HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 May 1984

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

A petition signed by 128 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

Mr OLSEN: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs give an assurance that Aboriginal heritage protection legislation, which the Federal Government intends to introduce, will not be used to stop Roxby Downs and other resource development projects in South Australia? I understand that next week the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs will introduce the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Heritage Protection Bill. The Opposition has obtained a copy of the drafting instructions for the Bill, which proposes sweeping powers for the Commonwealth. While it is important to protect genuine Aboriginal sites and objects, the legislation as presently proposed does not contain any meaningful verification procedures. This will expose it to manipulation by people who will use this legislation in an attempt to stop resource development projects. An article in this week's *Bulletin* states:

> The draft instructions provide no guidelines within which the Minister would act. The definitions of what is 'significant' with regard to Aboriginal objects and sites are to be determined by representation to the Minister. No attempt has been made to protect the Minister from false or misleading or redundant notions of dreamtime significance. If this sort of Ministerial power becomes law, the pressure upon Holding will be immense. He would be able to stop mining projects such as that at Roxby Downs.

The South Australian Government has publicly supported national legislation to protect sacred sites, but it appears that the Bill now proposed by the Commonwealth may well override State land rights laws, allowing Canberra to take unilateral action in a case such as claims relating to sacred sites at Roxby Downs.

Concern about the impact of this legislation was also expressed yesterday by Mr Hugh Morgan, Executive Director of Western Mining Corporation. Mr Morgan told a meeting of the Australian Mining Industry Council in Canberra that legislation allowing for full Aboriginal control over mining on Aboriginal land would lead to 'bitter resentment and social tension within the wider community'.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. He has had an opportunity to look at this draft legislation, but I have not; I believe that it came to my office yesterday. I spoke to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on Monday by telephone, and he told me that I would receive a draft copy during the week. This is Federal legislation and its effect is within the province and powers of the Commonwealth Government, not the State Government. So, the assurance that the Leader has sought I cannot give; that is a matter that is properly within the province of another Parliament. But the question and obviously the motives for which the honourable member raises it are of importance to this State, and the legislation will be given due consideration.

GOVERNMENT IRRIGATION AREAS

Mr MAYES: What is the reaction of the Minister of Water Resources to the Leader of the Opposition's proposal in recent television commercials to hand over all Government irrigation areas in the Murray River areas to a private trust? I have been contacted by a number of constituents, who have been concerned by comments in the papers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley has the floor.

Mr MAYES: —and who have been concerned with statements made by the Leader of the Opposition about the sale of Government enterprises. In particular, they refer to the report in the *Advertiser* of Monday 30 April in which the Leader details the sale of the State Roadliner Service, the inefficient Murray River irrigation service and the clothing factory at Whyalla. My constituents are concerned that these services and facilities provide an important service to the community.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I saw the advertisement on television on Sunday evening, and I do not think that it is any laughing matter for the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Actually, I have never in my life seen anything more like a used car salesman type of advertisement. It was nothing new—I thought that the Leader was carrying on his former profession—but just the tired old shibboleths that we used to have from the Tonkin Government that the cure of the ills of the economy of South Australia was to flog off and hand over Government instrumentalities to private enterprise. Yet, every day of the week we hear from the other side in regard to the extension of Government services in their electorates.

I certainly do not concur with the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in that commercial. As a matter of fact, I entirely disagree with them, particularly those in relation to the Murray River irrigation areas. First, to make a comparison between—I have said this in the House before and I say it again—private and Government irrigation areas is not valid. The major irrigation trust area is administered by the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I take nothing away from it in regard to its administration of that area, but it has certain advantages over Government irrigation areas. The advantage, particularly in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area, is that it has a compact area to service. In a number of Government irrigation areas, large and small, costs are escalated because they have to service a wider and more diverse type of operation.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition will be better served if he sticks to his windsurfing rather than windbagging. I understand that he is being coached by that greater surfer from Henley Beach, the former member for Henley Beach, Bob Randall. From the reports I have had, I also understand that it has been a pretty hard task to get the Leader to even stand on the windsail board. Nevertheless, it was most inappropriate for members opposite to laugh when the member for Unley referred to his constituent, because this matter affects not only that person but also every person in South Australia. That shows just how insincere are Opposition members and particularly the Leader.

ANOP SURVEY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier, who, in the absence of the Premier, fits the seat well—there is no two ways about it.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He fits them both well.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, and I believe that it is a vast improvement. Will the Government give an unequivocal assurance that no member of the Labor Party in South Australia has seen or been provided with the results of the blatantly Party-political questions asked as part—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to resume his seat. I have given a warning on a previous occasion that I will not tolerate debate being intruded into a question or an explanation. If the honourable gentleman proceeds in that manner, I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not yet sought leave to explain the question: I am still asking the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has the floor.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek clarification of what you just told me, Mr Speaker. Will you withdraw leave for the explanation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of members on either side. I made quite clear that the Standing Orders of this House provide that Question Time is not debate time. Therefore, either the substantive question or the explanation must not carry items of debate. If they do, they will be stopped.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will do my best: that is all I can say. If one cannot ask political questions in this place, one might as well pack up and go home.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take offence at that remark. There was no suggestion on my part that honourable members would be prevented from asking any question, whether or not it pleases the Government. I made my point quite clear, and I ask the Deputy Leader to come to the point.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will start again. Will the Government give an unequivocal assurance that no member of the Labor Party in South Australia has seen or been provided with the results of the—and I intended to say 'blatantly political', but I will say—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not continue in that vein, or I will warn him.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —political survey that contained a number of political questions asked as part of the ANOP survey commissioned last year by the Minister of Health?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: On the information available to me, I can give an unequivocal answer, and that is 'No'.

MARALINGA TESTING

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Deputy Premier tell this House what action the Government plans to take in relation to a radio news report this morning about atomic testing at Maralinga in the State's Far West?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I heard the report this morning on radio station 5DN. I know that every member of this Parliament and every person in South Australia would be alarmed if the report was as accurate as it sounded. In the little time I have had between Executive Council and other meetings this morning, I was concerned to try to provide some information for the House on this question, because it was obvious that someone would ask it. I had searched out and found a report headed, 'Edited Version of AWRE Report No. 0-16/68 of January 1968 on Residual Radioactive Contamination at Maralinga, South Australia'. At page 5 of this report it is stated:

> In addition to the firings at the Major Trials Sites (section 3.1), experiments in support of the weapon development programme were performed at selected sites in the Forward Area for a few months each year from 1956 to 1963.

