

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 September 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## PETITION: FUEL TAX

A petition signed by 4 780 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge both the Federal and State Governments to withdraw the recent fuel tax increases and not reintroduce the charge for at least two years was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PRESCRIBED CONCENTRATION OF ALCOHOL

A petition signed by 2 146 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reduce the prescribed concentration of alcohol to .05 per cent was presented by the Hon. G.F. Keneally.

Petition received.

## QUESTION

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

## A VERY SMALL CASE OF RAPE

In reply to Ms **LENEHAN** (1 September).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I am advised by my colleague, the Attorney-General, that a copy of the report of the Film Censorship Board, Sydney, has been obtained that 'the film *A Very Small Case of Rape* is a "glossy sex frolic" that attempts to satirise the women's movement. In two sexually mismatched marriages, one husband rapes his wife who in turns rapes their next door male neighbour whose sex-starved wife unites with her friend's husband and a new marital equilibrium is reached by the couples. All of the visual activity in the film was, in the board's view, inexplicit. Visuals included implied fellatio, implied cunnilingus, implied female masturbation, breast mouthing, simulated heterosexual intercourse and group sex—all of which came within the bounds of the "R" classification, in the board's opinion'.

The report was written when the film was imported in 1981. Subsequently the matter has been discussed with the Chief Film Censor (Janet Strickland), who has had one complaint from Victoria about associated advertising. In consequence, she has undertaken to require the distributor, Cinerama Films Pty Ltd, to submit all advertising to be used in connection with the film for approval.

## ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission 1983.  
Ordered that report be printed.

## PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
*Pursuant to Statute—*

t. Highways Department—Report, 1982-83.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MURRAY RIVER FLOW

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: I wish to inform the House about predicted flow levels in the Murray River based on the latest information received by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. According to information supplied by the River Murray Commission, continued heavy rainfall in Victoria and New South Wales is now expected to produce medium to high flows in the Murray River in South Australia over the next few months. While an earlier prediction of 65 000 megalitres a day in early October still applies, flows in the Murray River at lock 9 could well peak at about 90 000 megalitres a day late in October.

The rising river level is due to further significant rainfall in the Upper Murray catchment area as well as continued high flows coming down the Darling River in western New South Wales. Although the predicted peak is high, it will still be lower than the 126 000 megalitres a day recorded in 1981. River levels are expected to reach 17.5 metres at Renmark in the first week of November, and 6.8 metres at Morgan in the second week of November.

At this stage it is still too early to make accurate predictions, but the situation is being continuously monitored by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the River Murray Commission. Flow estimates will be constantly reviewed as more information becomes available and councils, landholders, and residents along the river will be kept fully informed of the situation through the media.

## QUESTION TIME

## WEALTH TAX

**Mr OLSEN**: Has the Premier had discussions with Treasury officers about the introduction of a State wealth tax and, if he has, will the Premier give a clear and unequivocal undertaking that such a tax will not be introduced during the life of this Parliament? I ask this question because the Premier has already broken his election promise not to introduce any new taxes during the life of this Parliament, and because it is the policy of his Party that a State Labor Government should seek to increase the equity of the financial system by replacing some existing taxes with taxes that would be borne most by those having the greatest ability to pay.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Before last year's State election we promised an inquiry into State revenue raising. The terms of reference of that inquiry have been finalised and we are simply waiting on the finalisation of the person or persons to conduct the inquiry. The inquiry would consider the whole range of tax measures available to the States, or which could be available to the States, and an attempt would be made to have public debate and to get submissions from the public in relation to those issues. I have had no discussions with Treasury officers about the range of taxes or about any possible new tax. We have no proposals in front of us.

**Mr Olsen:** They haven't been put to you?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No. When that inquiry takes place, I hope that people will not only make submissions about taxes (and I hope that the Opposition does that, too), but go further and begin to understand the dilemmas faced by any State Government trying to raise revenue. Our revenue base at present is narrow and inequitable. We have troubles in respect of the division of powers between the Commonwealth and the States. Those problems are being tackled by the Constitutional Convention and the working party following the Premiers' Conference, and at the State level they will be tackled through our own inquiry.

However, in the meantime, as I have often said in this place, we must use the revenue base that we have. We had to increase some taxes. Indeed, not to do so would have rendered this State bankrupt. Any Government that shrank from that action, for any reason whatsoever, would have been totally irresponsible. The Leader of the Opposition saw fit to acknowledge that a few months ago, but he has forgotten his own statements on that matter.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD DISPUTES

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he plans to establish a system for settling neighbourhood disputes?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which deals with a matter in respect of which he has had difficulties in his district. Recently, there has been publicity about an experiment that has been initiated by the Norwood Community Legal Service to try to develop a mechanism whereby neighbours' disputes and neighbourhood disputes generally could be settled by non-judicial means by bringing together the parties and thus having a situation where neighbours could still live in a degree of harmony although engaged in a dispute.

These disputes often involve minor monetary sums, yet court procedures to settle them are expensive and often protracted, besides leaving the parties at arm's length. A student social worker who has been doing this work has received a small Government subsidy to enable her to visit New South Wales to inspect neighbourhood centres there and the methods used in that State to settle neighbourhood disputes.

I will be interested to receive her report in due course. There is an established structure in New South Wales for settling neighbourhood disputes in a non-formal way. As this is a matter that the Attorney-General is considering and, as it pertains particularly to the *quasi* judicial system, I will refer the honourable member's question to him for further information.

### VALUE ADDED TAX

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Has the Premier had discussions with any Treasury officers about the introduction of a value added tax in South Australia and, if so, will the Premier give a clear and unequivocal undertaking that no such tax will be introduced during the life of this Government?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I have not had any discussions with Treasury officers about a value added tax, nor do I think that such discussions are necessary. As I have explained already in answering the Leader, the question of our tax base and possibilities will be canvassed in a public forum and I believe that it will be a useful and educational exercise. I repeat my challenge again for the Opposition to take part and put up its productive suggestions.

I also suggest that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts ought to answer the question of whether or not at the next election they will cancel out all the revenue changes that we have made and, if they were to so cancel them out, what they would be replacing them with. That is a very interesting question. I would like to hear an undertaking from them that those taxes that they have criticised are to be removed at the next election, and we will do a few calculations about that.

### JOB CREATION SCHEME

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Some constituents have expressed concern to me that there is some disparity in funds granted under the Community Employment Programme. The concern of my constituents is that some of the areas of high unemployment are missing out on job creation funds that are going to some of the more affluent areas in Adelaide. Can the Deputy Premier say whether this is the case and what is to be done to make sure that areas of South Australia hit by high unemployment will receive their share of the funds?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** The member was good enough to serve me notice yesterday that he intended to ask this question because of some wrong beliefs in his district that there was some disparity between the arrangements in relation to the job creation schemes. I want to place on record exactly what is occurring.

The question of the equitable distribution of job creation funds is one that seems to be creating some concern within the community (quite wrongly, I might say). After all, as the honourable member so correctly pointed out, one of the main aims of the job creation schemes was to help those areas worst hit by unemployment. I would like to take this opportunity to assure the member that job creation funds will be distributed fairly in South Australia in keeping with that priority—the priority of unemployment.

Since May, when the first grants were made under the wage pause programme, \$13.7 million has been allocated to job creation in South Australia. This is from South Australia's share of \$17.54 million from the wage pause programme. South Australia will also receive a further \$21.7 million this financial year for job creation under the community employment programme. They are not to be confused, because they are two absolutely different schemes.

Under the guidelines operating in South Australia, money is given to projects after the projects have been submitted to the job creation unit by a sponsor. I make clear on the record that I have nothing whatsoever to do with that until it comes to me. The job creation unit recommends to the committee, and the committee recommends to me. The sponsor is also required to make a contribution, although in exceptional circumstances the sponsor contribution can be waived. It is true that some areas have received more than others in South Australia up to this time.

However, that does not mean that those areas have received funds at the expense of others, which I understand has been the belief held in the community. The wage pause programme and the community employment programme are not simply 'first come first served' operations: the principle of the first in the queue getting it all does not apply. What honourable members, members of the public, and the potential sponsor groups should realise is that job creation schemes are expected to run over the next three years. All details of grants made and of how much various areas receive will be closely monitored, so that over the next three years of the scheme there will be an equitable distribution of the funds available.

Everyone will receive their fair share based on the unemployment component applying in each area. That may mean that some of the organisations and local government areas which have been quick off the mark to apply for funds (for which I congratulate those who have) and which have received a fair quota may have to wait some time before receiving any more. As I have said, the job creation scheme is not a 'first come first served' affair. The money will be distributed equitably over the period of the schemes. I insist that that is the case. If any member, irrespective of from which side of the House, has any problems in regard to this the Minister or the department should be contacted, and we will provide necessary assistance. We are even setting up a system at the moment to help community groups that are not aware of how they should approach the scheme. We do not want to advantage some people and disadvantage others. Some community groups do not have the expertise available to them to set up and make an application to the department, and we do not want such groups to be disadvantaged. We want people on a per capita unemployment basis to receive their proper share. All is being done to ensure that all the money is distributed properly across the State.

#### MURRAY RIVER COMMITTEE

**Mr LEWIS:** What has the Premier done towards the implementation of a proposal to establish the Murray River Ministerial Cabinet Committee, as suggested by the Murray Valley League, for the purpose of developing an integrated master plan for the use and resurrection of the Murray River for the benefit of all sections of the community that use that? I want to briefly explain my question by quoting from some disparate literature that has come across my desk in recent times. Several weeks ago I received a newsletter from the Murray Valley League in South Australia, which contained the following statement:

Early in 1983 the League's Executive Manager submitted to the South Australian Premier and relevant Ministers and Government 'heads' a proposal to establish in South Australia a special Murray River Ministerial Cabinet Committee and Working Party. It is believed that major decisions, concerning the multiple uses of the river, need to be made now, and jointly by the relevant Ministers. They need to set guidelines and develop a master plan for the river. It is believed that the proposal has received very favourable consideration by Cabinet and that firm decisions will be made by August.

In the recent May quarterly edition of the *Riverlander*, published by the Murray Valley League, an article in regard to this matter stated, in part:

Mr Moore [Executive Manager for South Australia] claims that such a multiple-use plan does not exist anywhere for the Murray. He points out that over the years departments within government and academe have been too preoccupied with their own specific goals (e.g. agriculture, irrigation, water supply, environment, limnology, recreation, tourism, etc.). While awareness of the resources of the river and their many uses is increasing, he said that planning and management have tended to be myopic or singular, concentrating on the primary river use of the time, showing little concern for other uses and even now revealing an insensitivity to adverse environmental impacts. Today irrigation dominates Murray River use, planning and management.

Further on, the article continued:

Whilst agreeing that interstate river problems can and do have considerable impact on South Australian's river use, he emphasised that these problems should not be used excessively as an excuse for not getting on with the job of proper river use and management in South Australia. Mr Moore further pointed out that whilst the further extension of powers sought for the River Murray Commission can better enable it to assist in the overall planning and management of the Murray, it is unwise to accept suggestions that a more powerful commission is the *deus ex machina*, which could solve the problems of the river. The time taken already to effect some of the limited changes to its charter amply demonstrates

this. The opportunity exists for South Australia to set an example in Murray River use and planning.

He concluded:

It is especially a time for co-operation between the various Government bodies, associations and river users and certainly not a time for parochialism, jealousies and unproductive competition between various groups. Mr Moore said that he has already submitted such proposals for a South Australian River Murray master plan to the South Australian Premier, Mr John Bannon.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know whether this is a new Opposition tactic to spin out Question Time by allowing these extraordinary lectures, but I do not deny that, even though it is perhaps denying members the opportunity to ask questions, the general matter that the member raises is one of great importance to the whole State, and one that is taken very seriously indeed by the Government.

I am aware of the proposition put by the Murray River Development League. There is a Cabinet subcommittee, the Resources and Physical Development Committee, which is chaired by my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, and comprises all those Ministers who would have a concern in this matter, and which in fact has this matter listed on its agenda for consideration. The honourable member will be aware, of course, that apart from inputs from the Murray River Development League, there are a number of other groups and areas that would have an interest in this. There is the general question of irrigation and the problems there to which my colleague the Minister of Water Resources has been addressing himself in conjunction with the Lands Department. There are the problems of the Riverland fruit cannery and general industrial activity in the Riverland itself, and that part of the Murray which is under active consideration by the Government. So, there are many strands to be brought together, but all the key Ministers who would be involved in the aspects that the member raises are members of the Cabinet subcommittee and they will be giving this matter their attention.

#### TOURISM WEEK

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Tourism outline what support tourism week, which begins on Sunday, has had from the news media in this State? Tourism week in South Australia is part of the celebrations centred around world tourism day, which falls next Tuesday. Clearly, it is not just a matter of an official declaration with speeches without supportive action, and this is the reason why I ask the Minister what support he has already received from the media.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** As I expect every member would be aware, I will be launching tourism week in South Australia on Sunday next at a function at Ayers House. I am very encouraged by the support given to tourism week by the news media in South Australia. In fact, I should say that, during the time that I have been Minister, I have been encouraged by the recognition by the news media of the economic importance of tourism to South Australia. The news media seems to have picked up this importance much more readily than have other sectors of the society in South Australia. We will be launching tourism week next Sunday. The Prime Minister will be making a speech on Monday, using the theme 'Tourism gets Australia going', which, as we would all agree, is quite appropriate. Next Thursday, the Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr Brown), will be in Adelaide, and will attend a number of functions. The industry generally would be pleased about that and it might once more take up the opportunity to canvass a number of issues with my Federal colleague. We have already arranged a

number of media events. We will have direct radio broadcasts from Kangaroo Island—

**Mr Becker:** Oh!

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** —a whole series of special newspaper features, and special segments on TV. I pause there, as there seems to be some cynicism being expressed by the member for Hanson about the importance of Kangaroo Island in the total tourism scene in South Australia.

