropolitan area to pertain.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which is one of importance and relevance. The question is not simply of equalisation of fuel prices between country and city areas, but it relates to the whole question of fuel prices on a national basis, which is certainly something which deserves urgent attention. The fact is that there are wide disparities between prices offering which are not necessarily related to costs of distribution, remoteness, delivery sources, or whatever. There is evidence that in many respects the price being offered relates to particular policies of the oil companies in terms of their suppliers or company-owned stations. It may relate to a particular price war or discounting practice in a district for competitive purposes and so on. The whole matter is certainly one of great confusion and it is one with which successive State and Federal Governments have grappled without much success. As the honourable member would know, some major inquiries have been commissioned in regard to this very vexed matter but, as is unfortunately often the case with such inquiries, either their recommendations are ignored or found too hard to implement, or they are put into operation in a piece-meal fashion that does not solve the problem.

I think that we came very close to achieving some sort of solution in this matter with the so-called Fife package announced some years ago. Despite opposition from certain sections of the community, I think that that had within it the basis of a successful method of fuel marketing which would have helped remove the disparities to which the honourable member referred. Unfortunately, that languished

and has not effectively been put into practice. I believe the answer to the country-city differential that the honourable member has mentioned lies in the hands of the Federal Government. It must be tackled on a national basis. It is not within the resources of the States either to provide a subsidy that would enable country prices to be equalised or, alternatively, to impose upon metropolitan consumers the level of price that would match that in the country areas. In that circumstance I think all I can say is that the State Government, from its perspective, will continue to advocate a national fuel pricing policy which attempts to get rid of the anomalies in pricing generally and for that to be implemented by legislation if necessary. Unfortunately, at the State level, we do not have very much room for manoeuvre.

### SCHOOL BUS SERVICE

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Education investigate the future provision of a school bus service into the Hallett Cove area and the nearby Karrara Estate? Such a service would be provided for the benefit of secondary students who presently travel to high schools out of the area.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question. I will certainly have that matter investigated further. Indeed, I will have it referred to the School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee that I have had established. The matter of school transport and issues such as the one raised by the honourable member are very important. The matter raised is one of an increasing number of such issues that come before me from both the metropolitan and country members of this House pointing out that it has been many years since we have had a proper review of school transportation. Consequently, there are many anomalies in the provision of a service: many areas are perhaps not getting the service that they could regard themselves as being reasonably entitled to and other areas may well be getting a service as a result of some form of caprice in years gone by.

The other issue which is equally significant concerns the capacity of the Government to provide that service. School transport is a very expensive operation which costs the department a lot of money. The school transport section of the Education Department runs nearly as many buses as does the S.T.A. In fact, the mileage covered by Education Department buses is many times greater than that of the S.T.A., having regard to country distances involved. That means that we have a finite package of resources and a large package of estimated demands for services that should be provided in the form of school transport, and hence there is a potential conflict. Given the fact that it has not been since the 1950s that the policy was properly overhauled, I requested that there be such an overhaul now by the committee to which I will refer the matter raised by the honourable member.

Given the fact that some members in this House on a number of occasions have asked me about these matters and about the School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee, this is probably the most appropriate time to identify the terms of reference of the committee. The committee is under the chairmanship of Mr Tony Flint, of the State Transport Authority; so we have someone who is not directly connected with the Education Department who can give us an overview of transport issues. Terms of reference of the committee, which is widely representative of parents, people within the department and people within the community, are as follows:

- (a) To examine all policies regarding the transport of schoolchildren in South Australia and to make

recommendations to the Minister of Education on the current applicability of each of those policies;

- (b) to examine all policies regarding the payment of travelling allowances to students and to recommend the current applicability of each of those policies;
- (c) to consider the existing conditions for the use of Education Department school buses for excursion and other purposes and to make recommendations regarding those conditions;
- (d) in all instances where the committee recommends a variation to existing policy which is likely to have cost implications (either by way of cost savings or additional costs), an estimate of the full year effect of each variation should be given;
- (e) without limiting the extent of the investigation by the committee, it should also examine and make recommendations on the feasibility of a system of payment for travel by students who live within the eligible distance criterion from a school or school bus route, but who might be able to use a bus passing their way if seats were available; and
- (f) to consider any other matters incidental to the transport of schoolchildren not covered in the above statements and, if the committee so determines, to make recommendations on those matters also, including costs, if applicable.