That report, released in May 1979, contained that information. Whether the radio broadcast was a repeat of those findings I have not been able to ascertain, but I have been concerned about the matter. I reached the Premier at the Melbourne Airport, where unfortunately he has been delayed by some problems with the airlines. I told him about it so that he would be able to take up the matter with Senator Walsh.

I think the Premier has already informed the House that this afternoon he will see Senator Walsh about all of this problem. I contacted him so that he would be fully cognisant with the situation, and maybe he can have some more research done on the matter by ringing London, because it evidently goes back to London whence the report came this morning. He will be fully armed with all the information when he talks to Senator Walsh. As members would know, the Federal Government has been in touch for some time with the British Government to ascertain just what occurred. I think that between the Premier of South Australia, Senator Walsh, and the Prime Minister, truth will out eventually. The South Australian Government will not in any circumstances tolerate this secrecy around matters that concern our people and our constituents. We will do all in our power to unveil the facts, and once they are unveiled we will certainly make them public.

ANOP SURVEY

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Deputy Premier ensure that ANOP is not given any further market research work commissioned at taxpayers' expense?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I ask this question for two reasons. First, there are competent and reputable market research companies in South Australia able to undertake this work, and in the case of the project commissioned last year by the Minister of Health it has been demonstrated that South Australian companies could have completed that survey for at least $10 000 less than the Government was charged by ANOP, which is a Sydney based company. Secondly, in a public statement on 19 April in the *News*, Mr Rod Cameron, Managing Director of ANOP, was quoted as saying:

> The Health Minister was not told that questions of a political nature were included in the survey he commissioned.

This statement was clearly untrue, because in the letter Mr Cameron wrote to Dr Cornwall on 11 August last year Mr Cameron said that political questions would be asked. This shows that Mr Cameron is not prepared to be truthful in public statements about the use of taxpayers' funds by his company, and is a further reason why this company should be prevented from conducting any further research at the expense of South Australian taxpayers.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: This is a question that I should not have thought would be asked by the member for Torrens. I have much more respect for the honourable member than his asking this type of question, and I would challenge the honourable member to make these statements outside because what you are saying is that Mr Cameron is a liar. You are bringing into consideration whether or not he has any respect—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier has twice used the word 'you'. On all occasions when referring to another member of the House, the member should be referred to by his district.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I apologise, Sir. The honourable member is actually making an allegation that Mr Cameron is not competent and has not acted in an honest manner: that is virtually what the honourable member is saying. It does not do the honourable member any good to make those sorts of allegations, and I think that, if one checks the letter and the statement by Mr Cameron, one will see that they are at variance. However, I consider that Mr Cameron was making a comment about the whole 11 questions when he made that statement in the first place.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Honourable members can smile or do whatever they like, but I am allowed to put my interpretation on such matters, as, I suppose, members opposite are also entitled to do. However, that is my understanding of those circumstances, and that is what I am telling the House. In relation to the actual meat of the question as to whether or not I would make a recommendation, or some words to that effect, that Mr Cameron would not get any more work from the South Australian Government, I want to say, 'No, I will not put myself in that position.' It is up to the Government whether or not it makes that decision. In fact, in total it would have to be a Government decision because Ministers do have the right to organise their own polls, provided that they get Cabinet authority to do so, which was done in these circumstances.

However, let me say this: Mr Cameron is considered to be one of the leading experts in polling in Australia—so much so, that I know that Liberal Governments have used him as well. He is very expert. As I say, he is considered to be one of the best in Australia. In relation to the quotes regarding the question of costing, which the honourable member raised, I have not seen any evidence of that. I know that the Leader in his summation the other day alleged that polls could have been conducted cheaper in South Australia, but they were not actual quotes: they were suggested by the society. One would really have to make comparisons by getting quotes from both ANOP and the pollsters in South Australia.

While I am about this, I say this: generally speaking, the South Australian Government tries to lean towards South Australian people when making contracts of any nature, and I would not be averse in my own circumstances if I was conducting a survey to give that consideration that I think South Australians are entitled to be given. However, if someone else holds an entirely different view to that, namely, that Mr Cameron is the best, I think that Mr Cameron ought to be given the opportunity to do the job. Therefore, I am not prepared to recommend to the Government that he has no more work in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the next question, I was at fault in not calling on the Deputy Premier (it is too late now) when he used the word 'liar' in relation to his perception of what the member for Torrens had perceived ANOP, and in particular Mr Cameron, to be. So, let all honourable members understand that the word is unparliamentary, whether used in the context of another member or persons outside this House. That would be helpful.

MATURE AGE UNEMPLOYED

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Labour urgently initiate with the Federal Minister for Labour and Industrial Relations and other State Ministers of Labour discussions to lay down sound strategies to ensure that adequate Federal funding is provided in the coming national Budget to enable mature age unemployed support groups to achieve recognition and funding to enable the existing groups and new initiatives to have proper financial support to carry out the much needed and inadequately funded support now being provided?

I raise this question on behalf of the 27 per cent of the total registered unemployed, who are 35 years and over, their families, and the number of unemployed in the mature age group who are not accounted for in accredited statistics. Government in this State has been supportive of support groups and is funding six groups from community welfare grant moneys not specifically earmarked for use for mature unemployed purposes. These support groups are providing the encouragement and means for many mature age unemployed to communicate again, and the means of assessing what alternatives to traditional work, as they have known work to be, are available to them, as well as keeping up their skills until employment is again available to them.

The dignity and confidence provided to many who are involved in such support groups is vital to them, their families and the community. Emphasis has been weighted in favour of youth unemployed, and it has been expressed to me by many mature age unemployed, both registered and unregistered, that they now feel it is time that they be given access to support groups adequately funded such as that which is provided by federally funded schemes for youth, such as the Community Youth Support Scheme, support which will take into account the special needs of the 35 years plus unemployed.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I commend the honourable member for her very active work not only in general areas but more specifically in this area concerning mature unemployed people. For quite some time now, the honourable member has been very active in regard to these matters. I am not sure whether she is a committee member or not, but in regard to the DOME organisation she has continually made representations to me on its behalf. I would readily concede that all Governments have inadequately funded and proposed training methods and employment schemes for mature age people—I suppose that refers to people 40 years of age and over. The honourable member would also be aware that quite recently I instituted a reconstruction in the Department for which I am responsible and set up a special employment programme unit. One of the considerations for the setting up of that unit concerned providing more staff and more impetus in an effort to devise more job creation schemes.