**Mr Mathwin:** He's talking about Ted's shearing shed.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** At this stage Ted's shearing shed is not of significant importance to tourism but, as he may be an ex member of Parliament after the boundary changes, his shearing shed could become something to show tourists visiting Kangaroo Island.

**The Hon. W.E. Chapman:** Don't hold your breath.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I agree with the honourable member—I will not be holding my breath in hoping for a change in Alexandra. Mr Bulfield, from the Travel Centre, will be broadcasting widely on the theme of little known holiday places in South Australia. The media generally has been very supportive, and I am very thankful for that. I expect that everyone who makes an effort to contribute to tourism week in South Australia will benefit in one way or another. I am confident that South Australia generally, as well as the economy, will benefit from their participation.

#### TOURISM FOR THE AGED

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** As part of my contribution to tourism week, I ask the Minister of Tourism whether he will investigate the possibility of the Department of Tourism conducting a survey into the needs and preferences of people over 60 years of age in regard to travel and tourism? Last night in the House I spoke briefly on this subject and pointed out that the over 60s market (with some notable exceptions) has been largely neglected by the tourism industry and, indeed, little has been done to analyse the needs and preferences of this group, yet, in demographic terms, this group is of increasing importance in the market sector. Between now and the year 2000 the proportion of Australians aged 65 and over will increase by two-thirds to 12 per cent of the population. This group represents a very discerning and mobile section of the population, with a keen eye for value.

I suggest to the Minister that SACOTA (the South Australian Council on the Ageing), with its 184 clubs and more than 30 000 members, would represent a magnificent opportunity for the provision of a data base. In other words, if the Department were to work through the senior citizens clubs it would have a ready-made survey base. I feel sure, having discussed the matter with the President and Director of SACOTA, that that organisation would be willing to cooperate if the Minister believes there is merit in the idea.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I do believe there is merit in the idea that the honourable member has explained to the House. The senior citizen tourism market is a significant one, and it is growing. Although studies have been undertaken, I do not know whether we have a study of the nature which the honourable member recommends, but we have a number of studies on the market that senior citizens present to tourism. I know that, in recent years, South Australia has benefited quite significantly by some low-cost holiday ventures that we have had in this State. Unfortunately, we have lost at least one of them, and that has had some impact on South Australia's capacity to provide attractive tourist destinations for this group. It would be our intention to encourage senior citizens—or people in that category—to see South Australia first.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Fifteen per cent of the market.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yes, 15 per cent of the market, as the honourable member points out; that is the situation now. Within a few years that will grow considerably. We are aware of the importance of the market and aware that people in this age group are becoming increasingly a greater proportion of people who want to travel.

We are aware that we should be providing the types of accommodation these people are seeking. Indeed, they seek a whole range of accommodation: not all senior citizens are looking for economical accommodation, and not all senior citizens are looking for expensive accommodation. It is important that this State and other States provide for that demand. I will take up with the department the suggestion of the honourable member and ascertain just what data base we have, and I will bring down for her a report on the viability of the review or survey that she recommends.

#### INSURANCE INTERMEDIARIES

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs ask his colleague to make urgent representations to the appropriate Federal Minister to expedite the introduction of legislation for the regulation of insurance intermediaries? Constituents have told me that the introduction of regulations to cover insurance intermediaries must now be treated as a matter of national urgency. It has been reported to me that complaints include brokers diverting money owed to clients to their own personal use; certain consultants with no qualifications advising on complex insurance matters and giving a bad name to the rest of the industry; brokers giving the impression that they are the actual insurers when in fact they are only the intermediary or agent; dishonest salespersons using policyholders to convert valuable life insurance policies in order to receive commissions on the new policies; brokers holding policies going bankrupt, leaving the client with no redress or insurance; and failure of brokers to forward policies to clients through lack of any regulation requiring them to do so and, as a result, many victims falsely believing that they are insured in all circumstances when nothing could be further from the truth. Constituents in my area would be grateful if all the abovementioned problems could be regulated by a disciplinary body.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure all members have received representations about the inadequacies of the present system of regulation of insurance intermediaries. I know that it is a matter which concerns the insurance industry itself, and I understand that there is a proposal before the Federal Government to introduce insurance intermediaries, agents and brokers legislation along the lines recommended in the Australian Law Reform Commission. However, I will obtain further details on that measure from my colleague in another place and advise the honourable member in due course.

#### SPORTS LOTTERY

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say when the Government will introduce a sports lottery and what has been the reason for the delay? I understand that A.L.P. policy during the 1982 State election was that there would be a sports lottery established in South Australia to support sporting clubs and associations. I notice on pages 197 and 198 of the Auditor-General's Report that the soccer pools fund in 1982 received some \$880 000, and I believe that as at 30 June about \$890 000 was still in that fund.

Having watched the slow progress of soccer pools in South Australia, I am concerned about the future of increased funding for sporting clubs in this State.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The question of the proposed sports lotteries is under active consideration. Of course, my department will not be administering sports lotteries: they will be administered by the Lotteries Commission, which comes within the jurisdiction of the Premier's Department. I am as anxious as the member for Hanson to have sports lotteries introduced, because I believe that, as with soccer pools, they will provide an opportunity to obtain additional money for recreation and sport in this State. Negotiations have been proceeding for some time, and I do not know what stage they have reached. However, I will inquire and inform the honourable member in due course. I would think at this stage that sports lotteries could start early in the new year.

The soccer pools have levelled off somewhat in the past 12 months, as I think the honourable member indicated. The average weekly return to the Government is between \$17 000 and \$18 000 a week, totalling over \$800 000 a year. It is an important and effective source of revenue for the department in providing funds for recreation and sport. Although we do not have any say in the administration of the Australian soccer pools, I understand that the proprietors are considering a new advertising campaign to try to increase turnover, and that campaign should commence in the next few weeks.

#### MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

**Mr PETERSON:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate the legality of a practice engaged in by at least one home air-conditioning company which requires payment for an annual maintenance service up to one year before the service is required and which applies a surcharge if this condition is not met? One of my constituents has had an air-conditioner in his home for the past three years and is happy with the service that he has been receiving. During the first year he paid \$30 for annual maintenance as defined by the contract, which specifically excluded the cost of new parts or of remedying any faults.

He was told that he would have to pay \$40 for maintenance in the second year and that that sum should be paid forthwith. He notified the company that he would require the service but would not pay the \$40 one year ahead of the date of the service. That service was carried out subsequently, but my constituent was required to pay a surcharge of \$10. For maintenance in the third year (this year), he has been told that the charge will be \$50 and that, if he does not accept the contract, an additional charge will apply next year. My constituent sees three problems involved here: first, the customer's money being held for nearly 12 months, during which time it could be used by the customer; secondly, the question of the contract charge that has been paid if the company goes bankrupt; and, thirdly, the legality of such a contract.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which raises an important issue and an interesting legal point. I shall have the question referred to my colleague and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### VICTOR HARBOR SEWERAGE

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:** Will the Minister of Water Resources say what is the policy of his department in respect of sewerage connections in the Victor Harbor township? I

concede that on the surface this question could be considered parochial. Indeed it is in this instance, because in recent times two quite important industries have been established in that region, one for the purpose of processing fish and the other for the purpose of processing glassware, and those industries are very welcome in the area. However, neither of these industries has been serviced with a sewerage connection, and representations have been made to the Minister to have his department reconsider its policy, and indeed its overall programme, with a view to having services connected to those specific sites.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** As the honourable member would know, the department has done extensive work at Victor Harbor in the Yilki area over the past two or three years. The area to which the honourable member is referring is the suburb of Newland, which is partly sewered. Representations were made to me by the honourable member about the two undertakings he mentioned, namely, a fish factory and a glass and glazing factory. I am pleased to advise the honourable member that, since his representations, financial arrangements have been finalised regarding the fish factory, and the proprietor has agreed to pay up to the 15 per cent revenue return (in accordance with policy) for the extension of sewers. As a consequence, I am advised that work will probably start early next week. I understand that it will depend somewhat on the construction gang in the area but that the plant is now on site.

In relation to the glass and glazing factory, investigations are still progressing, and it would appear at this stage that financial arrangements still need to be negotiated with the proprietor of that business. I appreciate the honourable member's approach in this matter: he made representations to me not only in writing but also personally, and I think that the situation I have outlined shows the promptness and reasonableness of the department in attending to such approaches by members on behalf of their constituents.

I am pleased to advise the honourable member that the work in question will be starting next week. It will probably take four or five weeks, or perhaps longer (I think that a distance of approximately 350 metres needs to be sewered). I will advise the honourable member on the other matter when I receive further information.

#### MATHS AND SCIENCE TEACHERS

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Minister of Education outline to the House the situation regarding maths and science teachers available for employment in 1984, following claims in the media this morning that South Australia will be disadvantaged in this regard? Concern has been expressed to me that, if this is the case, students (in particular, female students) will be affected; as maths and science are the areas that will provide alternative career prospects for women.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling the honourable Minister, I ask, as a matter of courtesy to members asking questions—and Ministers replying, for that matter—that the studying of maps and the holding of small-scale seminars, and the like, be conducted outside the Chamber. The honourable Minister of Education.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The whole process might have been alleviated if that overhead projector was used to screen a big map on the wall. The honourable member's question, I think relates to a radio broadcast this morning that indicated that South Australia would see some of its maths and science graduates, who were able to take up teaching positions, going either outside the education system by taking employment in industry, going interstate to other school systems, or, perhaps, not choosing Government schools, but going to non-government schools. That view

was expressed because of the fear that the late notification of whether an employment opportunity exists in the Education Department would, naturally, leave people anxious, and thus they would choose other options available first.

Of course, subsequent to that the honourable member has raised the point that we do have a serious problem in relation to maths and science subjects, because some of our students are not choosing to take those subjects to the extent that they should. One of the sub-groups that that applies to is girls, and certainly major attention must be paid to that area.

However, the situation in 1984 will be better than it was in 1983. Many of the problems that have been raised by the member for Brighton were indeed a problem in the staffing situation last year, because it is standard practice that most of the staffing in the Education Department is arranged during November or December of the preceding year. Often, people who have obtained their qualifications and who know that they will be registerable to teach will go elsewhere, knowing that it will be so late in the year before they find out whether or not they have a job.

Conscious of the fact that in some areas we are able to guarantee people employment well before November and December of their employment prospects for the following year we decided this year to open the employment process. I gave approval in July of this year for that process to occur, mainly in areas where we know that there will be shortages. In maths and science, I have given approval for the appointment of 166 teachers for the 1984 year. It should be remembered that that approval was given in July of this year, and that those involved will not have to wait until November or December. Therefore, a significant improvement has been made. The result is that we will get some excellent teachers whom otherwise we might have lost to industry or to interstate education systems.

One other aspect of the report on this morning's radio was inaccurate: reference was made to the fact that most of the appointments would be contract—that is incorrect. More than 60 per cent of those appointments will be permanent (it may be well over 60 per cent), compared to a situation last year where only slightly more than 50 per cent of those appointments were permanent. Clearly, the comments made this morning related to last year's situation and not to that applying this year, as this has changed dramatically for the better.

#### INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED SERVICES COUNCIL

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Health why he has removed the privilege of direct access to him by the Director of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council? A constituent of mine, who is deeply involved in the work of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council, has advised me that the previous Minister of Health, when making the appointment of the Director of the I.D.S.C., arranged the department so that the Director reported directly to the Minister. I am also advised that the present Minister of Health has ordered that the Director must now report to the head of the Central Sector of the Health Commission which, in turn, reports to the Chairman of the Health Commission, who then reports to the Minister of Health.

I am advised that this decision seriously affects both the autonomy and the effectiveness of this vital body, the Intellectually Disabled Services Council. I am further advised that both the Bright Report and the Intellectually Retarded Persons Project recommended the autonomy earlier enjoyed by the Director of the I.D.S.C., as implemented by the previous Government.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I shall refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a report. I do not think that anyone would deny that the Minister of Health is one of the most accessible Ministers in South Australia: any suggestion to the contrary would be a long way off the mark. Further, the Minister has indicated by his performance that he has a great concern and care about disadvantaged groups within his portfolio jurisdiction, as well as about disadvantaged groups outside the areas covered by his portfolio. So, I totally reject the criticism inherent in the honourable member's question. However, I will ask my colleague for a report and will bring it down as soon as possible.

#### PEACE EDUCATION

**Mr TRAINER:** Thank you Mr Speaker. I am hopeful that after the election, following today's redistribution, I will be answering to the title of the member for Walsh. Can the Minister of Education say what is the Government's response to the request for peace education to be introduced into schools?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Several groups in the community have been putting a proposition, not only to the South Australian education system but also to other systems in other States, that there should be a course called 'peace studies' in our schools. Amongst the groups that have been putting that proposition are the Teachers for Peace and also the United Nations Association of Australia and its respective State branches.

Some weeks ago I addressed the Federal conference of the United Nations Association on this topic, and indicated that my personal view was against having an identifiable subject called 'peace studies', partly because it could become a travesty of the name inasmuch as students would say, 'We are now going to do peace' and forget the connotations that it should have for all aspects of human relationships be they local, national, or international.

In some areas of social science teaching within our schools we attempt to deal with some of the important elements that are built into the concept of peace education, namely, conflict resolution on the national and international scale, and interpersonal relationships on the personal scale. It is our belief that that is the more important thrust that should be taken: that is, to focus on those particular points. We also acknowledge that there are some important points in terms of international development and an understanding of the international development needs right throughout the world that should be built into social sciences curricula and, indeed, they are.

I am not accepting the proposition that *per se* there should be a subject called 'peace', but I have supported and will continue to support the idea that the elements built into that concept should be integrated right across the social science curricula and, indeed, into other areas of the curricula.