A number of those terms of reference relate to the cost of school transport, and it is a matter of some considerable concern that, in attempting to provide the best possible service, significant costs are involved, and we must be concerned as to how we can get the best service for the least possible cost to Consolidated Revenue.

### MINISTER OF FISHERIES

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:** Will the Premier undertake to control his Minister of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries, by restricting him from threatening the livelihood, management and, where applicable, licence and business tenure of further primary producers in South Australia? Reference has been made today to threatening correspondence, dated 1 July, that the Minister of Agriculture directed to the fishing industry in South Australia. That matter, in isolation from the rest of primary industry, is in the capable hands of our spokesman for fisheries, the member for Chaffey. However, incorporated in that correspondence was a clear threat to primary industry and, on waiting on the Minister by deputation, fishermen, as has been since reported to me, were told that the options and alternatives incorporated in that correspondence were not threats; indeed, they were promises. When further challenged about whether or not the matters incorporated in that correspondence were Government policy, the Minister allegedly said that he was a Minister of the Crown, that they were his policies, and that they did not have to be the policies of the Government. In the circumstances, and having regard to the incredibly threatening nature of those matters raised in the correspondence to the fishing industry, concern has been expressed among another and somewhat wider range of primary industry as to whether the dairy, meat, wool, grain, and egg industries, and so on, are on the hit list and, if so—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It has already been indicated this afternoon that there must not be debate during an explanation. The honourable member for Alexandra.



**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:** I apologise if I have drifted from Standing Orders in this instance, but clearly my remarks are reflected in reports that have been directed to me from people in primary industry who are deeply concerned about the capability and performance so frighteningly demonstrated by the Minister of Agriculture.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will ignore the way in which that question was phrased, in a 'When did you stop beating your wife?' way, which implies, without any shred of evidence whatsoever, that the Minister of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries has written threatening letters to sectors of industry. In relation to the fishing matter, which the honourable member rather coyly said that he could not traverse because it was in the capable hands of another of his colleagues, I have seen that correspondence, and I have discussed it with representatives from the fishing industry. The honourable member will find that, over the next two or three weeks, that matter will be properly and amicably resolved, despite a lot of the rather heated off-the-top-of-the-head statements by people in the industry.

There was no question of threats being contained in that letter. That letter in fact set out plainly and clearly the situation, and I believe that in so doing it gave the industry a very proper understanding of the options that were available, and equally an understanding of the preferred option of the Government, and finally allowed it to get down to debate on a realistic basis and to negotiating with the Minister what sort of outcome there should be.

I think the reaction to that letter was surprising. That method of operation by the Minister is one of his greatest strengths, and I have already had a number of favourable comments back from people in the industry about the new Minister, his directness of approach, his ability to deal openly and honestly with those in the industry; he has been well received indeed in quite intensive tours of country areas. I think it has come as a bit of a surprise to some people that someone whose career was as a seaman has been so readily able to relate to people on the land.

I think the reason is that he is following in the good footsteps of the Hon. Ken Wriedt, in a previous Labor Government in the 1970s, who performed equally well with the industry, but I also think people in the industry have recognised in Mr Blevins a man with whom they can deal directly and who will tell them as it is, and they respect that. In fact, an editorial in the *Stock Journal* (unfortunately I do not have it to hand, but I am sure the honourable member would be aware of it) referred to the Minister's appearance at a conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners, praised the way in which he had spoken directly to the members, and stated how well he had been received. That is high praise indeed for someone who has come new to the portfolio. I think, far from seeming threatening, Mr Blevins' approach has been welcomed by those in the industry.

### AQUATIC CENTRE

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise whether the decision by the Adelaide City Council to request the provision of a car park outside the parklands will jeopardise the proposed aquatic centre in the North Adelaide parklands?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** At its meeting on Monday last, the Adelaide City Council approved in principle the proposal to cover and upgrade the North Adelaide swimming pool, subject to certain conditions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** One of the conditions contained in the resolution was for adequate car parking which does not utilise the surface area of the parklands. In carrying that resolution, some councillors, I am sure, did not realise what they were doing; the cost of providing underground parking in that area of the parklands is estimated at between \$5 500 000 and \$8 000 000, which is more than the estimated cost of covering and upgrading the pool. That is unacceptable to me, as I am sure it is to the Government.