I think we have failed to come to grips with two important aspects and have failed to create the amount of jobs in mature age occupations that we would have liked to have done, which the guidelines themselves provided for. We do not seem to be able to get many of those mature age people into job creation schemes. The other very worrying concern is in relation to female labour. The types of schemes that are generally coming forward are not accommodating females. As most people would be aware, recently the Premier seconded a woman, initially for 12 months, to a position which will enable her to get out into the community, to consult with community groups, to encourage them, and to help devise for them schemes of a nature that will help to overcome this problem as far as women and other disadvantaged groups are concerned.

In regard to the honourable member's question whether I will endeavour to encourage other State Ministers and the Federal Minister to provide proper funding to assist those in the mature age groups, the answer is 'Yes'. At this stage I can do it only by way of letter, but I give an undertaking to the honourable member that I will do that. I have advocated this before, of course, at Ministers' conferences, but for a fresh approach, as asked for by the honourable member, I will need to write to the Federal Minister, and I shall do so accordingly and will enclose a copy of the honourable member's question and her explanation of it.

STA LAND

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: What financial assistance does the Minister of Local Government intend offering the Henley and Grange council to assist in its purchase of STA land in its council area? An article appeared in the *Advertiser* on Friday 27 April giving the impression that the Minister of Transport had approved the sale of STA land in that area. The member for Henley Beach is said to have approved the sale of five pieces of land and is quoted as recognising that $1.8 million is 'far beyond the council's reach'. Obviously, that quote clearly refers to the council's financial ability or resources.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I take it from that that the honourable member infers that, if it is beyond the resources of local government, then the State Department of Local Government will pick up the tab?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: I am just asking what will happen.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am sure that the member for Henley Beach, if he feels it necessary to do so, will make representations to me. When that happens I will look at the matter.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He did so in the press.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: To me. The point I am making to the member who asked the question is that the matter has not crossed my desk at this stage. If it does, I will certainly take it into consideration.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health, advise the House of the economic viability of the Central Linen Service? On Sunday night in prime time television the Leader of the Opposition appeared, as an introduction to *Flash Gordon* and *The Ten Commandments*, to tell the public that the Central Linen Service should be sold because its services were too expensive. By contrast, I have had repeated representations from a private linen service firm in my district—

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order. I do not very often interfere in these things, but I take this point of order because I believe that the member for Ascot Park has used comment in his question and, taking into consideration an earlier ruling, that comment should be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition continues his behaviour he will be named. I uphold the point of order. It is unfortunate that one has to rule these things out of order when they are presented in a humorous fashion. The member for Fisher is perfectly correct.

Mr TRAINER: The first point of my explanation was to the effect that the Leader of the Opposition claimed, on prime time television on Sunday night, that the Central Linen Service should be sold as its services were too expensive. My second point by way of explanation is that, by contrast, I have had repeated representations from a private linen service in my district protesting that it cannot compete with the Central Linen Service as it is too cheap. As this allegation of undercutting the tenders of other linen firms is in contradiction with the claim of the Leader of the Opposition, can the Minister advise the House whether the Central Linen Service is too expensive, too cheap or, like Goldilock's porridge, about right?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place who, I am sure, will be delighted to give a complete reply. It is well known that the Central Linen Service in South Australia is operating very efficiently and, of course, that is the problem that we face! I was surprised at the hilarity that a previous question seemed to engender in this House. I assure members opposite that my constituents are concerned about the number of Government enterprises that the Opposition wishes to sell off. They have every reason to be concerned about this proposition because it is typical of conservative policies: anything that looks like it might make a profit has to be given to their so-called friends in the private sector.

However, if it is going to be a charge upon the taxpayer and run at a loss, the taxpayer must pick it up. It is the old theory: they capitalise their gains and socialise their losses. That is their philosophy. If it is going to be a total service, they let the ordinary (as they say) 'over charged' taxpayer pick up the tab. If it is going to make a profit, they let their entrepreneurial friends out in the community make that profit. It is not unreasonable that the State Government, in its reponsibility to provide services, is doing the community a good turn by wanting very effective and economically viable services. That should not be denied the State, because it benefits the State and the taxpayer if that is the case.

Personally, the philosophy that the honourable member puts forward I reject and my constituents reject. The question asked by the honourable member I will refer to my colleague in another place. I finish by repeating my first statement: the real problem that the Leader of the Opposition seems to face is that the linen service is an economically viable enterprise, and that seems to threaten his particular or peculiar sense of Government operation.

STA LAND

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I refer to the sale of land between Grange and Henley Beach. Has the Minister of Transport approved the sale of portions of State Transport Authority land, which is part of the proposed Grange to Henley railway spur-line and, if so, what is the size and location of the land approved for sale? Does it mean that the proposed transport corridor has been scrapped by the Bannon Government? In 1973, the then Director-General of Transport prepared a report titled 'Public Transport for the Adelaide Metropolitan Region' which was presented to the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr Virgo) in September 1973. It was presented to the House in 1974 and became a 'laid on' paper of this House—Parliamentary Paper 109. Both of those documents strongly recommended that this transport corridor should exist. Without going into the length of the document, it says that the land was purchased for the sake of establishing a railway spur-line from Grange running due south to Henley Beach Road. In 1980 the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, when reporting on the Grange Primary School redevelopment, also referred to this piece of land, as contained in Parliamentary Paper 135 of 1980.

The State Transport Authority, in evidence to that Parliamentary committee, recommended that this piece of land, the corridor to which we are referring, should not be sold and should not even be leased to the Education Department as part of the school, even though a condition was to be attached that no structures be erected on that land. That was in 1980. In 1984, last Friday in the *Advertiser* we read that portion of the land is now to be sold. I also read that the member for Henley Beach has agreed with the sale of five portions of the land and, on Thursday 26 April, the Minister of Transport stated:

> The State Transport Authority was a statutory authority charged with managing its finances and assets properly. It was perfectly reasonable for it to want to dispose of land surplus to its requirements to help keep its deficit as low as possible.

I infer from that (and this is my reason for the question) that the spur-line has now been scrapped. If so, is it the intention of the State Transport Authority and the Government to eventually sell all the land? What land has so far been approved for sale?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I have agreed to the State Transport Authority selling this land. It is surplus to State Transport Authority requirements. I believe that a total of 16 or 17 blocks is associated with the corridor. A number of them, to which the honourable member referred, are hired through the Education Department. The Authority will be discussing with the Education Department the possibility of its purchasing those blocks.