With regard to that, I now announce that next year we will be appointing in the Advisory Service a social science adviser who will have three responsibilities: first, to study the question of peace education and how it integrates into the various areas of the curriculum; secondly, to be concerned with the matter of development education and the importance that plays in terms of the understanding of social sciences; and thirdly, concern for Australian history and Australian heritage, because there has been much concern over the years that perhaps we have not paid quite as much attention to that area as we should. We decided, in creating this new position, that those three areas will be the responsibilities to be considered by the person appointed to that position in 1984.

## AGENT-GENERAL

**Mr MATHWIN:** Can the Premier say whether the Government has had any contact in recent months with the Agent-General in the United Kingdom, Mr Rundle, about the tenure of his appointment and, if so, does the Government intend to replace him before he completes his full term in 1985?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MATHWIN:** There will be a lot of contenders.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Despite your restrictions, Sir, but certainly before them and not after them, I was studying these maps, and I can understand the member's concern. He may indeed be looking for a job, and perhaps Agent-General is what he has in mind.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are far too many candidates for this position, it is quite obvious.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am in frequent contact with Mr Rundle, and while we are reviewing the whole area of overseas representation—and there is certainly no haste about that—Mr Rundle is continuing to carry out his duties as Agent-General as he has done since the change of Government. In fact, at present he is involved with a group that is seeing the various submarine consortia throughout Europe with Mr Smith and others. Mr Rundle is taking an active part in those discussions, and he continues to fulfil a useful and active role as Agent-General.

## LEGAL AID

**Mr GROOM:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, say whether there will be an increase in the provisions for legal aid in South Australia during the present financial year? Although the State's economy is well on the path to recovery, as the Minister knows there is still an increasing need for more legal aid due to unemployment levels.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** This question is related to one asked yesterday by the member for Whyalla in regard to provision of legal aid in that city. I understand that additional funds will be available for legal aid in this State in the forthcoming year as a result of additional moneys accruing by way of interest paid on solicitors' trust accounts and as a result of some decisions taken in Victoria by one of the banks. That decision has flowed on to other States. South Australians will benefit by an additional amount for legal aid and for other purposes, including that from the solicitors' guaranteed statutory fund from which moneys are paid to the victims of defaulting legal practitioners.

The position hitherto in this State has been that only a portion of the moneys retained in solicitors' trust accounts has gathered interest that was paid for those public purposes. The Attorney-General is considering details of these matters. It is intended that there will be a decentralisation programme for the Legal Services Commission and further support for community-based legal services in this State, and that will mean that more people in South Australia will be able to receive legal aid. However, I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain further information for him.

## RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Has the Minister of Water Resources made a submission to the Federal Government on behalf of South Australia in support of the proposed

River Murray Commission storage to be built above the Hume Reservoir for the purpose of water quality management and to further guarantee South Australia's entitlement and, if so, what were the contents of that submission? The former Minister for National Development (Sir John Carrick) had proposed that an urgent study be undertaken to determine the site of a further River Murray Commission storage for the purposes of dilution flows—in other words, water management from a water quality viewpoint—and also that the waters from this additional storage be retained by the Commission purely for the purpose of water quality control and also to further guarantee the statutory entitlements contained within the River Murray Waters Act.

Sir John Carrick proposed that that urgent study be undertaken within a six-month time frame. That time frame has expired; therefore, can the Minister say whether that important proposal in the interests of South Australia has lapsed with the change of Federal Government or whether the present Federal Government has continued with that proposal?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I have not made any formal submission to the Federal Government in regard to an up-river storage or in regard to the Commission's storages in Victoria and New South Wales. I do not think the matter should be completely disregarded, as there is certain to be some truth in the comments made by the member for Chaffey. Of course, last year—

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I am not always critical. Last year was a particularly dry year and storages in the upper reaches were at difficult levels. The supply under the commission's storages to the three States was therefore very low. The matter should not be completely disregarded. I am certainly prepared to make representations to the Federal authorities and to the Federal Minister to see whether the River Murray Commission supports that project and whether the other States and the Commonwealth support the project, because representations from South Australia alone would certainly not precipitate additional storage. It would be necessary for the Federal Government to provide the money for that resource. Certainly, I have not made any formal submissions on this, but I am prepared to consider the matter and to do so.

## SEX SHOPS

**Mr MAYES:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning consider reviewing the Planning Act to provide local government with the power to zone and control the location of sex shops? Many concerned residents in the Goodwood and Millswood area of my electorate have contacted me concerning the establishment in those locations of two sex shops which are placed in situations where schoolchildren daily travel past on the way to St Thomas's and Goodwood Primary School. As a consequence, the residents are concerned at the influence of these shops, and the general aesthetic outlook has a rather derogatory effect on the location and on the children who travel past.

One of the shops, the Pink Pussy, is located on the corner of Albert Street and Goodwood Road, right next to the Capri Cinema, which is often used as a cinema for showing children's films. Residents and I have contacted the council about this and we have been advised that it has no powers under which it can regulate the location of such shops.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is an interesting idea and I will certainly be happy to give it some consideration. Personally, I have never entered any such shops. I do not know whether the honourable member is offering a person-



alised tour of these shops in his electorate, or whether, if he is, I should take up his offer.

**Mr Mayes:** No.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Perhaps he is not, from the interjection. As the planning legislation operates at present, zoning is insufficiently fine grained to allow local government to withhold permission for a specific proposition such as this; that is to say, zoning categories usually address themselves to broad categorisation, such as general industry, light industry, commercial, local shopping, residential (R1, R2 and R3), rural A, rural B and so on. Within a commercial or local shopping zone one does not distinguish between various grades of commercial or retailing activity. I think that probably to isolate this form of retailing (if that is the way to describe it) would be a little unusual and would almost certainly require an amendment to the regulations, if not to the Act, to enable it to happen.

It occurs to me that there may be another way in which this could be approached. That is not through the Planning Act but through the Local Government Act. I would assume that there would be power in the Local Government Act for by-laws to be struck whereby within a particular local government area there could be some control, if not prohibition, of such activities in designated areas. I think that while I am examining this proposal (and I appreciate the honourable member's concern for having some sort of control in this area), I should also discuss it with my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to see whether an appropriate draft model by-law might be possible. The other thing that may be of interest to members (because I gather from the attention being given to this answer that members on both sides of the House have from time to time entertained this sort of proposition in their minds because of complaints that have been put before them by constituents) is that I believe that perhaps a year ago the Attorney-General's Department looked at this sort of concept as a general proposition, so I think it is also important that I discuss the matter with the Attorney-General. I fairly frequently commute through that portion of the honourable member's electorate to which he has referred and I am aware of the visual impact of these establishments, so I will therefore take the matter up.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 18 October at 2 p.m.

In so moving I would like to use the occasion to pay a tribute to the Head Messenger of the House of Assembly, Mr Gordon Parham Ellis. Mr Ellis is well known to every member of this place and to all who work in and around the Parliament, in whatever capacity. That is no surprise because, in the length of his service and in the nature of his duties, he is in frequent contact with all of us. In fact, it is Mr Ellis' long service, his experience and his knowledge which have been of such great importance to all members of this place, whether old or new hands. Unfortunately, there are no members of the Parliament now who can remember a time when Gordon Ellis was not occupying a position in this House.

It is nearly 25 years ago, nearly a quarter of a century ago, that he started on 11 March 1959 at Parliament House as a messenger. Many members have come and gone in that time. When Mr Ellis commenced duties, Sir Thomas Playford was in office and had been the Premier of this State since

1938. Opposite him, on the Opposition benches, was Mr Mick O'Halloran, who first entered the State Parliament in 1924, subsequently went into Federal politics and then returned to the South Australian Parliament and was for a long time Leader of the Opposition. Tales of the Playford/O'Halloran Parliaments are legendary in the history and development of South Australia.

Mr Ellis was, of course, in Parliament House at a time one might call the dying days of the somewhat more stately and less frenetic Parliament. Obviously, as new members have come in, adjustments have had to be made. I know I can speak personally, and I imagine each and every person here can also touch on the same personal basis, that Mr Ellis' advice and assistance in all aspects on his job has been absolutely invaluable, particularly in one's first few months of uncertainty as a new member of Parliament. In particular I remember, apart from that very early stage, the period when I was working daily in this building as Leader of the Opposition. My staff and I, as an office working here in the Parliament, had many occasions to thank Mr Ellis for his assistance and his unfailing courtesy, his diligence to duty and the general help that he gave.

Mr Ellis came to the job of messenger with a varied experience of life generally out in the wider world than Parliament, and I guess that was a good thing because he could call on that experience when dealing with the motley crew of members of Parliament to whom he has had to minister over the years. He is a South Australian, educated at Kapunda, I understand. He did a business course at what was then the School of Mines (now the Institute of Technology). He served for 4½ years in the A.I.F. during the war and after the war worked in a number of capacities, one of which I was not aware of, but it explains a number of things: he was a tailor, which explains certain skills he has and the general demeanour and deportment of the team that works under him.

His leadership has been exemplary and he has a long record of service to this House that is seldom equalled. It is with a real sense of personal loss and sadness that we realise that in future we will not see Gordon working around the House. I hope that his retirement will be long, happy and fruitful and that we will not lose contact with him in his retirement. I formally place on record our thanks to Mr Gordon Ellis for his splendid service to the Parliament and to South Australia.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I second the motion and join with the Premier in paying a tribute to Mr Gordon Ellis who is about to retire as Head Messenger. Indeed, this is his last sitting day in the House. Gordon is the longest serving member on the staff at Parliament House. Since I became a member and have had the privilege of knowing Gordon, I have found him to be most cheerful, obliging, courteous and helpful at all times. It seems that no task has been too much trouble for him. For someone to have a pleasant disposition at all times, whether during the day or night and whatever the circumstances, speaks volumes for the courteous and obliging way he has gone about his duties and for his personality. As a relatively new member of this House, I certainly concur in the statement, as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, that Gordon has been a type of father figure to members, providing them with help and guidance more as a friend than as a Parliamentary official. It is the mark of a man if he can retire from his work place a friend of those with whom he has been involved rather than just as their servant. Twenty-four years is a long time to serve in any field, and in the Parliamentary and political arena it is probably equal to a much longer period elsewhere. I commend Gordon for his



long and distinguished service as a member of the House of Assembly staff, especially as Head Messenger.

In a place that sees frequent changes in fortune, both of political Parties and of members, Gordon has been a witness to all of this while not letting it in any way affect his constant and efficient contribution to the smooth running of this House. The Premier referred to the fact that Gordon was educated at Kapunda Primary and High schools. I note that Kapunda is to be in the new electoral district of Custance, and I hope that the new member for Custance will continue the tradition of loyal service that has been set by someone who originally came from that district.

I join with the Premier in acknowledging the work done and the help given by Gordon as Head Messenger and, indeed, by members of his staff to me, as Leader of the Opposition in this place, and to members of my staff. Certainly, his diligence and obliging nature has been evident at all times. Gordon's presence will be missed by each and every one of us. On behalf of members of my Party, I wish Gordon Ellis a long, happy and healthy retirement and every good fortune for the future. I am sure that members of my staff concur in the sentiments I have expressed.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** I agree absolutely with the comments made by the mover and seconder of the motion. As one who required perhaps more assistance than the average member (and some might even say that I still require it), I owe Gordon a debt for the help and advice he has given me since I came into this place. For such help I cannot express my thanks adequately. We, as members, do not know how lucky we are in this House in the way we sometimes use up the people who work here. We are demanding in our attitude and we do not always admit that. We are extremely lucky to have had a man of the calibre of Gordon Ellis to help us along our way. I express my thanks to Gordon for his help and wish him good luck in his retirement.

**The SPEAKER:** Before putting the motion, I concur in the remarks made by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Semaphore. On behalf of the staff of the House of Assembly and on my own behalf, I thank Gordon Ellis for his long, efficient and helpful service to this House. Certainly, during his time here he has been universally liked and respected by members. I have always found him obliging and ready to help, notwithstanding the most peculiar hours that he has been required to work in this House. His kindness has not been limited to those in Parliament: I understand that outside of the House he has worked for charities and in particular has helped the aged and sick in the community. I am sure that Gordon will not be bored in his retirement, since I know that he will want to continue with his charitable activities. May I, on behalf of the staff, wish Gordon Ellis a long, healthy and happy retirement.

Motion carried.

#### MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL

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

That Hon. P.B. Arnold be appointed to the Select Committee on the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill in place of Hon. H. Allison from 7 October 1983.

Motion carried.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of

Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall), and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. F.T. Blevins), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

Motion carried.

#### VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Lands)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Valuation of Land Act, 1971; and to make related amendments to the Land Tax Act, 1936, the Local Government Act, 1934, the Sewerage Act, 1929, and the Waterworks Act, 1932. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for an independent review of valuations made by the Valuer-General for rating and taxing purposes. It will provide a process which is practical, less formal and inexpensive for the average homeowner, small businessman and primary producer than the existing process which provides only for an appeal to the Supreme Court. At the present time, where a property has been valued by the Valuer-General, an owner is able to object at any time to that valuation by serving a notice of objection on the Valuer-General. The grounds upon which the objection is based are considered by the Valuer-General who subsequently advises the owner of his decision.

Recently the Valuer-General has made provision for a valuer, other than the valuer who made the original valuation, to consider complaints and objections concerning valuations but this approach is still looked upon as 'Caesar appealing unto Caesar' by owners. Any owner who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Valuer-General now has 21 days in which to lodge a formal appeal with the Land and Valuation Division of the Supreme Court. Such appeals generally involve legal representation and expert evidence from qualified licensed valuers resulting in considerable expense which may act as a disincentive on the part of some owners to pursue an action.

This Bill provides owners with an additional alternative to have the valuation reviewed without taking away this right to appeal to the Supreme Court. It enables an owner, on payment of a prescribed fee, to request a review of his valuation by an independent qualified valuer selected from a panel of valuers. Valuers can only be nominated for appointment to the panel by the Real Estate Institute of South Australia Incorporated or the Australian Institute of Valuers (South Australia) Incorporated. A panel of independent qualified and licensed valuers will be established for each region of the State for this purpose, and these valuers will be experienced in valuations in the particular region. The scope of the review will be confined to matters of valuation fact, for example, sales and other information relating to comparable properties in the area, and will not include questions of law. There will not be legal representation at a review.