I believe, however, that the proposal is negotiable. The Adelaide Planning Commission, at a meeting yesterday, stopped short of that proposal of the council. It is looking to the Government to provide details in regard to previous parking arrangements, and to the Government and the department to provide other details in relation to parking in that area of the parklands. I believe that the proposal by the Adelaide City Council is negotiable and that it certainly will not jeopardise the arrangements regarding the North Adelaide swimming pool.

It is important to the swimming fraternity in South Australia and to the public in general that we have a facility that can be utilised year round. The most appropriate place for that facility is undoubtedly the North Adelaide parklands, and the present North Adelaide swimming pool can be upgraded at reasonable cost with moneys provided by the Commonwealth under the I.S.S.F. scheme and the State Government. It is certainly a viable and reasonable proposition. In answer to the question, I suggest that the proposal by the council will not jeopardise the project, that car parking is negotiable, and I certainly believe we can come to some arrangement in regard to that proposal.

### GAOL INCIDENT

**Mr PETERSON:** Will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary a report on an inquiry promised by the Chief Secretary on allegations made by a prisoner named Byscko in Yatala gaol? A delegate of Byscko rang me on Sunday 29 May, saying that Byscko wished to speak to me. I went to Yatala prison, where I was given every assistance by the warders. Mr Byscko alleged that he had been provided with a hacksaw by a warder to facilitate his escape to draw attention to conditions at Yatala gaol. He had cut through a 1/16 in. mesh and two 1 in. bars to escape from the cell in the replaced A division. He was recaptured and put in another cell. He then kicked a door off its hinges in the maximum security section. I spoke to the Chief Secretary on Tuesday 31 May, and he promised that an investigation would be undertaken and that the results of that investigation would be given to me and, I assume, made public. I thought that that was only fair, because it was reasonable that the name of the warder should be cleared or the allegation substantiated. Although I have rung the Chief Secretary's office since then regarding my inquiry, I have received no substantial answer.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As the honourable member knows, the Chief Secretary has one or two matters concerning prisons with which to deal, especially at this moment, and one can therefore understand that, because these problems are far reaching and fairly fundamental, his staff would be very much tied up on various investigations concerning the development of capital and other responses to the problems involved. However, I know that my colleague would not wish me to make excuses, so I shall refer the question to him and hope that the honourable member receives a prompt reply.

## Mr IVANOV

**Mr OLSEN:** As the Deputy Premier has given a public undertaking to give Parliament full details of his part in the Combe-Ivanov (and now Wright) affair, and as the Deputy Premier has refused to do so by way of answer to specific questions on the subject, will he say when the Parliament and the public can expect to receive an unfudged version of the pertinent events?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I stand ready, as I said at the beginning of Question Time today, to debate this matter at any time the Opposition wants to bring it on.

**An honourable member:** Just answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Todd.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I will put my point of view at that stage. Concerning any questions asked today, I assure members that they will receive my considered reply on Tuesday.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that, when you gave me a warning a few moments ago, it was not my interjection that caused you to do so. It was one of my colleagues, so I ask you to reconsider the warning you gave me.

**The SPEAKER:** As far as I can recollect, the voice I heard was in fact that of the member for Todd. However, if the honourable member observes the Standing Orders he has no need to worry.

## PUBLIC GALLERY

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Could you, Mr Speaker, say what privileges are currently given to the media in the public gallery of this House? I have in mind especially the plight of schoolchildren who are finding it hard to view proceedings over the tops of the cameras.

**The SPEAKER:** The current situation leads to some difficulties. After long discussions with all parties involved in the running of Parliament and with the media generally, it was arranged that general TV and radio coverage, as well as press coverage, including photography, be allowed subject to certain reasonable conditions. It was known all along that, in order to achieve a satisfactory result, some space would be taken up, as is evident now, by cameramen from the television networks occupying space normally available to schoolchildren and other members of the public, and that the vision of persons who could otherwise be seated behind the cameras could be blocked. A detailed submission will soon be made to the Minister of Public Works seeking some arrangement whereby the provision of access for schoolchildren in particular, as well as other members of the public, can be maintained at its present level, without disrupting what I believe has been a good and useful experiment in relation to the media.

## Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Despite public statements by the Deputy Premier that he would give his answers to Parliament and not to the press, and in view of his persistent refusal to do so, will the Premier say why the Deputy Premier told the House on 13 May that he did not know whether or not Mr David Combe had spoken to Mr Ivanov about the Deputy Premier's interest in visiting Russia, when Mr Combe had already told the Deputy Premier on 25 April that he had spoken to Mr Ivanov about the matter on three separate occasions?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Leader has decided to turn an earlier question toward me. The matters raised by the Deputy Leader have all been adequately covered by statements and in the press, and I refer him back to that. I think it extraordinary that, after all the posturing we have had from the Opposition on this issue over some days, when we now meet in Parliament we are confronted with this series of somewhat footling questions from the Opposition.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You said—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I draw to the attention of members that the Deputy Premier has made clear that he will answer in a considered fashion the questions put to him. As he has made clear, he is willing and able to debate the matter in this place.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Doesn't he normally answer in a considered fashion?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Coles to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Premier will not subject himself to this procedure of questions without notice on this issue that he has been subjected to in the columns of the press. I thought that that was a simple statement, and the Deputy Premier has sustained that position. The answers will be provided.

## WATER PRESSURES

**Mr WHITTEN:** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning assure the House that any problems that may occur with the lowering of the pressure in the aquifers near any proposed mining project will be considered? This question has been brought to my attention by an article in that great country journal, which I always try to read, *The Farmer and Stockowner* (July edition), at page 5, which states, under the heading 'Poor reaction over mine plan':

Farmers in the Biscuit Flat and Greenways area have joined with their Kingston (South-East) counterparts in pointing out problems with the proposed Kingston coal mining project. Commenting on the recent environmental impact statement issued by Western Mining Corporation, U.F.S. members said in a submission to the Minister of Environment, Dr Hopgood, the biggest concern was that many properties in the area were irrigated from free-flowing artesian wells.

Later, the article stated:

The few lines in the environmental impact statement covering proposed compensation were 'woefully inadequate'.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes, I can give that assurance. Members would be aware that the Kingston lignite deposit is one of about five propositions currently being examined by my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy to determine the future direction, in part anyway, of energy generation in this State. The major environmental problem—and, indeed, the major economic problem—to be addressed in relation to this deposit is, of course, the problem of deep water and the effect that it would have on the local Act. It is something to which my department has been directing its attention in the assessment of the environmental impact statement. I reiterate that it is of economic as well as environmental significance because of the costs involved in this proposition. That is one of the matters that my colleague will obviously take into account in determining whether this or one of the other four propositions will be the next cab off the rank.

## Mr IVANOV

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** As a result of the answer that the Premier most recently gave the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition, will he say whether this Parliament and the people of South Australia can expect to have cover-ups of embarrassing questions whenever they occur in the future?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The answer to that, of course is 'No'.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The answer to the question whether this Parliament and the people of South Australia can expect to have cover-ups of difficult or embarrassing questions (I think that was the phrase used by the member for Light) is quite positively 'No'; there is no question of that. The issue to which the honourable member refers is one in which quite clearly considered replies are necessary, and it is open to a Minister at any stage (indeed, it has been done by Ministers on the other side of the House when in Government on many occasions) to reserve a question for a considered reply.

**Mr Olsen:** Where was the Ministerial statement?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker, I do not really need your protection from that sort of nonsense.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will suspend the sitting if this behaviour is going to continue. I warned the Leader of the Opposition and I warn the Premier that I will not tolerate that sort of condescension. I will uphold the Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am making quite clear to this House that there is no question of cover-ups or evasions in this matter. The information will be provided, but in any situation where it is clearly the intention to try to misrepresent, distort or twist information given to this House, as has been done in this case, then considered replies are warranted.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Mallee.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** If we can return to a situation where there is some form of decorum and understanding of the way in which questions without notice are conducted, no problems arise. I stress again that in this case considered replies are necessary, and I point to what has been happening in the press over the last week or so to indicate that. The answers will be given; there is no question of that. We have not had the debate.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I take a point of order. Is the Premier's statement that, until such time as the decorum associated with questions without notice is improved, he or his Ministers will not be answering questions? I take that as a direct slant against the Chair.