Negotiations are to be held with the Henley and Grange council, officers of which have been to see the Premier about this matter. It is to be discussed by the resources and physical development committee before any report or any decision is made with respect to the various blocks. As I have said, there are 16 or 17 blocks, although I am not sure of the total area involved, but I can get the information for the honourable member. The land is surplus to the Authority's requirements.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Why didn't you announce that you were scrapping the transport corridor?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Authority does not require the land as a transport corridor, and this corridor has been developed by the local community over many years.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Did you consult with anyone before you decided to scrap it?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How many questions do you want to ask? This matter will be decided in due course in the interests of the Henley and Grange community, and Cabinet will make its decision in due course.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: But you've approved—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have shown remarkable tolerance towards the member for Davenport, and I ask him to desist.

ACTION HOME LOANS PTY LTD

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate the policies and practices of Action Home Loans Pty Ltd? I ask this question following concern expressed to me by a constituent about this company, which offers housing finance and also offers to sell mortgages as a secure investment. On investigating this matter, I found that the Queensland Attorney-General, Mr Harper, had made a Ministerial statement in the Queensland Parliament on 7 February 1984 about this company, and I would like to quote briefly from his statement, as follows:

> Being a money lender, this firm does not fall within the usual range of providers of housing finance such as banks, building societies, terminating housing societies, etc. The interest rates which it charges are far in excess of interest rates normally charged for housing finance.

He went on to say:

> From information available it would seem that the firm Action Home Loans Pty Ltd is charging interest at rates of 19.8 per cent per annum in respect of a loan for a home, a rate I am certain all members would agree is well in excess of current market rates.

He concludes his statement by saying:

> In all circumstances I would urge persons having dealings with the firm Action Home Loans Pty Ltd to exercise the greatest degree of caution and to seek independent legal advice before entering into any relationship with the firm.

On investigating the matter further I found that the Crown Solicitor had given an opinion on a matter (that had been referred to him in respect of this company) in which he stated, in respect of clause 26 of a particular mortgage document:

> Reading clauses 26 and 28 in conjunction it is alarming to note that the lower rate of interest is 22 per cent per annum and the higher rate is 32 per cent per annum.

In respect of the evidence I have presented, I ask the Minister to investigate urgently the practices of Action Home Loans Pty Ltd in South Australia.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and for drawing this matter to the attention of the House. Obviously, the questions she raises are of significant importance to home purchasers in the community. I would be very surprised if on the information she has given to the House that type of transaction does not offend the Consumer Credit Act. This is a matter that the Minister will have to investigate in conjunction with the Crown Law Department.

POLICE INCIDENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has the Deputy Premier, as Minister responsible for the police, received a briefing or report from the police relating to an incident that occurred on the morning of Sunday 15 April at Caesar's, in Pulteney Street, Adelaide? If so, when did he receive such a report or briefing? Is he satisfied that the action taken by the Vice Squad was appropriate and that he as Minister responsible should support the action of the police on this occasion?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes, I received a report and a briefing yesterday afternoon in this Parliament. The honourable member must have been watching for the police to arrive to know that. I am satisfied with the briefing that I received, and I am going over the report in detail. At this stage, it is my view that the stories I have been told and the suggestions made about the events that occurred that night have been grossly exaggerated. Three statutory declarations have been made, and I am looking at them in close detail. One person involved in the incident has changed his statutory declaration or, more correctly, perhaps it should be called a deposition. I am examining that matter. At the moment, following the briefing I received yesterday, I do not think that the police acted otherwise than in accordance with their authority to examine and detect matters pertaining to the circumstances of the incident.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a progress report on the implementation of the Government's energy management programme which he announced in February this year? I am prompted to ask this question as a result of an article that appeared in Tuesday's edition of the *Financial Review*. The article states that savings of $4 million were expected by the New South Wales Department of Health this year with implementation of an energy management scheme based on microprocessor technology. Do South Australian hospitals offer the same potential for energy savings, and is this potential being examined as part of the Government's energy management programme?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is exactly the kind of high technology equipment discussed in the *Financial Review* article which offers Government—and for that matter commerce and industry—new opportunities to control energy costs. South Australian hospitals operate on demand rate tariffs similar to those in New South Wales and, on the face of it, opportunities clearly exist to better control power consumption through the use of micro-processors and similar electrical equipment.

As to the honourable member's request for a progress report on the Government's energy management programme, I can report considerable progress in the past couple of months. Staff have begun to be appointed to the nine-member co-ordinating group which is being established within the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy, and the remaining appointments are expected to be gazetted in the near future. It is this group which will work with energy managers to be nominated from the existing staff of each Government department and agency.

Each Minister has been written to by the Premier, outlining the very significant financial benefits to be derived from effective energy management and seeking their full co-operation. I have followed this up with a letter to the head of each department and Government authority outlining the details of the programme and the contribution they will be expected to make. Senior officers of the Energy Division are well advanced in meetings with all permanent heads, and in many cases departments and authorities have already nominated energy managers.

The co-ordinating group has already begun collecting energy use data, and in the months ahead similar data will be gathered from all Government agencies and will undergo analysis, using spare capacity in computer facilities being installed in the Department of Mines and Energy. This will be followed by the development of a reporting system, the provision of advice and technical aid to departmental energy managers and setting realistic targets for energy savings in consultation with Treasury and energy managers. Referring back to the honourable member's remarks about hospitals, I can say that the Health Commission is one of the agencies included in the scheme.

It seems likely that the Commission may seek the co-operation of hospitals to nominate the equivalent of an energy manager from each hospital to become part of the programme. I believe that the energy management programme has got off to a good start and anticipate that from now on the pace will be stepped up—substantially so when the staffing of the co-ordinating group is finalised in the near future. On the basis of experience interstate and overseas, it is estimated that total budgetary savings of $12 million are possible in the first two years of a properly co-ordinated and managed programme, with no reduction in comfort or services provided.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Transport say what monitoring mechanism is being used to prevent the use of Government motor vehicles for private purposes? Over the past few years a number of instructions have been issued by both Governments to tighten up the use of Government motor vehicles by employees outside working hours. I raise this question again and direct it towards the monitoring aspect, because I have received a genuine letter from a constituent, as follows:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to express my concern about the very apparent misuse of Government cars during non-business hours. It is quite obviously a common practice for cars on issue to Government departments (and presumably petrol bought by the Government for official use) to be used by individuals for their transport to and from work.

To compound matters, some seemingly divert to deliver their children to school, their wives to work, or to call at shops. I have even seen a casually dressed individual leaving a local deli on a Sunday in one of the more expensive (and petrol thirsty) Government cars.