The Bill provides that an independent valuer shall not alter a valuation if the affect of the alteration is less than 10 per cent more or less than the Valuer-General's valuation. This provision is to ensure that nominal adjustments, which are purely a matter of opinion and not substantiated by

fact, do not occur. The fee is to be refunded if the owner's valuation is amended by more than 10 per centum of original valuation. Notwithstanding a decision made by the independent valuer, both the owner or the Valuer-General reserve the right to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends that provision of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 provides a new heading to Part IV of the principal Act. Clause 5 strikes out subsections (3) and (4) of section 25, the contents of which are to be inserted in later provisions.

Clause 6 inserts new divisions after section 25 of the principal Act. The proposed new section 25a provides that the Governor may establish panels of licensed valuers for regions. Valuers must be appointed on the nomination of either the Real Estate Institute of South Australia Incorporated, or the Australian Institute of Valuers, and must have experience in valuing land in the area of the region in relation to which the panel is established. Appointments are to be for periods not exceeding three years. The proposed new section 25b provides that a person who is dissatisfied with the Valuer-General's determination of an objection made under this Part, may apply for a review, to be conducted by a valuer selected from the appropriate panel. Applications cannot be made if a question of law is in issue.

The valuer conducting the review must give the applicant and the Valuer-General an opportunity to make submissions, and after due consideration of all relevant information before him the valuer is to either confirm, increase or decrease the valuation. The valuer is directed to confirm the valuation if he would otherwise have altered the valuation by a proportion of one-tenth or less. The Valuer-General should make any consequential alterations to the valuation roll. The applicant will have his application fee reimbursed if his valuation is successfully reduced. The proposed new section 25c preserves a final right of appeal to the Land and Valuation Court. The proposed new section 25d is a general savings provision, allowing rating or taxing authorities to recover rates or taxes notwithstanding that an objection, review or appeal is underway. Clause 7 provides for the consequential amendment of certain other Acts.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Enfield General Cemetery Act, 1944. Read a first time.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

Its principal object is to broaden the Enfield General Cemetery Trust's powers of investment. As the Act now stands, the Trust is limited to investing its moneys in Government securities, Government guaranteed securities or on deposit with the Treasurer or a bank. It is desirable that the Trust be given the same powers of investment normally given to other statutory authorities so that the Trust may generate extra income from its reserve fund. The Bill also

seeks to remove the Trust's obligation to publish its annual accounts in the *Government Gazette*, which is a costly process. The accounts are audited by the Auditor-General in the normal way, and therefore appear in his annual report tabled in Parliament. Publication of accounts in the *Gazette* is not normally required of statutory authorities.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers the Trust to invest, with the approval of the Treasurer, its reserve fund and any other surplus moneys in such form of investment as the Treasurer approves. Clause 3 repeals section 28, which obliged the Trust to publish its annual accounts in the *Gazette* and also forward copies to the Minister. The whole of this provision is unnecessary, as sections 27 and 29 of the Act provide the normal requirements made of statutory authorities.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS BILL

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill be extended to 20 October 1983.

Motion carried.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 1013.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** In the time allocated to me today, I wish to outline what I perceive as the lack of priority given to recreation and sport in this Bill. Recreation embraces a wide range of activities and, because of our climate, space and natural attractions that favour outdoor recreation, many people and organisations are obviously involved in this area. Of course, indoor sports and activities are no less important than the outdoor recreation in which a large proportion of the community is involved.

Until recently, recreation and sport has been left to voluntary organisations. However, as many would be aware, Governments are now becoming more involved in this area. The Departments of Recreation and Sport in most State areas and in the Federal area began from the national fitness movement which was established late in the 1930s and has continued in a voluntary way for 20 or 30 years. Recognition for Government involvement came about because of the need for capital to be ploughed into the area of sporting and recreational facilities. Government is now involved, of course, in capital grants construction works in connection with sports and community recreational and cultural facilities.

My electorate is well served by recreation facilities involving both the Burnside Community Centre and the Fullarton Park Community Centre. However, in many other areas, particularly in the western suburbs and some country areas, sporting and recreational facilities are nowhere near the standard that they ought to be.

Government is also now involved in assisting sportsmen and sportswomen, although unfortunately, greatest assistance seems to be for those in the elite group, while the amount of money available for the training of young people in their chosen sport is quite minimal. Government is also involved in promoting the stimulating benefits of the fitness area,

and obviously that is one of the largest expanding areas of recreation. Further, Government is engaged in attempting to find out what young people's ideas are in the sporting area and in the provision of sporting facilities, at the same time ensuring that coaching is made available for those concerned.

Any project which increases the range of leisure opportunities is eligible for consideration by way of grants from the Government and, of course, fixing priorities for some of these grants is a very difficult area confronting Ministers. I believe that neither Federal nor State grants are sufficient. The major area to which grants are applied involves facilities, but facilities alone do not provide a recreation service: we need to provide courses to train recreation workers. It is unfortunate that at the moment, while we have in the education system a large number of trained recreation workers, there is insufficient money for them to be totally utilised.

I attended an excellent seminar conducted by recreation workers at the Education Department Central Eastern Region premises in Osmond Terrace, Norwood, a month or so ago, at which were outlined all the work and programmes that had been set up at primary and secondary level. They, the officers concerned, had set it up principally as a sort of travelling circus and were intending to take this seminar around to all the regions. The work undertaken by this small group of dedicated people was excellent. The concern expressed to all who attended was loud and clear, namely, that insufficient funds were available compared to the time that had been spent on training these people, and they were concerned that much of the effort they had put in to developing their skills and programmes, particularly at primary and secondary level, would be lost.

Of course, members opposite may well say that here am I suggesting now that more money ought to be spent in these areas. Of course, I am saying that, but I am also saying that the Government's priorities need to change so that recreation and sport will receive more money out of the current Budget without increasing the Budget at all. When one looks at the small sums put aside each year for recreation and sport, one finds that from the recurrent Budget \$3.47 million, or 1½ per cent of the total Budget, is spent on recreation and sport, and in the capital area it is \$1.16 million, or 3.6 per cent of the total of \$378 million. If one adds them together, one sees that \$4.63 million, or a miserly 1.81 per cent of the total Budget, is spent on recreation and sport. That is quite an insignificant sum and suggests that the priority of this Minister should be raised so that more money is available to recreation and sport.

The reason that I say that more money ought to be available is that, with the shorter working week and the reality that we will probably be working less as the years go on, leisure time will continually increase. If we are to minimise the health and drug problems of our younger people (and they are problems mainly caused through lack of involvement), we need to make available money in the recreation and sport area so that they can be coached and encouraged to participate—not necessarily at the highest level, but purely and simply encouraged to participate.

Obviously, in local areas extreme demands are put on Government by sporting and recreation groups. When I was a candidate it was brought home to me in one of the electorates in the western suburbs in particular that many organisations wanted capital moneys from Government, not necessarily by way of a grant but maybe in loan form, to enable them to begin planning for community centres, particularly for aged citizens. Only small sums are made available for this purpose, but with the ageing of the population larger numbers of people are involved.

The relevant department has capable officers who are able to plan, design and develop facilities, but their major

problem is that they have insufficient money. They are expected to be involved in many major campaigns but, unfortunately, they are always hamstrung through lack of finance. As members would be aware, sport constitutes an industry. For example, the racing industry is a major industry in South Australia. Also, sport provides a major tourist attraction, and people from all over Australia come to see major events. In February next year Adelaide will be the host city for the Inter Dominion Trotting Championship.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Peterson):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** I refer to a matter relating not only to the improvement of South Australia's transport system but to that of Australia as a whole. I believe that it is time to standardise the railway between Adelaide and Melbourne and that work should commence immediately.

**Mr Ferguson:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am glad that the honourable member supports that proposition. I hope he will join in a campaign to achieve this. I have written to the Federal and Victorian Ministers for Transport asking them to support this concept. I understand that studies undertaken have shown that the construction of a standard gauge line between Adelaide and Melbourne would be economic and would provide significant advantages to South Australia, Victoria and other States of Australia. It would mean that for the first time Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and Alice Springs would be all linked with a standard railway line. This could be done at a surprisingly low cost. I cannot give specific figures, but I understand studies have shown that the cost would be perhaps in the range of \$10 million to \$20 million.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am talking about the cost of the work in South Australia. I believe that the cost in Victoria would be much higher than that. A third rail would be needed between Adelaide and Tailem Bend so that the standard and broad gauge lines could operate on that section. From Tailem Bend to well beyond the border into Victoria the existing rails could be relaid to provide a standard gauge. For the final section to Melbourne a third rail could again be used. All the railway lines in South Australia, including the important Mount Gambier line which is south of the Adelaide to Melbourne line, would be standardised. The Mount Gambier line and some of the other spur lines running off from what would be the Adelaide to Bordertown line would be included in that. This would enable timber products to be railed to Sydney and Perth from Mount Gambier without any change of gauge. Such a standardisation project would not interfere with the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line. The two projects would complement each other and would bring the Australian railway system up to date. It is time the fundamental mistakes made by our forefathers before Federation in installing different railway gauges were corrected.

These two national projects would create thousands of jobs. The standard rail link would be part of our defence strategy. I was particularly disturbed to see that the defence strategy aspect was excluded from the terms of reference of the David Hill Inquiry that has now been announced by the Federal Government. The steel for the third rail would give a timely boost to the B.H.P. rail rolling plant at Whyalla. The Federal Government cannot hide behind the claim that there are insufficient funds, because the work could be done on the basis of deferred payment. The South Australian portion would be upgraded by Australian National and would require Federal Government approval. The Victorian portion would be done by Vicrail with, no doubt, some

Federal Government assistance. I stress that the proposal I have put forward concerning the third rail to Tailem Bend would mean that the whole of the Murray Mallee area and the Pinnaroo, Loxton and Waikerie lines could continue to be used as broad gauge.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No, I said a third rail from Adelaide to Tailem Bend. The existing alignment of the track would be maintained. Any other proposal would be entirely out of the question because of the cost involved. From Tailem Bend to Bordertown and well into Victoria would be standard gauge with the existing railway line, which is a welded line, being relaid on sleepers; therefore, there would simply be the standard line. That would require the immediate standardisation of all spurlines running south of the line from Tailem Bend to Serviceton and, in particular, the Mount Gambier line. Under such a proposal (and members can see how simple it is) there would be no loss of service to any of the regional sections of South Australia.

All of them would continue to operate on the existing basis, with the exception of Mount Gambier, which would be serviced by a standard gauge line rather than a broad gauge line. However, I stress that that would be to the advantage of Mount Gambier, because for the first time paper and timber products, etc., could be shipped from Mount Gambier plants such as Apcel and Cellulose Australia, and others, straight through to Melbourne, Sydney, Perth, Alice Springs or Adelaide all on the one gauge.

**Mr Ferguson:** That would cost more than \$10 million.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I cannot provide the exact figures because I do not think they are available, but the cost would not be enormous. This gap that exists between Adelaide and Melbourne in regard to standard gauge dislocates, if you like, our rail system. Standard gauge lines link most of the important places around those centres, and so it would be stupid not to proceed with this project for standardisation. I stress that it must be done in conjunction with the Alice Springs to Darwin line. I am not putting this up as an alternative proposal at all.

**Mr Hamilton:** It has been around for a long time.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It has been talked about for a long time. There have been discussions of a relocation to the northern side of Adelaide going out perhaps through the so-called Truro gap, although that proposition would be entirely out of the question, as it is quite obvious that money would not be available. If one compares the type of proposal that I have put forward concerning a third rail to Tailem Bend and then a new standard realignment of the existing track from Tailem Bend to Bordertown, one would find that the cost of that is minuscule compared with trying to realign the existing line north of Adelaide or through the Adelaide Hills.

I hope that the South Australian Government will take up this suggestion. This is a matter of national importance. I hope that the Government will use what little influence it seems to have with the Federal Government to ensure that approval is given for this project by the Federal Government. I understand that work could proceed quickly on such a proposal. In fact, I would suggest that much of the skill and expertise that has developed in the teams of people who laid the third rail from Crystal Brook to Adelaide should immediately be used to begin work on the proposal that I have outlined. In the interim, while new rails are being laid from Tailem Bend to Bordertown, it would be feasible to maintain the Melbourne service by directing rail traffic out through Pinnaroo and down through Victoria.

Although there may be some delays in train services from Adelaide to Melbourne, it would still be feasible to maintain a broad gauge service until the new line is able to operate. For that reason, I put the project forward and I ask for the

support of the Labor Party in this State. I am delighted to see that I already have the support of the member for Henley Beach. Perhaps he can write a back-up letter to the Federal Minister for Transport and to the Victorian Minister supporting what I have said this afternoon and supporting the letters that I have sent.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I congratulate the member for Davenport on the constructive suggestions that he has put forward in the speech that he just made. I take this opportunity to compliment the honourable member for Semaphore on the question he asked last week of the Minister of Marine concerning the incentives given by various organisations for the transshipment of containers from South Australia by rail to Victoria, thus making it extremely difficult for South Australia eventually to gain a direct shipping service through the Japan-Korea north-south conference. Again, the honourable member for Semaphore is to be complimented on the question, which is probably one of the most important questions to be asked this session, and also for the sources of his information. The honourable member for Semaphore put to the Minister that certain incentives were being offered by various agencies. He said:

I am informed that the \$80—

and the honourable member for Semaphore was referring to an \$80 subsidy per container— includes a \$30 rail freight rebate made up of \$22 from Vicrail and \$8 from Australian National.

He then went on to say:

That is out of a total freight rate of \$200. In Melbourne the Seatainers terminal is offering a rebate of \$30 per container, and the Victorian port authorities are offering \$20 per unit.