**The SPEAKER:** I did not take that as a slant against the Chair. What I did take as offensive was the Premier's reference to his needing protection from me, but I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** My point of order related to events after the event to which you have just referred. I would ask that, if you are unable to recall the subsequent statements of the Premier, you will take them into consideration between this meeting and the next meeting of the House, and provide an answer to the point of order on that occasion.

**The SPEAKER:** I am quite able to recall them. I think that the remarks of the Premier went perilously close to perhaps being offensive (if one wanted the strict interpretation of the Standing Orders) to members of the Opposition generally, but not to the Chair.

## FLINDERS RANGES MINING

**Mr TRAINER:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide a progress report on the mineral exploration programme being undertaken by his department inside the western boundary of the Flinders Ranges national park?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** Members will recall that Cabinet approved a two-stage exploration programme comprising geological mapping, surface sampling and geophysical investigation. A statement of intent, outlining the timing and nature of work to be carried out during stage 1 was then prepared and circulated to the Department of Environment and Planning and such groups as the Conservation Council.

Stage 1 involves three periods of work on the ground by geologists and field assistants. The first working period, basically an orientation effort with some mapping and sampling, was carried out between 18 and 26 July in an area south of Bunyeroo Gorge. On 19 July, a section of the stratigraphy of interest and the type of work proposed was shown to two officers from the Department of Environment and Planning and the acting ranger in charge of the park.

The next stage of work will be carried out between 15 and 26 August. It will involve one geologist and two field assistants carrying out detailed mapping with line and/or grid rock chip sampling. The third trip, involving follow-up mapping and sampling, is scheduled for 12 to 23 September.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** During the first trip, departmental staff established a base camp on Edowie Station, outside the park, and during the remainder of stage 1, two other camps will be established on properties outside the park. Officers will walk to the target zone from the park boundary. While stage 1 is being carried out, departmental geophysicists will conduct experiments outside the park to finalise the methods and techniques to be used during stage 2. The purpose of these experiments is to determine before stage 2 commences the most effective methods of obtaining the geophysical information required with minimum impact on the park environment.

---

## MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL, 1983

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. G. J. Crafter (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) moved:

That this Bill be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1982.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** By leave, I further move:

That the select committee on the Bill, appointed by this House on 1 June 1983, have power to continue its sittings during the session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 22 September.

Motion carried.

## JOINT SELECT COMMITTEES

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier):** By leave, I move:

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Select Committee on Proposals to Reform the Law, Practice and Procedures of Parliament and the Joint Select Committee on the Administration of Parliament have power to continue their sittings during the session.

Motion carried.

### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Duncan, Eastick, Gunn, and Trainer.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs Eastick, Mayes, and Meier.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs D.C. Brown, Ferguson, Mathwin, and Plunkett.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That a committee consisting of Messrs Bannon, Ferguson, Mayes, Trainer, and Wright be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I rise in this grievance debate to refer to the matters before us in regard to Yatala Labour Prison. The situation at Yatala is outrageous and quite inexcusable as far as this Government is concerned. It is quite interesting that, when things are as serious as they are there at present (and one has only to look at the headline in tonight's *News* and the headlines in the media over recent months to realise how serious matters are), the Chief Secretary has not done the House the courtesy of being here today to answer questions on this matter and at least bring down a report to the House to let us know what is going on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The present Chief Secretary has refused to come into this House today although, while in Opposition, he was the person who had all the answers; he knew what was going wrong and how it was to be righted. Now, when we look for him to inform us and to answer questions, he is nowhere to be seen.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The House has become very unruly this afternoon. Members either are suffering from industrial deafness or have decided to take over; they should behave in a much better way than they are behaving. I ask members to come back to some decorum, and allow us to carry on in a proper manner. The honourable member for Murray.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The member for Albert Park has just said that the Chief Secretary would be remiss in his duties if he was not looking into these matters.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Only this morning I heard the Chief Secretary say that he was not even going out to Yatala to see what had happened. He made that statement publicly. He said that it was all under control and that he need not do anything about it. We can see by the headlines tonight just how much control there is at the present time. The Chief Secretary has been continually warned of ongoing problems at Yatala. He has been continually warned, both inside and outside this House, through various media reports, by various people in this Parliament, including myself, and by noted people outside who understand many

of the problems being experienced at Yatala. Repeatedly I have suggested that there is urgent need for some effective segregation at Yatala to reduce some of the tension between prisoners—a tension we have known about for some time.