I am becoming increasingly annoyed during my travels to and from work to see such an apparent misuse of Government resources. I would appreciate you ascertaining for me the official policies in this sphere and what the practice costs the taxpayer.

The letter is self-explanatory. I understand that a number of regulations have been issued relating to this matter. To what extent has the Government been monitoring the situation to ensure that there is no abuse of Government vehicle use?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Government policy in this matter is laid down in circular No. 87 from the Premier's Department, reissued by the previous Government in October 1982. It remains the same, and states:

Use of Government Motor Vehicles

Heads of Departments and Statutory Authorities are advised that Government motor vehicles are to be used only for Government purposes except where—

(1) During periods of emergency fuel shortages, drivers of Government vehicles will be permitted to assist members of the public by transporting them, where appropriate, during the course of a planned journey.

(2) A Permanent Head gives specific permission otherwise.

No Government owned vehicle shall be used outside the State of South Australia unless extremely unusual circumstances exist. Approval to take a Government owned vehicle outside the borders of South Australia must be obtained from the appropriate Minister.

I receive numerous complaints about the misuse of Government vehicles, and those complaints are checked out. They are referred to the Minister in charge of the Department to which the vehicle in question has been allocated. I expect those Ministers to check such complaints and to take necessary action. I understand that the Public Accounts Committee is reviewing this matter. When we receive a report from that committee we will consider whether or not it is necessary to alter this policy in any way.

WINDSURFING

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Marine aware that it is an offence to ride a windsurfer without a life jacket? Did he see the photograph in the *News* on Monday of the Leader of the Opposition riding a windsurfer without a life jacket?

An honourable member: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Semaphore has the floor.

Mr PETERSON: Will action be taken against the Leader of the Opposition? I had contact this morning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member.

Mr PETERSON: —from a constituent of mine—and that is a fact—who has been involved—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: —in a prosecution for riding a windsurfer without a life jacket. He inquired of me whether some special dispensation was given to Parliamentarians. I undertook to raise the question today because this matter of riding windsurfers without life jackets is of great concern to everybody in lifesaving and coast guard circles, because there is great danger. To have a photograph in the newspaper of a prominent politician without a life jacket illustrates to people that they can do it. It is something which should not be done by a prominent person. Will action be taken?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not aware whether it is the law for a surfie (or whatever one calls them) to wear a life jacket. If it is, there would not be any exemption for politicians; if it is the law, they will be required to wear them. I will check that out for the member and if it is necessary to take action against the Leader of the Opposition we will give that serious consideration.

SAMCOR, PORT LINCOLN

Mr BLACKER: My question is to the Deputy Premier, representing the Premier. On 5 April the Premier, in answer to a question from the member for Alexandra, said that the SAMCOR abattoir at Port Lincoln was subsidised to the extent of about $1 million a year, on a base employment figure at that time of about 15. On what basis did the Premier make that statement? Did he deliberately mislead this House in order to play down the importance of SAMCOR, Port Lincoln, or was he misinformed?

My constituents have expressed concern that the Premier's statement has grossly understated the real position and the importance of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula. On further inquiry I am informed that the employment figure quoted by the Premier was less than that which applied when the works was actually closed over the Christmas period. The actual employment at the works, including employees at Lincoln Bacon Specialists, as of this Tuesday was 142; this does not include potential jobs for boning room operators who have been denied access to the works by SAMCOR. It should also be explained that this is now a low employment period and that at the peak of work this number nearly doubles to a figure of 300.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am obviously not in a position to answer the question about what the Premier said at a certain time; the honourable member would be well aware of that. The Premier is not here, but I am sure that he would qualify it if he were. I do have some information which has just been provided to me and which may be of some value to the honourable member. It is headed, 'SAMCOR Port Lincoln works closure'. As to how many employees are immediately affected by the decision, my information is that there are 31 permanent employees for whom other positions in the public sector will be sought. That assurance has been given, as the honourable member would be aware. There are 45 seasonal employees, who will be retrenched.

I know that the honourable member would be aware of working conditions of seasonal workers in most abattoirs around the State. When the abattoirs are operating, workers are required but, if the abattoirs are not operating at full steam, workers are not required. If the honourable member requires further information (which I have, but with which I will not delay the House), I would be happy to provide it later.

STEEPLECHASE ACCIDENTS

Mr MAX BROWN: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport, because of the fatal accident in the Great Eastern Steeplechase in which Painted Rough was killed, considered banning such racing events? The Minister would be aware of the considerable public outcry over the fall of Painted Rough in the Great Eastern, and I would be interested to know whether or not he is prepared to ban these events.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The setting of race programmes is the prerogative of racing clubs, but I would not advocate the banning of jumping races following an incident that occurred at Oakbank on Easter Monday. From time to time there is an element of risk, as in any other sport. Unfortunately, there have been two incidents, one involving the death of a jockey at Bordertown in a hurdle race. A lot of emotion has been generated regarding the incident involving Painted Rough, more so than in regard to the jockey who was killed at Bordertown.

I have received a number of letters and I have noted letters in the press. I appreciate the comments but, with due respect to those people, racing clubs make every effort to ensure that horses are properly treated. Stewards and veterinarians are on hand, and every effort is made to ensure that horses are not ill treated, even in jumping events. One of the things that people seem to forget, as stated in letters in the press, is that jumping events do not occur in other States not because they might be cruel to horses but simply because over a period racing clubs in those States have not obtained sufficient fields for jumping events to be economical. South Australia has always been one of the leaders in this sort of event, particularly the South-East and the western region of Victoria, where most of the good jumpers have originated over the years.

I am not in a position to take any action, nor would I advocate a ban on jumping races. I repeat that every care is taken by racing authorities to ensure that horses are not treated cruelly. Jumping events have taken place at Oakbank for the past 109 years, and their absence would certainly take away the glamour of the meeting. It is unfortunate that these situations occur in sport and in horse racing, in which there is an element of risk. I also point out that over a period both the surface of the course and the hurdles have been improved. Some years ago open baton hurdles were used that were much more dangerous than brush hurdles or brush fences. Every precaution is taken. I know that the member for Whyalla has a special interest in this matter being a racehorse owner.