Because of the importance of this question, I have taken the trouble to check this with various contacts that I have, and I am informed that the amount is \$90 per container, made up of \$40 from Seatainers, \$20 from the Port of Melbourne authority and, as the honourable member for Semaphore said, \$30 made up of \$22 from Vicrail and \$8 from Australian National. I regard this matter as extremely serious.

The honourable member for Semaphore asked the Minister of Marine would he have this—what I can only call collusion—investigated by the Trade Practices Commission. To my amazement, the Minister did not say, in his reply, that he had already done so. I would have thought that would have been the first thing that a State Minister of Marine would do, because this incentive or piece of collusion is causing enormous damage to the case that this State is putting up to try to get a direct north-south shipping service to the port of Adelaide.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** He didn't say that.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** He did say that he was going to have it investigated, and certainly he should have. I understand that this rebate commenced in April this year. I was not aware of it, but I would have thought that the Minister would have been aware of it, by the very latest in July, and that is the information I have.

The Minister's case is not made any more acceptable by the fact that his Director-General of Transport is a member of the Australian National Railways Commission. The Minister should make every effort to see what can be done about having this piece of collusion stopped. It is not just a matter of going to the Trade Practices Commission. What the Minister should be doing is travelling to Canberra to see the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr Morris, to see what he thinks about Australian National's involvement in this matter. He should be going to see Mr Marks, the Chairman of Australian National, who has been a good friend to this State, and asking him why Australian National joined in this enterprise. The Minister should be seeing that

his Premier should be contacting the Victorian Premier to find out why the Victorian Government is involved in this matter (the Victorian Government is involved through the Port of Melbourne Authority).

The Minister's officers—and they may have already done this—should be going to Victoria to talk to Mr Stan Mayne, the Chairman of the Port of Melbourne Authority, to see whether this practice cannot be stopped. No doubt, there are many other things the Minister could do, because if we sit back and accept this type of collusion against the interests of this State, we will have no chance of gaining that vital north-south link direct to the port of Adelaide.

Much has been said, and the Premier is one of the people who has mentioned this matter, about interstate preferences. It has been said that there is an agreement between the Victorian and South Australian Governments, and that interstate preference on contracts will no longer be applied. That means that, if a contract was let in South Australia and a Victorian firm applies and a South Australian firm applies, there will be no preference given to the South Australian firms. There used to be at least a 10 per cent differential applied by Governments.

While no preference is being applied, we have the situation of collusion between a private company, a public authority (the Port of Melbourne Authority), and a Commonwealth public authority (Australian National), directly militating against the interests of South Australia. What chance has this State of obtaining an ANSCON service direct to Japan-Korea when \$90 per container is offered as a rebate on a \$200 fee for the shipment of containers between Adelaide and Melbourne, and vice versa?

We know that wool is being packaged in containers and sent to Melbourne to be shipped, when it could be shipped from the port of Adelaide. I am informed that wool is being shipped through Portland direct to Melbourne from the South-East at concessional rates. I wonder what various importers and shippers think about this rebate being applied to South Australian produce. I wonder what importers and exporters in Victoria think about these rebates that are being applied. I wonder how they feel.

I wonder if they think the Trade Practices Act is being breached. I wonder if they think they ought to get concessional rates. I wonder if the people in Mildura who are shipping to the port of Melbourne by rail think they ought to get concessional rates. I would be very surprised if they did not. I have no doubt in my mind that this rebate breaches the Trade Practices Act. As I said, I am very surprised that the Minister was not able to give an answer immediately when the member for Semaphore asked his question.

Finally, the Opposition in the past few months, while this Government has been in power, has adopted a bi-partisan approach to the gaining of a direct north-south shipping service to the port of Adelaide, because it believes that that is so important for this State that it should not become a Party political matter. The Minister went to Japan soon after last year's election. The appointment had been made for me to go—but we lost the election so the Minister went in my place and I was pleased that he did. I complimented him on taking that action.

However, he did not sign the agreement for a north-south shipping service at that time. I believe that that was because the Japanese Government was waiting to see what this Government was going to be like. There has been so much inactivity that we have now given Victoria and Australian National the chance to get a foot in the door and, by applying this practice of collusion, they have done great damage to the State. I urge the Minister, as indeed would the member for Semaphore, to take the strongest possible action on this matter.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I refer to a letter that has come to my attention. It apparently dropped off a truck or car during the past weeks or months. It is addressed to the Hon. Michael J. Young, Parliament House, Canberra. That honourable gentleman happens to be the same person involved in another series of events at the Federal level in connection with the Hope Royal Commission. As the *Canberra Times* reported on 19 July:

The former Special Minister of State, Mr Young, resigned after the Commonwealth's lawyers told him last Thursday there was evidence showing that a figure in the Ivanov-Combe affair, Mr Laurie Matheson, had been given information put before Cabinet's intelligence committee, the Hope Royal Commission heard yesterday.

It does not seem surprising that Mr Young did give away this information when this letter was obviously not looked after and came to my attention through one of my constituents. The letter was from Kim Beazley to Mr Young. It is undated, so I cannot elaborate on when it was written. However, it states:

Dear Mr Young,

I am writing to you and other South Australian members of Caucus to explain the situation at Port Wakefield, South Australia, where my department proposes to extend the proof range. I enclose an information paper prepared by my department.

It then states what is envisaged under four separate headings. It is a great shame, when that letter has been around for some weeks or possibly months, that the present Federal Government (which supposedly believes in open government) is quite clearly undertaking government in closed surrounds. The Federal member for Wakefield (Mr Neil Andrew) has not received any notification of these undertakings, and I believe has not received official notification of the Port Wakefield proof and experimental establishment paper, of which I have a copy. This compares significantly with the previous Federal Government when the then member (Mr Geoff Giles), undertook much work to try to clear up the situation with the Port Wakefield proof range. He discussed it with the people and brought the appropriate Minister to Port Parham—the specific hamlet or town suffering from the proof range. He undertook to ensure that an inquiry would be instituted to consider all the facts and to keep the people properly informed.

I emphasise that he will keep the people properly informed, as this is obviously not happening under the present Federal Government. It is worrying the residents in that area. I have had many phone calls in my office from people who want to know what is happening with the proof range. Some of the stories put forward have possibly been exaggerated, but no-one knows the real situation. I have referred these inquiries in each case to the Federal member for Wakefield (Mr Neil Andrew), who also has been concerned.

**Mr Mathwin:** He is upset.

**Mr MEIER:** He is very upset about not being informed of the letter that Mr Young and other members of Caucus have received, because he believes that, as the local member, he at least should know what discussions are occurring in regard to residents in his district.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is his right.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, it is his right as the member for the area but, unfortunately, that is not happening. The Port Wakefield proof range (or any proof range for that matter) is there to ensure that any explosive ordnance, namely, guns, mortars, rockets, missiles, shells, bombs, etc., are fit for service. Port Wakefield is one of two important ranges, the other being at Graytown in Victoria.

Port Wakefield has been operating since 1928. The proof and experimental establishment and its associated firing

points are located in the northern part of the Port Wakefield defence area, which was first proclaimed under the Control of Defence Areas Regulations in 1937. So, it has been with us for a long time. Since that time considerable development has occurred in and around the area, particularly at Port Parham and Webb Beach. In fact, the paper that went with the letter to Mr Young, states:

The proclaimed area includes two hamlets, Parham and Webb Beach, with a total of some 180 houses. Most of these are small, holiday cottages, many of weatherboard or fibro construction, built over the past 40 years; but there are also some modern and substantial houses, mainly at Webb Beach.

The residents are looking for answers. They are getting upset that this report and other discussions are not being made public. Again, I emphasise that the previous Government and the then member tried to keep the people informed at every step. There is also in the area a shell-grit mine run by Australian Consolidated Industries. It is important in the manufacture of glass. A.C.I. also has further operations in the area.

Public safety is a big factor, because one first has to check that no-one is in the area before firing takes place. The army endeavours to undertake every possible precaution, but there seems to be many unexploded ordnances in the area. It would take many millions of man hours to get rid of them and, even then, safety could not be fully guaranteed. In the summary of this paper it is stated that there are three main options for the location of activities performed at or planned for Port Wakefield.

The first is that the proof and experimental establishment remain at the present location. This would also involve the Commonwealth acquiring an extra area at a cost of about \$4 million. The second option was for the acquisition of land and the relocation of the proof and experimental establishment about six kilometres northwards. The Commonwealth would need to acquire land southwards as well, but excluding Parham. That would be at a cost of \$40 million. The third option would be the relocation of proof and experimental establishment activities to Herbert Creek, right away from Port Wakefield. That would be at a cost of about \$50 million.

I do not intend to look at the pros and cons of whether the army should stay there or which option it should undertake. The matter has appeared on a recent nationwide programme in which it was stated that many of these constituents are becoming more and more concerned. It is disheartening for me, as the State member for the area, that open consultation does not seem to be occurring.

I hope that some action by or information from the Commonwealth Government will be forthcoming so that at least the Federal member, Mr Neil Andrew, as well as the local District Council of Mallala, the new council of Wakefield Plains (which covers the area of Port Wakefield), and I will have the correct information and do not have to rely on leaked documents, which have been misplaced by, in this case, a former Minister of State—certainly no longer a Minister.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** I should like, first, to endorse the remarks of the member for Goyder. I have a constituent who owns a holiday house in the area to which he referred, and he has spoken to me about the problems he and his family are facing over what seems to be the proposed action of the Federal Government. I will certainly look forward to working closely with my colleague on this problem, but it only confirms that the statements by the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, that he intended to be a Prime Minister of consultation only hold good when Mr Hawke thinks he can gain himself some political kudos. When he comes to looking after the little man, Mr Hawke's so-called consensus seems

to fly out of the window. However, I will not spend any more time on that matter, because it has been covered fully by my colleague, and I will be working with him in relation to the problems his constituents and at least one of mine share.

I now refer to a matter that is of extreme importance to the future of South Australia and Australia; the future, if there is a future, of the production and mining of uranium in South Australia. I am sure that all South Australians share the concern I feel in relation to the doubts that have now been expressed about the future of Roxby Downs and the future of anything to do with the production of uranium in this State. No doubt a large section of the Australian Labor Party both in the State and Federal arenas are strongly opposed to the mining of uranium in South Australia, and for that matter in Australia.

I can only hope that those with commonsense in the Labor Party are able to outvote their colleagues who are so determined to bring South Australia and Australia to their knees. I cannot understand why there is such a large proportion of the Labor Caucus so opposed to uranium mining. It has been well and truly proved (and I think the Minister of Mines and Energy who is in the House would agree with me) that the situation is such that technology has now made it quite safe for the mining and production of uranium, and that Australia has set such stringent controls on the export of uranium that there is no risk that Australian uranium could be used for anything other than the peaceful production of electricity in overseas countries.

I can only assume that the strong left wing of the Labor Party, purely for its own political ends, wants to bring Australia to its knees. They know only too well that if Australia can be brought to its knees, if we can have even worse unemployment than we have now, if we can have even more widespread poverty than we have now, if we can have even more people in more desperate circumstances than we now have, they would have an excellent foundation for the fomenting of strife within our society.

Make no mistake about it, that is what the left wing is all about. It hides behind its so-called desire to look after the welfare and health of South Australians and Australians, but what the member for Elizabeth and other left-wingers in the State and Federal Parliaments are really trying to do when they want to ban the mining and exporting of uranium is to bring the Australian economy to its knees so that the socialist revolution they are striving so hard to achieve will have more fertile ground in which to develop.

There is no doubt (indeed, it has never been contested) that South Australia is extremely fortunate to have the wealth of uranium deposits that it has. Roxby Downs has proven that it will become not a mirage in the desert, as the Premier would have had us believe before last year's election, but the biggest single mine in the world, with tremendous wealth for this State. Royalties from that mine will flow into the Treasury and the Government will be able to spend that money in areas where it is needed for the welfare of the people and the development of our State, rather than continually increasing taxation.

Had this Government controlled its spending better there would have been less need for the raising of taxes but, with development of such projects as Roxby Downs and with the income from royalties, even a Labor Government will have less need to raise taxes than it has at present. Not only will royalties flow into the State Treasury but also about 18 000 permanent jobs will be created, directly and indirectly, if Roxby Downs proceeds. This would mean that 18 000 people would not have to rely on social security benefits for their income because they would be meaningfully employed and much happier than they are at present. The development of Roxby Downs would mean income not



only for the South Australian Government but also for the Australian Government. Unfortunately, however, because of the rift within the Australian Labor Party our reputation overseas as a reliable country with which to do business is being seriously eroded, and unfortunately the actions of the South Australian Government have done nothing to alleviate that feeling, which exists especially in Japan.

The fact that the present Minister of Mines and Energy has refused permission for Honeymoon and Beverley to proceed must cause any mineral development company extreme concern. It is no coincidence that, for example, Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which had allocated \$30 million to be spent in South Australia on mining exploration, has now spent that money on exploration off the coast of China. Obviously, B.H.P. is looking for somewhere to invest its money with the chance that, if it finds a mineral deposit, it can develop it. Not only has the Minister refused permission for Honeymoon and Beverley to proceed but he has also refused to honour the moral obligation that his Government has to reimburse those companies for the money they have spent: \$10 million in one case and \$3 million in another. However, the Minister says that the Government is under no legal obligation to pay the companies a cent, so it will not do so. How does the Minister expect any company to invest exploration funds in South Australia when it runs the risk of losing every cent it invests? Under those conditions why should such companies spend money here? Surely we must expect such companies to go to other countries where the return is more certain.

I have been told by at least two people in my electorate that they have lost their jobs because of the Minister's decision not to allow Honeymoon and Beverley to proceed. For instance, a widow, who was employed as a secretary by one of these mining companies and who has two children to support as well as herself, has been laid off. How does she feel about the Minister's decision? I have been approached by a young father of three children, the sole income earner for the family, who has lost his job as a labourer at Honeymoon. How does he feel about the Minister's decision? These are but two of the personal examples in my district that have brought home to me the fact that people have lost their jobs as a result of the Minister's decision.