Only fairly recently I had the opportunity to again visit Yatala through an organised inspection. I say 'again', because I have now had the opportunity to visit that gaol on a number of occasions. The reason that the present Chief Secretary gave for its not being proper for me to be at that inspection was that I might make the whole thing political. I suggest that, while the Chief Secretary was in Opposition, he was the one who made the whole thing political. He was the one who referred to it and made it very difficult for those in administration at that time to carry out their duties. I am pleased that I persisted and went on that inspection. I went as a result of a resolution passed by the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union of Australia and the P.S.A. that I should be invited to see how serious the matters are out there. I make the point that it was not an enjoyable experience but at least I saw first hand many of the problems that exist.

On 12 July I again warned the Chief Secretary of the need to overcome many of those difficulties that were being experienced. The inspection gave me the opportunity to assess what priorities were needed to avoid more problems and more trouble at Yatala. I said on 12 July that it was clear that, unless urgent action was taken to segregate prisoners who have been ringleaders in recent incidents at Yatala, there would be further serious trouble. I went on to say that prisoners should be separated immediately from other inmates through the use of alternative premises. We have heard much about reports and many statements from the Chief Secretary. What satisfactory action have we seen? Absolutely nothing!

The idea that I put forward at that time of moving some of the ringleaders or prisoners to Port Augusta was pooh-poohed. It was said that it was not a good idea. We are still in a situation where we have a brand new wing of the Port Augusta Gaol—which was completed last year and opened in October and which could house 40 prisoners—which still is not being used and has not been used from the time it was opened.

We are continually told that the reason it has not been opened is because of lack of staff. Once again, I suggest that it is about time the Chief Secretary got his priorities right and took some action. I also suggested at that time (and have continued to do so) that there was an urgent need to proclaim the Correctional Services Act. That legislation was brought down in 1982. My colleague, the member for Victoria, was the Minister who introduced that legislation, and it was supported by this Parliament. The regulations associated with that legislation were passed on to the Minister very soon after we left office. Eight months later we have still seen no sign whatsoever of those regulations, and still the Act has not been proclaimed. The Chief Secretary has the audacity to say that he has not had time to complete the work he needs to do regarding the regulations.

Again, I would say that it is essential that at least portions of that Act are proclaimed to return much of the authority to the prison officers who gradually, over a period of time, have had that authority eroded. It is essential that that happens now.

**Mr Mathwin:** Where do you think the Chief Secretary is right now?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Glenelg is completely out of order.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I would suggest that the Chief Secretary should be in this House explaining to us what is happening at Yatala, and providing the opportunity for the Opposition to hear what is happening, even if the Govern-

ment does not want to hear it. The Opposition would like to know what is the current situation at Yatala. However, the Minister is nowhere to be seen.