I point out that owners and trainers look after their horses as much as possible. They have a genuine affection for their horses, as do most of the people involved in the racing fraternity. I am rather surprised at the reaction that has been generated, and I believe that people generally are basing it on emotion rather than logic. It is not my prerogative nor my decision to ban jumping races in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1984

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 2 May. Page 3935.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): In speaking in this grievance debate, I first draw the House's attention to the misguided direction that has been given by the Minister for the Arts' Department in relation to promotion of banding. It has been traditional that for over 20 years the Tanunda Band Competitions are held as a promotional of banding in South Australia. Indeed, the very fact of a competition associated with banding has been a spur to individual organisations within the banding sphere to measure themselves and their players against other players. The Tanunda Band Competition has been promoted widely as a tourist attraction. In addition, members from the Banding Association, particularly through the Tanunda Band, have been used extensively by the present Government and previous Governments for promotion of South Australia within Australia and overseas. A direction has now been given by the Minister for the Arts or his Department that the funds to be spent during 1984-85 are to exclude any funds being made available for the promotion of the Tanunda Band Competitions. The statement was made that the funds are for promotion of banding in South Australia and that band contests are not considered as promotions.

I ask the Government, and more particularly the Minister for the Arts, to reconsider this rather narrow tunnel-vision

approach to what is proper promotion. One cannot have excellence in any sphere of endeavour unless there is an element of competition when one group measures itself against another. The very fact that the Tanunda Band Competitions, which have been traditional contests on the first Saturday in November for many years, attracts bands not only from other parts of Australia but also from New Zealand, is a promotion of the whole element of banding. To now deny the Tanunda Band Competition organisation, which is not the Tanunda Band itself, but comprises a number of persons who are associated with the Tanunda and other bands, is to completely fly in the face of reality in respect of proper promotion of an art.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It has been going on for 20 years.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As my colleague the member for Kavel says, it has been in vogue for over 20 years. The former member for Angas, the Hon. Bert Teusner (a former Speaker of this House), helped to promote the reality of banding at Tanunda, and it has been an ongoing promotional of benefit to the State both in the sense of excellence, which it has helped to bring about in banding, and also a part of the excellence of the tourist promotional associated with the Barossa Valley area.

The Oompahfest, which is a further extension held in January of each year, has used all the combined bands or a selected band created by members of various bands in the promotional in Sydney, first by the Tonkin Government and, subsequently, the promotional of South Australia in Hong Kong and Tokyo, and is being extensively used by the Government and Department to suggest that South Australia has much to offer in the area of wine production, and as a source of tourist activity. Yet, for the sake of $2 400, we have this misguided approach that a band contest is no longer a promotion of banding. Before it is too late I trust that the Government will reassess the position, and recognise that this area of excellence is necessary in the best interests of the banding fraternity in South Australia, and that it has tremendous ongoing potential for tourism and the tourist promotion effort.

The next point I make in relation to this grievance circles around a very unfortunate and regrettably long-standing appreciation of responsibility in respect of fines associated with local government, not only the Adelaide City Council but also other council areas. It goes beyond into a number of statutory authorities and some of our educational institutions. In this respect, I refer to the Adelaide University, where the owner of a motor vehicle can be (and often is) taken to court and prosecuted for a misdemeanour of a traffic infringement nature, when the first knowledge that that person has of a transgression is the delivery of a summons to the door of his home.

It is a recognised fact that, if a person is stopped on the road for a speeding or any other traffic infringement, action is taken against that individual for his conduct in that vehicle. However, if the vehicle is parked unlawfally, double ranked, too long in one spot, in or too near to a bus zone, or is involved in various other activities of that nature, and the registration number of the vehicle is taken, it is referred to the Motor Registration Division and subsequently the information comes out that such and such a vehicle was owned by Mr Bloggs, Mr Smith, Mr Jones or whatever the case may be. Action is subsequently taken against that owner, notwithstanding that he may have, as a constituent of mine in the last week has reported, sold the vehicle some three months before. Unfortunately, there appeared to have been a break-down in the communication system in the Motor Registration Division, and that person was still registered as the owner of that vehicle, even though he lodged a transfer personally at the Elizabeth branch in March this year. Unfortunately, where the driver is unknown the owner becomes responsible for the debt.

Mr Ferguson: Quite wrong.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is quite wrong. I am glad that the honourable member for Henley Beach agrees with me. Even if the owner identifies to the authority—be it a council, a Government authority, or a body such as the Adelaide University—the person who had charge of the vehicle on the given date, the action still proceeds in the name of the owner. The owner has not been the person who has transgressed, but is it, or could it be, claimed that, by allowing a member of the family, an employee or some other person to use one's motor vehicle, one has transgressed against the law? That is not a fact. That is not supported by any reasonable or rational approach. Even where the person who failed to pick up the on the spot fine or the other notification because he was not in charge of the vehicle is denied knowledge of that infringement (the first knowledge he has, as I have indicated previously, is the summons), there is no opportunity to expiate the fee or to take action other than through a court.

Therefore, the cost of this issue mounts against an individual who is completely innocent and who has no knowledge of the various problems that have arisen. There is a regrettable indifference on the part of a number of authorities, including councils, the Motor Registration Division and, indirectly, the Minister, but I am not challenging the Minister on this occasion, as I will do that in another way by letter.

The Parliament must give urgent consideration to requiring that a person who has not responded to an infringement notice must provide on oath or by some other means, perhaps a statutory declaration, details of who to that person's knowledge had charge of a vehicle on the day on which the infringement occurred. Any subsequent action should then be taken against the person who is the transgressor.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I shall address myself today to an extremely serious situation that exists in relation to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. I want to outline to the House the background and I shall then highlight the absolutely disgraceful way in which the present Government is winding down the effectiveness of that college. I have been provided with figures from the Bureau of Statistics which show that in excess of 81 000 people live in the area that is served by the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. The latest figures which come from the most recent census show that there is a very rapid growth in the area: 10 years ago the population was only 48 000. So, the population has almost doubled over the past 10 years. Additionally, both the present Government and the previous Government indicated that the Golden Grove development would go ahead, and it is estimated that another 14 000 people will be living in the Tea Tree Gully district by 1988 and, further, that by 1990 another 30 000 people will be added to the population served by the Tea Tree Gully TAFE.

In regard to the age structure of those living in the area, 16.7 per cent of the population is between the ages of 15 and 24—which is much higher than average—and that is the age group that should be served by the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. In relation to unemployment, CES figures indicate that in the December quarter of 1983 within the Modbury area alone 3 147 people were unemployed, of whom 61 per cent were between the ages of 15 and 24. The figures also indicate that the retention rate for school leavers in the area is lower than average and that fewer students are proceeding from year 11 to year 12 than in most other areas. I have been advised (and I think this is an absolute indictment of the present Government) that, of the 11 800 subject enrolments by students living in the Tea Tree Gully catchment area, 9 478 were at other colleges. In other words, the Tea

Tree Gully college caters for only about 2 300 of the 11 800 student subjects undertaken by residents in the area that should be served by the Tea Tree Gully TAFE.