The matter at present to be decided by the Australian Labor Party at Commonwealth level is of vital importance to Australia. Tens of thousands of jobs and tens of millions of dollars hang on the decision whether or not to allow mining to proceed, and I urge the A.L.P. Caucus to disregard the emotional clap-trap put forward by its left wing and to strongly support the continuation of development at Roxby Downs and all aspects of uranium mining and production in this country.

**Mr RODDA (Victoria):** I wish to raise one or two matters in the 10 minutes allocated to me in this debate. The member for Torrens said something about the transport industry when he addressed the Chamber a few moments ago, and I now refer to Australian National. It is now history that the Dunstan Government disposed of the country railways to the Whitlam Government, which I do not think has been a bad thing for the State generally. The State Minister still has some rights and country members from time to time are still required to make overtures to Australian National.

I have always seen the railways as having had priority to cart large freight loads and I have always encouraged people to use the railway for the carriage of their superphosphate to the country and their wool clip to the shipping port. On my property I have insisted on using the railway for freight

because it is handy to use a railway truck rather than having a road vehicle come on to the property to load wool from the wool shed door to deliver it to Port Adelaide, Portland, Melbourne, or wherever the case may be. Certainly, the rail service is handy for graziers, farmers and wool growers, who brand their own wool before it is loaded and taken away. I have always insisted that wool grown on my property is loaded onto a rail truck and transported to Naracoorte for shipping by rail to its destination.

As a Parliamentary representative, I have always said to people that if they want to retain their rail services they must use them and, in the main, that thought is uppermost in the minds of country people. True, there has been recently this sad business about the passenger service in our district and the fear that the Bluebird rail car will be taken off its run, because this service provides a great benefit for passengers, especially for pensioners and people who have to travel. Nowadays, intending passengers must book to travel on this service, which is fair enough as it is futile to send three rail cars into the area if they are carrying only one passenger. I have noted this and have used the train myself in recent times, although there have always been plenty of passengers present on my journeys.

An anomaly has crept in at Naracoorte in regard to the carriage of wool. I must confess that we had only a small parcel of wool and that we had to transport it by road. If a farmer does not have 20 or 24 bales of wool his shipment cannot be loaded at Naracoorte railway station and the local carrier has to store his bales until the requisite number is reached. It is then placed on a rail truck for shipping. On our property we had an early shearing to take advantage of the fat wether market, and we had five bales of wool down in the shed. They were due to be sent to the store, but we found that if we took them to Naracoorte, because of the small number, we could not get them loaded on rail. In consequence, they must be transported by road to Portland. That greatly cuts against my grain, and it is a matter that the Minister should discuss with his Federal counterpart. I have not yet had time, but I will be speaking with Dr Don Williams about this matter.

However, it is the little things in aggregate that keep this wonderful service going, and I can assure Australian National that it does have a supporter in me in relation to the big freights to go on rail. It would be a very sad thing if we had to put heavily loaded transports on our country roads. There are consequences in relation to this, because we have seen a contract to cart the aggregate that was necessary to upgrade the roads from Mount Schank to Keith, and it literally smashed up great portions of the Mount Gambier to Naracoorte to Keith highway. Therefore, with a bit of common sense there can be a saving to the community, we can help the rail, and we can save the roadways; so I make that point.

My colleague the member for Torrens was talking about discussions with the Japanese. In the time when I was Minister of Marine (some 18 months ago) we had quite fruitful discussions with the Japanese. I know that the present Minister has been to Tokyo and has had discussions. It is disappointing to see that that service is not coming to the State, but surely it must be time to put on pressure, because it is now almost the end of September and the wheat harvest has started. We will have a very good wheat harvest so wheat freights will come up *per se*. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that heavy container freight goes to Melbourne overnight, and approximately 24 000 containers a year are destined for Japan. We should have that shipping in our own ports, earning our own wharfage, earning money for this State. I lend my voice to that of the member for Torrens (the shadow Minister of Marine) to urge the Minister



to keep on the pressure to keep those pipelines open through discussions with the Japanese people.

In the remaining three minutes available to me, I would like to say that there have been discussions about the new clearing regulations. A number of people in my district have been expressing grave and almost bitter disappointment. Some of them hold virgin land. Young families are growing up, and sons are staying on the property. Some cases have come under the umbrella of this control and they are not able to enter into a clearing arrangement. They have been told that they may have to hold off one-third (or more or less) of this land, and it is most disheartening. Of course, utterances have been made that this regulation saw the light of day at the hand of my colleague the member for Murray in his capacity as the Minister for Environment and Planning. He will be making a public statement to the people of South Australia about the true situation.

I heard the Minister for Environment and Planning responding last week to the debate in this House. He has some very firm opinions about this, and I do not think that anybody on this side of the House is against the preservation of trees of the right quality. However, it has to be in balance. People have worked hard to buy properties and they have not had the capital or the reason to develop it. Now they find themselves coming under the lance of a regulation which is causing them (if I may put it this way) great anguish and ultimately great hardship. So, I think that this will be taken notice of.

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

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** Before referring to the topics that I want to discuss, I feel a little lonely, having regard to the numbers present. I know that members may be reading documents with red covers and studying maps, and so on, but I would like to see some of them back in here. Therefore, Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr EVANS:** I refer to a matter that the people of Australia should be concerned about. South Australia relies on the Commonwealth Government for funds in some areas, and South Australians should be concerned about the way that social security benefits are being exploited by people who do not live in Australia and who, in some cases, did not intend to stay here for any length of time. However, because of the reciprocal arrangements that we have with other countries, some people have been able to exploit our social security system. It is possible for people to come to Australia under a permit, stay here as permanent residents, and to work for a certain period of time. They do not become Australian citizens during that time. They may sustain an injury, claim that it occurred at work, and obtain compensation. Further to that, if there is an illness or an injury preventing them from working they can claim a pension. They then go back to their country of origin, and we go on paying the benefits applicable until they die.

That is perhaps not as serious as, for instance, a woman coming from New Zealand while pregnant, giving birth to the child (which becomes an Australian citizen), then, after having lived here for some time and having obtained a supporting mother's pension, going back to New Zealand and continuing to receive that pension for all time. The same thing has occurred with people coming from England. It is a worthwhile proposition to pay the fare to Australia, to go through the same process as that which I have described, and then after a period of time go back to England.

I will cite a further example of this type of thing, although there was no child involved. A lady phoned me and said

that her sister was living in a *de facto* relationship with a merchant seaman and obtaining a supporting mother's pension (in fact, I think it was a deserted wife's pension). The lady in receipt of the pension had two children. As the matter had been reported to me by the woman's sister, who was quite irate about having to work in a dry cleaning steam area under pretty tough conditions, being prepared to work while her sister was exploiting the system, I thought that it was correct to inform the department. I believe that, upon being informed, the department began inquiries about the matter. The merchant seaman ended the *de facto* relationship and ceased to live in the woman's home. As we know, a merchant seaman is on the water much of the time, and he was travelling between Australia and New Zealand. Subsequently, the lady applied to be put back on the pension, because to all outward appearances she was no longer living in a *de facto* relationship.

Once she was receiving the pension, they moved to New Zealand, and there is no possible way in which officers can check up whether or not those people are living in a *de facto* relationship in New Zealand. Because that man was spending a lot of his time in New Zealand, the relationship continued, and the Australian taxpayers were paying for the pension. When the reciprocal arrangements were entered into there might have been a roughly equal exchange of people coming from England who were dependent on the English pension in Australia and people coming from New Zealand as against those going to those countries from Australia.

However, I believe that that is no longer the case. If the present Treasurer of this State required calculations to be done by the Federal Government, it would be found that tens of millions of dollars a year is going out of this country to people who have exploited the system. I do not say that all of those people have exploited the system, but many of them have done so. If this continues, and if the practice is allowed to develop, it will become a burden that we as a country and as a race of people should be prepared to say we will not carry. If the reciprocal arrangements have to cease, or if stricter application has to be enforced, that must be done.

I do not believe that we can cut out the scheme, because many people from England, or from other countries, worked in those countries for a substantial part of their life and they are entitled to a pension from those countries. It would be unreasonable to suggest, irrespective of the legitimate method by which they came here, that they should go back. It is unreasonable to suggest that pensions should be affected in any way, but it is about time we woke up and said, 'Let us cut out these areas of exploitation so that we can either reduce taxes or take the opportunity not to increase taxes, as they have been increased in the past.' More particularly, we could say, 'Now we have more money to spend on those who are genuinely disadvantaged.'

This sort of grievance is not usually heard in this House because, in the main, the matter is outside the jurisdiction of the State Government, but there is an effect on the State Government's potential for funds, because if these people take considerable sums from the Australian coffers by this method, the central Government has less money to distribute to its agencies, and that includes the State Governments and local government.

I refer briefly now to the use of departmental equipment. As I stated previously (and unless one repeats comments they are seen as being not very important and ignored by all forms of government), many millions of dollars worth of earth-moving equipment and the like is sitting in departmental yards and is never used. This equipment does not wear out: in the main it rusts out, ages, or becomes obsolete or outdated in regard to efficiency. If we could ever get

departments to work together to make effective use of machinery, or if we could achieve a cross-over of use by departments, we would save the State millions of dollars a year.

I am not unconscious of the fact that in this country there are times when it is difficult to work with some types of machines. For example, earth-moving machinery is not used during the winter, and quite often the personnel who work with that equipment are not prepared to work in those weather conditions. Under the awards, those people do not have to work under such conditions. I am also aware that at the best time of the year for work with those machines, that is, in the summer months, we close down the country for four or five weeks and the machines are left idle. That is another area of inefficiency that we are never likely to correct.

With a cross-over of use of equipment, personnel, engineers and planners between departments, I believe that we can make greater use of the personnel and equipment available. I hope that the Government will consider this matter urgently so that the money that will be saved can be spent more wisely in other areas to create job opportunities in the State.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I wish to point out to the House a problem referred to me by a number of constituents regarding the location of a time clock at bus stop 27A, which is an extra bus stop that was installed merely to accommodate this time clock, on Diagonal Road, Somerton Park. The nuisance created by this time clock is causing my constituents a great deal of frustration, upset and, I believe, some nervous damage. I have written to the Minister of Transport about it on a number of occasions, and the replies that I received have not been that satisfactory.

There are two buses that use that stop, although hardly any people either alight from or board a bus at that location: they all use the original bus stop 27. One of the buses comes from a southerly direction and goes to Port Adelaide, and the other comes from Seacliff and goes to the city. The Department has seen fit to place the time clock (which has only been there for about 12 months) right in front of a constituent's front door. It is causing a lot of trouble and, although I have asked the Minister on a number of occasions to do something about it, I have had no satisfaction at all. I now refer to a letter that I sent to the Minister on 21 December 1982, as follows:

I was approached by a constituent, a Mr R.W. Richter, of 123 Diagonal Road, Warradale, concerning a bus time clock placed outside his residence.

It went on:

I now have other residents in the immediate area complaining about the same time clock. Mr D.G. Hooper of 6 Diagonal Road, Warradale, lives opposite the time clock and is very determined that it should be moved.

And I believe rightly so. It goes on to say that the noise of the airbrakes of the buses disturbs his peace. He continues:

Every bus has to halt at the stop whether passengers are alighting or not.

As I said, very few people use this bus stop. The letter continues:

If the bus is early it must remain stationary at the stop until the correct time. Whilst stationary the airbrakes make a continual noise.

We all know what that sounds like. It is not too bad in the day time but is a horrible sound if heard early in the morning or late at night. When the buses eventually move off and accelerate, there is still even more noise and a great deal of pollution.

The Minister (Hon. Roy Abbott) replied to my letter on 3 February and told me that he had received my letter

(which I wrote on 21 December and which was a nice Christmas present for the Minister). His reply stated:

I refer to your letter of 21 December 1982 concerning the request from two residents that the bus time recording clock on Diagonal Road, Warradale, be relocated from stop 27A to stop 27.

It goes on:

During this inspection, it was noted that there is insufficient kerb space available in front of the shops at stop 27 to locate a bus zone of sufficient length to accommodate two buses as required.

There have never been two of those buses there at the same time. I suggest with great respect to the Department that if it fears that this may happen, it can alter the time table slightly, because the buses do not run every 10 minutes. As it is a matter of about 40 minutes, it should not be very difficult to alter that situation. It is not as though it is on a main thoroughfare in the heart of a great big city. People are very fortunate that they must wait only 10 minutes for a bus. However, in relation to Diagonal Road it is much more than that.

The Minister's suggestion that the zone is of insufficient length to accommodate two buses is absolute rubbish. I again wrote to the Minister on 7 February, following receipt of his earlier reply. I thanked the Minister for his letter, because one must always try to be polite. I then referred to the relocation of the bus stop and said:

Might I respectfully ask why time clocks cannot be located at the Marion Shopping Centre? It would appear to me to be the ideal situation, where space is set aside for stationary buses and where the clocks would not interfere at all with local shops or nearby residents, and from where it is only a journey of some five minutes to the present location at Stop 27A.

I stress that the journey involves only about five minutes. Eventually, the Minister replied on 10 March in the following terms:

The relocation of this time clock to the Marion Shopping Centre as suggested would not allow the achievement of its intended purpose of recording intermediate running times of buses. This is to ensure that buses adhere to the time table for the benefit of passengers joining buses en route.

As I have said, it is a five minute journey from Diagonal Road to Marion Shopping Centre. If the time clock is relocated to the Marion Shopping Centre it will interfere with no-one; in fact, it will be convenient. It will not cause any interference, because the buses will be able to idle in neutral for as long as they like, sending up as much pollution as they wish: they will not interfere with shopkeepers, shoppers, or residents.