It would seem that there has to be a death or something else very serious at Yatala as a result of further riots or fires before some action is taken by the Government. Again, I merely repeat that we are continually being told of plans for the future. However, no action is being taken and, unless there is segregation and proclamation of the Act, we will continue to have problems and the lives of prisoners and prison officers will be at risk. Therefore, I would hope that the Chief Secretary might at last take the advice that has been handed to him by the Opposition since it came to Government to take responsible action.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I welcome the opportunity to defend the Chief Secretary. I would say that, if members opposite can contain themselves for just a few minutes, perhaps they may (and I stipulate 'may') learn something. I believe that the diatribe we have heard in the past 10 minutes is typical of the cowardly and gutless approach I have come to expect from the previous speaker in the time I have been in this Parliament. I would have thought that he would at least recognise the fact that I would suggest (I do not know, but I would suggest) that the Minister would be at the prisons now conferring with—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Perhaps at this time I should clarify for the sake of the members for Glenelg and Todd that I called the member for Albert Park, not the member for Glenelg or the member for Todd. Any interruptions to the speech by the member for Albert Park are completely out of order.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I rise on a point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MATHWIN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your kind protection. I would ask you to reconsider the warning that you gave or the implication you made—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. No warning has been issued.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Obviously, members opposite do not want to hear my contribution. However, I believe that they will. I would say to the House that the Minister would be in a catch-22 situation. If he does not go to the prisons and see what is going on, he is remiss in his duties. If he is in the Parliament and answering questions, he should be out there. It does not matter which way the Minister acts: this crowd opposite would not be satisfied, and that would be the pragmatic approach applicable to the situation here today.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Today I heard on the radio what the Minister said. The previous speaker is mishandling the truth, to say the least. With regard to the Minister doing absolutely nothing, what an outrageous statement! Anyone who had a little bit of grey matter between his ears would know that the Minister would not be doing absolutely nothing, to use the previous speaker's own words.

Having said that, I know that I do not have to defend the Minister. He can do it himself, and I believe that he will do it more than adequately next week when he returns to this Chamber. Therefore, I would now like to get on to matters that are important to me, and I am not suggesting that my previous statements are not important. However, it is rather interesting to note what the previous speaker did in his position as the Minister responsible, or the Minister acting as the representative of the Minister of Local Gov-

ernment. A couple of years ago I asked a question, appearing on page 3613 of *Hansard*, about which I was very concerned. I will pursue this until I get what I want, or what I believe to be correct. I asked whether the previous Government would be prepared to carry out a survey into the quality of caravan parks and the accommodation provided in them. I asked how many persons were involved in caravan parks on a short-term and long-term basis. I also asked questions about fireproofing of caravans and the needs of children residing in caravan parks. The response I got from the then Government was that it did not intend to carry out such a survey.

I believe that South Australia is one of the few States in which a survey into caravan parks has not been carried out, and it is long overdue. Those surveys should be carried out to determine what I consider to be many problems in caravan parks. For the edification of some members opposite, I will refer them to studies carried out in Victoria, namely, the 'Caravan and Camping Study, Research Report Series No. 7' by the Geelong Regional Commission in October 1980. I refer to another report entitled 'Jacked up—or Hooked On—A Survey of Long-term Caravan Park Dwellers in Western Australia', sponsored by the Save the Children Fund. The third report, relating to long-term caravan residents in Melbourne, is entitled 'A Case Study of Housing Marginality' by the Centre for Urban Research and Action.

As I said, this matter has concerned me for some considerable time. It was first brought to my attention when I was in Western Australia some years ago, talking to a former railway colleague who works in the Pilbara. He advised me of many of the problems he believed existed with respect to those itinerant workers who were required to travel throughout the vast State of Western Australia. He suggested that I should ask our own State Government about the problems we have in South Australia, not only on a short-term basis but also on a long-term basis.

On 20 June I asked the Parliamentary Library research service to investigate this matter for me in regard to research carried out on the social effects on permanent residents in caravan parks and charges paid by long-term tenants. The response that I received from our research people in the Library is as follows:

It is difficult to ascertain the number of long-term residents in South Australian caravan parks. It appears that many parks in the metropolitan area have such residents, although only three have a substantial number. These are Sturt River at Darlington, the Vines at Reynella, and Bolivar Park. There are about 85 long-term caravans at Sturt River and 100 at the Vines. Bolivar management refused to answer questions by telephone. The cost and conditions are:

Sturt River: minimum four weeks; \$50 refundable bond; \$29 per week for caravan and two residents; \$4 per extra person per week; electricity extra; coin operated laundry available; and, owner van required.

The Vines: \$40 refundable bond; \$28 per week for caravan and two residents; \$3 per extra person per week; electricity extra; coin operated laundry available; rental payable two weeks in advance; and, either owner van, or on site for extra rate.

A number of studies have been made in Australia and overseas relating to factors concerning long-term residency of caravan parks. Most of the Australian research has centred on Queensland and Western Australia, where caravan residency has accompanied 'boom' mining development, or New South Wales and Victoria where housing shortages and unemployment have contributed.