The Tea Tree Gully TAFE Council has advised me that in its opinion the budget provided by the Government is totally inadequate. The Minister has written to the college indicating that, in his opinion, funds for this year have been increased. That is absolutely and patently false, as I will show a little later. Members of the Tea Tree Gully TAFE Council are extremely angry that the Minister will not accept the true figures. According to the Minister, an additional $2 025 has been provided over the college budget of the previous year, but of that amount $2 000 was provided for an adjustment to the allocation to compensate for the transfer of a staff member and subsequent loss of teacher hours. Therefore, if we take away that $2 000 (but the Minister will not acknowledge that what I have referred to is fact), it can be seen that in real terms considerably less funding has been made available to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE than was made available last year.

This is in an area of growing population and one in which the population will grow even more rapidly in the future. The council has told me that the facilities of the college are totally inadequate. The college has been pleading for a multi-purpose technical studies workshop for a long time, but still this Government will not give any assurance that that workshop will be provided. That workshop would allow residents in the area to be provided with desperately needed full-time and part-time study facilities. Additionally, incredible as it may sound, the college, which is only eight or nine miles from the city centre, is not even provided with sewerage. Applications have been made to the Government for funding to allow sewerage to be provided, and that has still not been done.

For years promises have been made that Tea Tree Gully TAFE would be provided with a completely new college. Again, this Government will give no indication as to whether it will meet the commitment and promises previously made and, if so, when the college can be built. Further, the council has told me that the staffing situation is also absolutely appalling in that this year the number of staff is one less than it was last year. It is already probably the smallest college of advanced and further education in South Australia. In 1982 it had a Principal and four staff members and this year it has a Principal and three staff member. There has been a reduction in funding in real terms and a reduction in staffing as well. This has had an effect on the courses provided by the college: in 1982 there were three matriculation courses, five business study courses, and nine commercial courses, in addition to certificate courses of which there was one class, making a total of 17 substantial classes offered by Tea Tree Gully TAFE.

However, in 1984 the number of matriculation courses has been reduced from three to one, business study courses have been reduced from five to three, and commercial studies courses have been reduced from nine to four. In other words, the present number of substantial courses is less than half those offered two years ago, and this is occurring in an area of growing population and where the population will grow even more. Is it any wonder that members of the college council are angry at what this Government is doing to their college?

This situation can be contrasted with the Noarlunga college. We all know what is happening at Noarlunga: it is suffering a number of Labor members of Parliament in the area, and obviously the Labor Government regards it as being more important to look after Labor voting areas than to look after non-Labor voting areas. Noarlunga, which services an area smaller than Tea Tree Gully services, has a budget about 10 times as large as the budget of the Tea Tree Gully college with a similar 10 times the number of staff provided to serve a population of less than that in the Tea Tree Gully area. How can any Government defend statistics like those?

As the college council has pointed out to me, the situation gets worse and worse, because just before the previous Government came to power the staff at the college comprised a Principal, two senior lecturers and six lecturers, but now it is down to a Principal and four lecturers, which is one less than it was in 1982 when this Government came to power. In other words, there is continuing reduced funding and continuing reduced staffing in an area where unemployment and the number of people between 15 and 24 years is higher than average, and where people are crying out to be able to undertake courses. It is absolutely incredible that, of 11 800 subject enrolments by students living in the Tea Tree Gully college catchment area, 9 478 of them are undertaken at other colleges because the present college cannot offer the facilities that are needed and this Government will not do a darned thing about it.

I have been contacted by constituent after constituent about this. One person has to travel to O'Halloran Hill to undertake a course that she was able to undertake last year at Tea Tree Gully college. Others have to go to Elizabeth, and others have had to give up their studies because they cannot afford to run a car, and the courses offered at other colleges are at night. The situation at Tea Tree Gully TAFE is an absolute disgrace for which this Government should hang its head in shame.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to take up some points with which I began to deal yesterday in relation to the announced closure of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln. I would like to take up the matter on a different tack and challenge some of the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture. When he attempted to justify the closure he referred to the Government's announcement that 250 jobs would be made available during the Porter Bay marine construction programme and another 500 permanent jobs would be available in the accommodation, entertainment, leisure and other tourism related services on an ongoing basis. I believe the Government was totally unfair and unrealistic in even making such an announcement. It is totally ludicrous to suggest that knifemen from the abattoir can go down and get a job digging a hole for the marina.

First of all, the money will not be appropriated, the machinery and equipment will not even be on the site and there will not be jobs available when the announced closure of this works takes place. They will not be there for 18 months or two years, and this area has one of the highest unemployment rates in South Australia. To have the most significant opportunities for work in the area swept from under the feet of the people concerned will have devastating effects on the community, on employment opportunities and on the finances of that community. It is just not on, but that is the way this Government operates.

The Government has seen fit to throw out the window some 100 relatively permanent jobs and another 200 seasonal jobs and says that it will be all right because a marina will be built in that area and jobs will be available. What the Government does not say is that those jobs will not be available for another 18 months, two years, three years or four years, and in some cases five or six years. Where is the realism and practicality of this Government in handling the situation in this way? I do not believe it knows what it is doing, and what really concerns me is that I do not believe it cares about what it is doing, because if it did care it would be able to give a far better explanation to the public and this Parliament than it has so far given.

If I were in any way conscious of the fact or believed that the Government had examined all the implications of its actions and still came up with the same decision I could more readily accept it, but because of the explanation given by the Minister and because of the explanations and the vast variety of assumptions that have been made by the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture in another place and today the Deputy Premier, I am absolutely convinced that they do not know what they are on about. How can one deal with a Government that is not even prepared to look at the situation and is interested only in standing off and making sweeping statements, none of which has been substantiated?

I do not know how long we will have to go on putting up with this sort of thing. The closure of SAMCOR is as significant to Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula as would be the closure of the motor industry to Adelaide. That is the relativity we are talking about. If we closed down all the production lines and all the associated parts manufacture, that impact on the community would be similar to the impact the closure of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln will have on Port Lincoln itself and Lower Eyre Peninsula. It is that relativity that this Government must accept. This Government must realise that it has an obligation as the elected Government of the day to all people of the State and not just a select few, as some have said.