If the time clock remains in the residential area of Diagonal Road, Somerton, my constituents will continue to be awoken early in the morning. The buses' engines tick away in neutral while the drivers wait to clock on. After the drivers have clocked on, the buses accelerate away, creating a whining noise as the automatic transmission is engaged, spilling out heavy clouds of pollution which inconveniences my constituents. During the summer months most of us sleep with our windows and doors open to allow fresh air to circulate through our homes, and the pollution from the buses also circulates through our homes. I believe that that situation is grossly unfair. In fact, the Minister and his Department are treating my constituents most unfairly indeed and, in fact, they will not even submit to give and take in this situation. The Minister's letter also states:

Experience indicates that very few people enjoy having a bus stop outside of their house . . .

With due respect to the Minister, I believe that experience indicates that no-one enjoys having a bus stop outside of their house. The Minister's letter also states:

Moving a bus stop only results in the complaint being transferred to another group of residents.

Both of the Minister's comments are quite incorrect. I repeat that no-one would enjoy having a bus stop with a time

clock outside of their home, with buses ticking over, creating noise, hazard, and a problem for residents. No-one would enjoy that.

The Minister's suggestion that moving the bus stop would only transfer the complaint to another group of residents is not correct. If the Minister followed my suggestion on behalf of my constituents and removed the blasted time clock to the Marion Shopping Centre, I would be happy, my constituents would be happy, the Minister would be happy, and the residents of Somerton in the area in question would also be happy. It is about time that the Minister came back to reality and realised that there are people in the community who have feelings and need some attention and consideration. The residents of Diagonal Road need consideration from the Minister, and I ask him to do something about the situation forthwith.

Motion carried.

### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare):** On behalf of the Deputy Premier, I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report, by Tuesday 18 October, in accordance with the time tables, as follow:

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

*Tuesday 27 September, at 11 a.m.*

**Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, Minister for the Arts**

Legislative Council	Treasury
House of Assembly	Treasurer, Miscellaneous
Parliamentary Library	*State Bank of South Australia
Joint House Committee	*Treasury Department
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works	State Development
Legislature, Miscellaneous	Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous
State Governor's Establishment	*Department of State Development
Premier and Cabinet	*State Clothing Corporation
*Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Arts
Public Service Board	Minister for the Arts, Miscellaneous
Premier, Miscellaneous	*Department for the Arts

*Wednesday 28 September, at 11 a.m.*

**Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Minister of Public Works**

Labour	Public Buildings
Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, Miscellaneous	*Public Buildings Department

*Thursday 29 September, at 11 a.m.*

**Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation**

Environment and Planning	*Department of Lands
Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous	Services and Supply
*Department of Environment and Planning	*Department of Services and Supply
Lands	Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous

*Friday 30 September, at 9.45 a.m.*

**Chief Secretary, Minister of Tourism**

Police	Correctional Services
*Police Department	Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous
Auditor-General's	Tourism
	Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous

*Tuesday 4 October, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Education, Minister of Technology</b>	
Education	*South Australian Teacher Housing Authority
*Education Department	Office of the Ministry for Technology
Technical and Further Education	Minister of Education and Minister for Technology, Miscellaneous
*Department of Technical and Further Education	

*Wednesday 5 October, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Housing, Minister of Local Government</b>	
Local Government	Minister of Housing and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous
*Department of Local Government	

*Thursday 6 October, at 11 a.m.*

**Minister of Community Welfare, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs**

Community Welfare	
Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous	

\*Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

*Tuesday 27 September, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Health</b>	
Minister of Health, Miscellaneous	*South Australian Health Commission

*Wednesday 28 September, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Transport, Minister of Marine</b>	
Transport	Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous
*Department of Transport	Marine and Harbors
Highways	*Department of Marine and Harbors
*Highways Department	Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous
*State Transport Authority	

*Thursday 29 September, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Attorney-General, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Corporate Affairs, Minister of Ethnic Affairs</b>	
Attorney-General's Courts	Attorney-General, Miscellaneous
Electoral	Corporate Affairs Commission
	Public and Consumer Affairs

*Tuesday 4 October, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Mines and Energy</b>	
Mines and Energy	*Australian Mineral Development Laboratories
*Department of Mines and Energy	Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous

*Wednesday 5 October, at 11 a.m.*

<b>Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Recreation and Sport</b>	
Engineering and Water Supply	Recreation and Sport
*Engineering and Water Supply Department	*Department of Recreation and Sport
*South Eastern Drainage Board	Minister of Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous
Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous	

*Thursday 6 October, at 11 a.m.*

**Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Forests**

Agriculture	Fisheries
*Department of Agriculture	*Department of Fisheries
Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous	Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous

\*Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:**

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Mrs Appleby, Messrs Baker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Ferguson, Klunder, Olsen, and Trainer, and the Chairman of Committees (Mr M.J. Brown).

Motion carried.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:**

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Mrs Adamson, Messrs Ashenden, Duncan, Gregory, Ingerson, Mayes, Meier, Plunkett, and Whitten.

Motion carried.

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

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 850.)

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** The Opposition supports this Bill in principle. It deals with three matters, namely, the power of justices of the peace to imprison; the maintenance of accurate records relating to justices of the peace; and, thirdly, the new procedures to be adopted by justices on completion of evidence for the prosecution at the preliminary examination of an accused person. The former Liberal Government, under the Attorney-General, had, in fact, been moving to the point where justices were not able to imprison and this legislation takes a step along that road.

I point out that the previous Justices Act Amendment Bill in 1982 provided that, on a date to be fixed by proclamation, such action would be taken. The proclamation was passed, making the former Act effective from 31 July, but it seems that there was an oversight within the administration in respect of the provision dealing with the power of justices to impose prison sentences. A subsequent proclamation also failed to correct the anomaly which had been created, and this legislation places the matter beyond doubt and allows justices to impose prison sentences of up to seven days.

I refer one or two minor questions to the Minister in charge of the House at present. Have any assessment of costs or any estimates of the number of additional magistrates that may be required been made? How will administration of South Australia's courts be affected? The Minister may or may not be able to give us the answers today, but they are not major concerns in the debate. However, of major importance is the fact that there has been a considerable storm of protest from justices of the peace against an approval given by the Royal Association of Justices to the charging of a \$5 fee every two years (that is \$2.50 per annum) towards the cost of registering justices and creating a permanent register.

I do not think anyone would deny that that is desirable and, one way or another, we will have a register of justices. It has been alleged that there may be as many as 7 500 justices of the peace in South Australia, many of whom cannot be located. It is indeterminate whether they are alive or dead or whether they have moved to a different address in or out of the State. In those circumstances it is difficult to establish how many justices of the peace there may be for the purpose of rostering.

However, the justices are opposed to the payment of a fee, and to being asked to register, generally on the basis that they receive a fee of only \$3 for each court session that they attend. Many of them have to travel; all of them have to give of their own time on Government business, virtually free of charge, because a fee of \$3 is a pittance. I do not think that anyone would question the fact that justices of the peace, numbering as they do several thousand, constitute a most important part of the judicial system in South Australia. I do not believe that suggestions that the justices are under threat can be sustained. So many of them are hard at work that obviously the Government would be faced with massive extra costs to provide a sufficient number of magistrates to fulfil the work load which justices normally perform. The matter has been canvassed and I have spoken with the Minister and the Attorney-General about it. I

understand that, rather than have the Opposition move an amendment to remove that \$5 fee and the registration principles, the Government has agreed to remove that clause from the legislation. I have now received an amendment which states precisely that; so, the point of disagreement is to be removed in the course of this debate.

Under those circumstances, I simply repeat that the Opposition supports this legislation in principle. I understand that the Government's move to oppose clause 5 and to pass this legislation quickly also carries a proviso that further consideration may be given to the question of fees and registration. One of the suggestions I make to the Minister is that the Royal Association of Justices is approached with a view to establishing a permanent and accurate register. I do not know whether the Royal Association of Justices has a very comprehensive membership—that is an obvious gap in my knowledge—but perhaps the Minister and his Attorney-General could negotiate with the Association and come to a more satisfactory arrangement whereby the Association will co-operate with the Government in establishing the roll, as we all believe is desirable. Under the circumstances, the Opposition supports the legislation and will certainly support the opposition to clause 5 during the Committee stages of the Bill.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare):** I thank the Opposition for its support of this matter. The member for Mount Gambier has sought some more detailed information, and I will undertake to obtain that for him. That, I think, will answer the queries that he has raised.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Justices to make biennial returns.'

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Government opposes clause 5. The reasons for doing this are known to the Opposition. The Government does not propose to proceed with its initial proposal to charge a \$5 nominal fee every two years to enable the costs of keeping a register of justices to be met and the appropriate bureaucracy to be maintained in office. This has met with considerable opposition within the community, although some of that opposition has been based on a misunderstanding of the purpose of the maintenance of the register. The Attorney-General has advised that he will undertake discussion with the Royal Association of Justices and other appropriate bodies to try and find an alternative way by which the register can be maintained.

Clause negatived.

Clause 6—'Vacation of office of justice.'

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I move:

Page 2, lines 33 and 34—Leave out paragraph (c).

This amendment is consequential upon the negation of clause 5.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 851.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I only have time to say that the Opposition supports the Bill. I feel strongly about so doing, because I would have liked to have more to say about it. However, under the circumstances, all I can say is that the Opposition supports the Bill.

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

### PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 851.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** This Bill is consequential on the Justices Act Amendment Bill. Again, I explain to the House that I would have liked to have more to say on this measure, but it is impossible for me to do so because of the time factor; so again I can only repeat that the Opposition supports the legislation.

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

### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 851.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** To some extent this Bill, too, is consequential on the provisions of the Justices Act Amendment Bill. I take the opportunity once again of bringing to the attention of the House that the legislation that we are debating today, again in an amended form, has not yet been proclaimed, even though it was debated in this House over 12 months ago. Regulations made under this legislation were ready to be brought down when the previous Government left office in November last year, but we have not seen them. So, the legislation passed last year has not been proclaimed and the regulations, ready for tabling last year, have not yet been tabled.

This lack of action by the Government is deplorable. Again, I would have appreciated the chance to say something on the Bill before the House, but I understand that the Deputy Premier has issued an instruction that I have only half a minute to speak to it, so I assume that I must bow to his pressure. However, I urge the Chief Secretary to get off his backside and ask the Government to take positive action for a change by having last year's legislation proclaimed so that it may bring about the improvements that were anticipated when the legislation was debated over 12 months ago.

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

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Before the House engages on consideration of the Estimates for the next two weeks, I wish to raise the important matter of uranium supplies from Australia. All members realise that the Australian Labor Party is suffering trauma on this subject at present and that a significant section of that Party is seeking to curtail the supply of uranium overseas and to deny export licences to companies currently seeking them.

I wish to put a point of view that members opposite may or may not have considered, although it is pertinent and valid in any debate on this subject. The Western world, as

well as the communist world, have a continuing demand for uranium, and those countries demanding it will get it, if not from Australia then from somewhere else such as Namibia, Gabon, or Canada, or any other country where uranium is mined and marketed.

Australia can have an influence on the world scene only if it becomes a major supplier of uranium. Those people who suggest that by denying Australian uranium to the markets of the world we are doing anything at all in relation to the proliferation of nuclear weapons are completely misguided, because the safeguards provided in the case of Australian uranium are much more stringent than are those of some other countries.

It is the supplier country, the country that has the ability to cut off supplies when mines are established, that can have some influence on the world scene. The point I put to the House is that these opponents of writing export contracts are really working against their own interests and views in thinking that in this manner they are in some way going to influence the world scene—because they are not.

They are simply going to make sure that the countries that have no option but to use uranium for an increasing portion of their electrical generation will get it somewhere else. The chances are that they will get it from some places in the world less stable than Australia, where the safeguards policies are far less stringent. I find it interesting that the people who are advocating the non-sale of our uranium comprise the left wing of the Labor Party, the so-called moderates. There are so many wings in the Labor Party that I wonder how they fly. There is the left wing, the centre unity, the moderates, the right wing, the right centre, the left centre—you name it, the Labor Party has got it! Generally speaking, the group within the Labor Party which is opposed to uranium mining is the hard left (or the socialist left, as they are called in Victoria); they are diametrically opposed to the mining and export of uranium. But their stance is stupid, for a number of reasons.

Ideologically, the socialist left is closest to the satellite socialist countries, the communist countries of Europe. Politically and ideologically they are closest to that group; that is, the one group in the world that has no inhibitions at all about nuclear energy is made up of the Russians and the satellite countries. They do not worry about protest marches or unions jacking up against uranium. The countries now getting into uranium use and nuclear development more rapidly, except for France and Japan in the Western world, are the satellite countries. Most of those countries have operating nuclear reactors and need supplies, and at the end of the century they will be well placed economically in relation to their energy supplies.

Of course, we are all aware of the ideological war between the West and the communist countries. Everyone is aware of the continuing ideological war. Of course, there is also an economic war, and the nations which have access to reasonably assured supplies of energy at the turn of the century will be those who are well placed. If a nation wins the economic war it has a good chance of winning the ideological and political war. As I say, the socialist satellites (Rumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia) are all into nuclear energy, all supplying nuclear materials, and all needing uranium as a fuel for their reactors, and they will get it. They have no hangups whatever because, as I have pointed out to the House previously, over the 30 to 35 years in which nuclear reactors have been used for power generation, they have the best safety record in the world bar none in regard to loss of life, injury, and so on. They have by far the best safety record.

On that ground, I cannot understand why the left wing of the Labor Party, which is so closely and ideologically related to this group, is so opposed to this question when

its overseas comrades are into nuclear energy in a really big way. That is one point that I make. The second point is that, if they want to achieve their end and for Australia to have some influence in regard to the nuclear question, Australia will need to become a major world supplier, and we can do that. Of the uranium mines in the Northern Territory, Ranger in particular is a significant and large uranium mine, one of the few mining enterprises in Australia that had a profit last year: it made a handy profit. The extreme elements in the Labor Party and the ideologues are determined that they shall write no new contracts; in other words, those people are determined to see that Ranger in the course of time comes to a halt. They want to block Roxby. The Premier has had a change of heart. The Labor Party could see that it could lose the State election if it did not do something about the Roxby question, so it doctored its policy, which is a completely dishonest policy now.