I would suggest very strongly to this Parliament that these sorts of problems exist out there in the community. I believe that research into this matter is long overdue. Finally, I point out that in no way am I reflecting on the residents or the owners of those caravan parks here in South Australia.

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** On or about 12 May this year the Minister for Environment and Planning arranged for a gazettal notice indicating that a schedule of

land clearance regulations was to apply in South Australia. On or about 31 May that schedule of intent was tabled in this Parliament. In the interim period, applications had commenced to flow in from various primary producing regions of this State seeking permission under the new regulations both to proceed with development of new land and to carry out some clearance activity on land that was already under pasture.

Since the tabling of that schedule in this House, a move has been made to disallow the regulations and, accordingly, a similar move was made in the other place. I noted with interest today that the move for disallowance has been reinstated following the Parliamentary recess. Therefore, that motion for disallowance once again becomes effective. However, it does not cease to require persons in the community having to apply to clear vegetation in accordance with that schedule as originally lodged. I am concerned that in the interim period there has been a lodgment of some 486 applications to date from various parts of the State, a significant number of which have come from the district that I represent, in particular, from Kangaroo Island.

From information that I have gleaned from the local council, and had confirmed by the Department of Environment and Planning today, some 44 applications have been lodged through the Kingscote council alone. Of those 44 applications one for sure has been approved, and I understand that several others are in the process of being considered by the department. Collectively, the scene suggests that at this time there is an enormous backlog and that the departmental officers commissioned to carry out this work for the Minister are greatly embarrassed about the delays that are occurring, as indeed are the applicants. It is on behalf of the applicants that I express concern to the House, and I hope that the Minister will take prompt action to alleviate both the build-up and the costly delay that is occurring in the field.

When people apply to clear virgin land or clear land within the requirements of the schedule, invariably they want to get on with the job as part of their ordinary property management plans. In that respect delays of the kind that have already been demonstrated are costly, especially in communities where there are a limited number of contractors equipped to carry out such clearance work. The contractors themselves have a plan or an arrangement within the community to move from property to property, and accordingly from job to job, to minimise travelling costs associated with each of those jobs. If in the process of that programme an applicant is unable to proceed as a result of a delay caused by the department (and indeed there are gross delays applying at this time), then he may miss out on the tour of the

contractor through the district and in many cases have to pay dearly to have the contractor return.

I am not so sure that the Minister appreciates all the practical aspects of this matter. I understand why he brought in the schedule of regulations without notice. I accept the Minister's explanation given in this House concerning his doing that, but I do not accept that delay that has occurred in regard to the producers who are bearing the real costs involved. There are some parts of those clearance regulations with which we on this side of the House agree. We have no objection to the monitoring of new land clearance. Whether it be done by the Department of Environment and Planning or by the Department of Agriculture or both is not a matter of great concern to us, so long as the officers carrying out the inspection work are competent to do so and not extremist or of a kind that will make decisions contrary to the ordinary good management practices of land development.

With those few remarks I simply call on the Minister to make staff available, albeit temporarily, to hasten the catch-up of the backlog of applications lodged with the department and to deal with the applications rationally and as expeditiously as possible. It is frustrating to have a regulation, for example, that requires that a property owner must apply (and in most cases accompany his application with a \$20 fee to the local council) for the purpose of removing a tree or trees, especially when the removal of such trees is for the purpose of, say, installing a dam on the property. It is quite ridiculous in those circumstances, which embrace the ordinary practices of farm management, for a property owner, having selected a site and finding that there is an encumbrance in the form of a tree, to then have to lodge an application. In this instance an application must be lodged if such a tree is more than six inches in diameter at the butt. This applies to other similar farm development purposes, particularly in regard to land that is partially developed or in the course of development where it is frustrating to have to go through such a ridiculous process. As far as I can ascertain from my colleagues on this side of the House, we do not oppose the monitoring of development of new land by a responsible department or by a department that has officers who are competent and experienced to carry out such work. However, we do oppose the frustration that is being caused by the balance of the requirements in those regulations which really come under the canopy of matters of ordinary management.

Motion carried.

At 4.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 August at 2 p.m.