Roxby Downs could in time become an even larger uranium mine than Ranger, in the Northern Territory, possibly the largest uranium mine in the world, and put Australia on the map in relation to the supply of this mineral. However, they want to stop that, and that is stupidity because, if Australia wants to have some influence on the world scene, the best way to do it is to become a major supplier; then Australia has some clout.

As I said earlier, I think that we have probably the most stringent safety requirements of any place on earth, but it is a pure and simple fact that, if we do not supply uranium, some other nation will and it is likely to be an African nation (Namibia, perhaps) or some nation where far less interest will be taken in the way that uranium is used, and far less attention paid to safeguards and ensuring that uranium is used for peaceful purposes. Therefore, I suggest that these left wing ideologues of the Labor Party and those opposed to it (and other sections of the Labor Party are opposed, through ignorance) go overseas, if they can, and talk to their comrades overseas, to the union movement in Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland and almost all the European countries, to their comrades in the satellite countries of the Eastern Bloc, to people in Korea, Japan, America, and Canada, and they will find that the world needs uranium, it will continue to need it to an increasing extent, and it will get it.

As I said, if Australia wants to have some influence on the world scene in relation to this commodity, the best way is to become a major supplier. We know that there are some sane elements in the Labor Party. Unfortunately, they do not appear to be in the ascendancy, because I have known for years about Prime Minister Hawke's attitude to this question. I talked to him socially before he even got near Parliament: his public statements back it up. However, he had to give three undertakings to gain preselection for his seat in Victoria, and I will bet my bottom dollar that one of them was that he would keep quiet about uranium, coming as he does from Victoria. That would have been one of the undertakings, and he has done so, except that, in recent days his conviction has come to the surface again. He spoke at Monash University and made the very valid point that all we do is make energy more expensive to the world if we deny it. He spoke in Adelaide, at one of the A.L.P. conferences, and he has obviously made some statements to Ralph Nader in the last day or so.

There are other members of the Labor Party sitting in this Chamber who are prepared to face the reality of the situation, and I put to them that, if Australia is to have some say, and if South Australia is to have some input, the best thing that we can do is to be part of the scene which already exists and become a safe and reliable supplier of this essential commodity.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** I wish to refer initially to an item in this morning's *Advertiser* headed '92 more shipyard workers laid off', which states:

The retrenchment of 92 employees from Adelaide's remaining shipyard indicated that the decimation of South Australia's engineering industry was far from over, a union leader said yesterday. An organiser of the Amalgamated Metal, Foundry and Shipwrights' Union, Mr E.N. Wyman, said 92 tradesmen and apprentices had been laid off from Tidewater Port Jackson Ltd's Torrens Shipyard at Port Adelaide on Tuesday.

Forty had been retrenched earlier this month. Other South Australian engineering companies were continuing drastically to reduce their labour force, with five big firms retrenching more than 100 skilled metal tradesmen in the past fortnight.

The article continues:

Mr Wyman said the number of workers at the Torrens shipyard had dropped by nearly 160 from 250 since the Sydney firm had taken it over after the collapse of the Colan Shipbuilding Co. earlier this year. 'When you consider the state of the whole engineering industry, these guys have Buckley's hope of getting a job in or out of their trade,' he said.

In view of this announced retrenchment of workers from the Colan Shipbuilding Company yesterday, I question whether the Government is doing enough to encourage boat building in South Australia. I know that one Port Adelaide boatyard is fully employed building fishing vessels (and that is the North Arm slipway), but these vessels are for interstate fisheries.

I question whether encouragement is being given to South Australian fishermen to build safe and efficient vessels. It has been brought to my attention that this is certainly not the case in the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishery. This fishery has been so badly managed that by 1979-80 the average gross turnover of boats within that fishery was less than \$97 000, when the costs of operating an average prawn trawler in South Australia approximated \$250 000. It had reached a stage when fishermen could no longer financially carry on and, in conjunction with the economists from the Department of Fisheries, the fishermen agreed to a plan to use an entirely new and different style of fishing gear. Also, the fishing season was reduced by regulation. Whilst these changes were of considerable economic benefit to the fishery, it soon became obvious that in the changed circumstances the existing vessels were far too small. They were unsafe so far as handling the new type of gear was concerned, and they were certainly unsafe generally.

The change in gear occurred when fishermen went from using one net to three nets. Further, the vessels are unsafe for fishing every night of the season, as is now required of fishermen owing to the down-turn in the industry and economic necessity. Since 1979 an enormous increase in the cost of fuel has occurred, and it has become necessary for fishermen to stay at the fishing grounds for longer periods, rather than return to port every second or third day as was their custom. To do this, of course, fishermen require larger vessels, because they need refrigeration, and they need better accommodation to meet modern day market requirements. The larger vessels are also required to provide better accommodation for the crew. In the St Vincent Gulf fishery, boat sizes have been restricted to 50ft.

While fishermen were considering an increase in the size of vessels, they became aware of a 27 per cent Commonwealth Government subsidy for 65ft vessels, such vessels built under subsidy costing a fisherman less than a new 50ft vessel costs. A further anomaly exists whereby, in all other prawn fisheries in South Australia, 65ft vessels are allowed; indeed, it is the common size of vessels all around Australia. St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen approached the Minister about having the size of vessels increased to enable them to purchase 65ft vessels. They pointed out that the vessels presently in use are years out of date, and are totally inadequate for present day needs, and that the majority of them

were originally built as rock lobster boats having been converted to prawn fishing boats as the need arose. They were never designed to stay at sea for more than a day.

Further, when making this request to the Minister to increase the allowable size of fishing vessels, the fishermen also gave an undertaking that no further pressure would be placed on the fishery. However, the Minister did not accept that, as he believed that greater effort would be put on the fishery and, therefore, he would not agree to an increase in vessel size. At that time he said that, rather than allow for an increase in the size of vessels, he would allow more fishermen in. That does not make sense to me. It strikes me as being odd that 65ft vessels operate around the rest of South Australia and Australia whereas they cannot be used in the St Vincent Gulf fishery.

It is interesting that a previous Minister of Fisheries gave approval on 19 August 1981 to regulations that entitled Spencer Gulf fishermen to use that type of vessel. He also stated in a news release that there was agreement for this, that there were ways that the fishing effort could be controlled, and that with agreement between the industry and the Department of Fisheries this sort of input could be controlled. On 17 May this year the President of the St Vincent Gulf Prawn Boat Owners Association, Mr Norm Justice, forwarded a letter to the Minister of Fisheries wherein he tried to explain the whole situation, stating that there may have been some confusion over the requirements of the fisheries in the gulf. Once again he stated that fishermen were quite prepared to meet any requirements of the department in regard to the fishing effort. It was also pointed out again that the fishing methods had changed so drastically over the past 14 years that fishermen believed it was essential that the larger vessels be provided to prevent a tragedy occurring. In response, the Minister stated in a letter dated 27 June:

As there is presently excess fishing effort in the St Vincent Gulf fishery . . .

I again point out that the St Vincent Gulf fishermen undertook not to increase the effort and to agree to whatever conditions were required of them to keep down the pressure on the fishery. In regard to the safety of the fishing vessels, the Minister in his reply stated:

All vessels operating in the St Vincent Gulf fishery are surveyed by the Department of Marine and Harbours . . .

That is true, but they are surveyed not necessarily for their suitability to drag three nets through the water but for their basic ship construction and bilge alarms, and that type of thing. I also refer to a letter that was sent to the Federal Government by a South Australian shipbuilder expressing concern about the down-turn in work in the industry. Also referred to was the effect that opening up the boatbuilding industry would have. The letter states, in part:

As a company which services the fishing industry we have a vital interest in the well being of the prawn fishery in South Australia. Much of the investment which has gone into this fishery has been channelled through this company and it disturbs us greatly to see the economics of the fishery deteriorate so drastically.

Our experience is that successful fishermen generally plough their profits back into the fishing industry and this is done either by diversification, upgrading of their existing vessels or the construction of new vessels, and of course, service companies [and the community generally] like ours derive tremendous benefits from this investment.

There are 14 prawn-fishing boats that sail from Port Adelaide, and all of those boats are aged. In fact, one went down at its moorings on Monday night. The problem is that second-hand 50ft vessels are not available in Australia and replacements must be built. The boat that went down, to which I referred, is salvageable. However, if a boat is lost at sea it has to be replaced with a 50ft vessel. Such a boat is unsafe, and if the regulation size were raised to 65ft that would

provide a great boost to the shipbuilding industry in this State, an industry that has suffered down-turns over the years. We have seen several attempts at major shipbuilding operations in this State, all of which have failed, but we do have a very successful and efficient shipbuilding industry that must be catered for and supported. It needs Government assistance to keep going, and it needs assistance by way of changed regulations to make it possible for ships to be built, thereby providing work for shipwrights, engineers, boat-builders, and suppliers of engines, propellers and all the bits and pieces required, while at the same time providing a much safer fishing fleet for the prawn fishermen who work in St Vincent Gulf. The regulations need reviewing and, as I have said, the fishermen themselves are quite prepared to meet any regulation on fishing effort.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I wish to reiterate what I said during the debate on the three pieces of legislation that have just passed through this House. We had something like 10 or 12 minutes to deal with those three measures. Accordingly, with the Government insisting on that sort of time table, there was no way that we could make a responsible representation on behalf of the Opposition. The other matter I refer to concerns the deplorable situation that now exists in regard to the Mount Barker High School, which is one of the major high schools in the District of Murray. During the previous Government's term of office some \$6.5 million was spent on the redevelopment of that school. It is in an excellent location, and it is a very good and well respected school in the Hills.

With the amount of \$6.5 million which has been spent on that school, we are now in a situation where there are so many problems associated with that redevelopment, and that is what I want to bring to the attention of the House. I understand that the Public Buildings Department redeveloped that school for metropolitan conditions: that is what we have been told. For example, it has not taken into account the very high rainfall received in those areas, and other conditions associated with the Hills. So, there are a number of major leaks in the building. I was invited by the high school council to visit the school a few weeks ago and I was absolutely disgusted with what I found. There is very expensive machinery, such as fume extractors, sitting there, not connected to electricity. There is plumbing including washbasins, etc., that have not been connected; sinks which have not been connected; doors with locks that cannot be closed; expensive tanks outside that have no facility to take run-off water. I could use the whole of the time allocated to me to run through the problems being experienced at that school because of the poor workmanship of the Public Buildings Department. If it is not that, then I would like someone to tell me what it is.

Only last weekend I received a phone call from the librarian of the school, who was particularly concerned. There had been a lot of rain over that weekend, and considerable damage was caused by flooding. For example, in one section the floor was covered with one inch of water; there were video recorders and TV sets with water soaking through them; boxes of headphones had been moved from one section of the building to another because of leaks, and they were saturated. Much electrical gear was also affected as a result of the flooding. One very frightening situation was evident where water was actually coming out of a power point. The library itself in the workroom was flooded. I understand that, at a rough estimate, about \$300-worth of damage was caused; \$300-worth of books were lost, and a claim has gone into the Department for those. It is an incredible situation.



I wrote to the Minister over two weeks ago and I spoke to him in this House last evening and asked him to look into the situation, but some action must be taken, something must be done about it, and it is not a matter of waiting for another two or three weeks—something has to be done now because of the seriousness of the situation.

I want to refer also to something outside of my electorate, a matter dealing with the portfolio of environment and planning. If I had had the opportunity today I would have asked the Minister for Environment and Planning a question but, because he decided to talk himself out over the last question, I did not have the opportunity to do so. So, I will do it now. The question is: why is it taking so long for some action to be taken by the Minister for Environment and Planning, who after all is the Minister responsible for the protection of sacred sites, concerning the dispute between the Kokatha Aborigines and Roxby Management Services relating to the proposed route of a road through Canegrass Swamp? As we all know, this is a matter that we have been hearing about over a long period of time.

I understand that a study, carried out by Mr Hagen at a cost of some \$28 000, has been in the hands of the Minister for Environment and Planning for at least three or four weeks, and it could be a lot longer than that, and only now we find that, after all that time, and with the seriousness of the situation, two senior officers of the Department of Environment and Planning are flying to the mine site today. We also learnt from an article in the *Advertiser* this morning that, following the assessment of the sites by the Department (and we have no idea whatsoever how long that assessment will take), the Department will then hold talks with Roxby Management Services.

In the past few days questions have been asked about the Government's attitude in regard to the mining of uranium, and in regard to Roxby Downs in particular. I would have thought, from the answers provided and the comments made by the Government, that the Government would have recognised this as a matter that needs to be resolved as quickly as possible. Yet, we have a situation where the Minister for Environment and Planning has an expensive report (at a cost of some \$28 000) which he has obviously been sitting on for this period of time, and now we find that after all this time two officers are to go up and have a look, then some negotiations will take place, an assessment is to be carried out, and after all that, they might get down to talking to Roxby Management Services.

It is not good enough. Again, I would hope that the Minister for Environment and Planning would take some

positive action. Another area in which I hope the Minister will take positive action relates to the Hills face inquiry reopened by me, as Minister for Environment and Planning, during the term of the previous Government. It had a limited opening and was conducted by His Honour Judge Roder. It was limited to parties who previously had made submissions to the original inquiry in 1980.

The reason for that inquiry being reopened was that circumstances had changed in some instances since the original submissions were made. That report by Judge Roder was delivered to me as Minister prior to my leaving office, probably in October or November of last year. The present Government has taken no action in regard to the recommendations of that report. Again, I urge the Minister to take positive action in that regard as a number of people made submissions to that inquiry and are looking for some positive action by the Government in relation to that report. It is not a matter on which the Minister can sit for an indefinite period. I hope we will see the Minister for Environment and Planning make a statement on the results of that inquiry shortly.

Motion carried.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

A message was received from the Legislative Council intimating that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall), and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. F.T. Blevins) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) as they think fit.

#### JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 October at 2 p.m.