It has been suggested that these employment figures need to be challenged. However, I understand that unemployment in Port Lincoln ranges from 18 per cent to 23 per cent through the various age groups, and it may be even greater than that. Those figures represent a devastating unemployment situation in any community, let alone one that is relatively isolated and has no room for industrial expansion. Port Lincoln people cannot be told that they could get a job at Whyalla, Port Pirie or Adelaide because, in order to take a job in one of those centres, they must sell their home, relocate the family and suffer consequent domestic upheaval. People in Adelaide can shop around for a job from their home base, but that cannot be done in an isolated place such as Port Lincoln.

Earlier today, the Deputy Premier quoted figures that could be challenged, because what he has not taken into account is the fact that many people involved are long-time workers at SAMCOR in Port Lincoln who hold letters of agreement issued at the time of the changeover from the Government Produce Department to SAMCOR. Those letters indicate that the persons who transferred would not be disadvantaged: in other words, they were to have continuity and permanency of employment. Those workers therefore claim that, because they have the same rights as permanent public servants, the Government cannot sweep under the carpet the implications underlying those letters of agreement when they were issued. If the Government thinks that it can do so, it has another think coming. Employees have a copy of that letter and, if the Government has not yet been told about this matter, it will be told soon because the matter is far wider than the 30 or 40 jobs of which we have been told.

The Government must take this matter seriously. From the reaction of Government members I realise that they do not know much about it. The industrial section at the Port Lincoln SAMCOR works has an excellent record: as far as I can remember, there has been no industrial strife there. Indeed, this may be causing the problem because the smooth industrial record of the Port Lincoln workers is embarrassing some of their colleagues who have taken industrial action elsewhere. However, our fellows do not see it that way. They know the value of the works to the whole community and are willing to work beyond the normal rule. In this regard, they have honoured commitments to work up to 10 per cent above quotas and to work the overkills, and this has led to industrial harmony in Port Lincoln. Indeed, the only shut down I recall was caused by problems with the meat inspectors. When these officers go out in an export abattoirs, the whole place must shut down. The men working the abattoirs were not responsible, nor was the management, for that shutdown. So, the industrial record at the Port Lincoln works is good, and the employees there now consider that they are being kicked in the backside by a Government that claims to look after the workers but acts to the contrary.

The Government made demands of these employees and they responded admirably to those demands, yet their plight is now ignored by the Government. These employees, who believe that in the circumstances they have a right to severance pay, will claim it, and I support them in that regard. The issue is one of relativity. The importance of the SAMCOR works to Port Lincoln equals that of the entire motor building industry to Adelaide. If the Government wishes to use certain criteria in closing the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln, will it use the same criteria to close the SAMCOR works at Gepps Cross? From what I hear of the productivity record at Gepps Cross, it might as well.

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

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I wish to address the field of special education, to pay a tribute to those involved in two of its areas of whose efforts South Australians should be proud, and to draw to the attention of the Minister of Education what I believe is a problem in this field, especially as it relates to the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. The first initiative to which I refer is the Early Literacy In-service Course, known as ELIC, being conducted from the Wattle Park Teaching Centre. This course is co-ordinated by Miss Anne Darwin, and I pay a tribute to her and to the centre for what the course is achieving. I believe that South Australia is probably leading the nation in this field. The course instructs teachers to pick up learning difficulties in children at the earliest possible age. The earlier such a learning difficulty is picked up the greater the chance that the child has to rehabilitate. As I understand it, the unit has applied for Commonwealth funding for this especially fine initiative.

At an interstate conference, educational representatives from other States have shown interest in the South Australian course. I take the opportunity, not only before the House but before the Minister, to support the project and I ask the Minister to use the full weight of his status and standing with his Commonwealth colleagues to see that the required funding is made available to South Australia. If the Minister searches his files, he will find that the interest being shown in other States in this course is there now, and the more this course can be expanded and the more teachers (especially primary, junior primary and pre-school teachers) can take this course and learn to pick up the learning difficulties experienced by children, be they literacy or numeracy difficulties, the better it will be for our children generally.

I first came across the scheme while visiting a school in the District of Mitcham. One of the teachers told me about it over morning tea. After making inquiries, I talked with Anne Darwin and took home a lesson on videotape, which I played back in my lounge-room.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: How did you get on?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Probably I could have done with some instruction myself, and no doubt there will be those who will agree and those who will disagree with that statement. Having been most impressed with the programme, I commend it to the House and the Minister and ask him to put his whole weight behind getting that Com-

monwealth subsidy and to help in the recognition of that programme among the teaching authorities in South Australia.

The second item I wanted to mention in special education is the recent commissioning by the Minister of the Institute for the Study of Learning Difficulties, which is to take place at the Sturt campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. It is a very bright star in special education. Certainly, it is starting on what I would call a shoestring budget; certainly, it is starting in a small way.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am not criticising the Minister. The Minister should not be sensitive. As Minister of Recreation and Sport, I started the Sports Institute on the same basis. I do not criticise the Minister. It is much better for these institutes to get a grounding and then grow when they know what are their needs, rather than to give massive funding right at the start when some of those taxpayer dollars may not go in the best possible way.

I commend the Minister (that is twice I have commended the Minister today—I am feeling a bit out of sorts) and the Government as well as Dr Caite, Dr Ramsay and Dr Roger Rees (who will be heading up the unit), for what I believe is an extremely important initiative and one which is being closely watched from interstate. I will briefly mention some of the activities in which the Institute will be involved. Its function primarily will be as a research institute, and, in no area of education can I imagine a more important need for research than in special education. It will provide clinics where supervised remedial tuition, as part of the teacher training programme or research project, will also be regarded as a legitimate research activity of the Institute. It will provide seminars and will be involved with publications so that the work of the Institute can be promulgated widely. That is very important. I wish the Institute well. I am sorry that I was not able to be at the meeting but, as the Minister, Dr Rees and others know, I was engaged in very important activities in this House at the time. I was upset at not being able to be there.

The last question I wish to raise is that of special education as a whole and teaching in special education in this State. There is, from my consultations, a lack of morale amongst many of the staff in the South Australian College of Advanced Education. I do not wish to canvass the matter in very much more depth at this stage. I would be happy to talk to the Minister privately. There is a lack of morale in the college amongst the staff totally, but particularly within the special education section. There are many reasons for that. The Sturt campus, which contains the faculty of health sciences and education, comprises not only special education courses for teachers but also the developmental disabilities diploma. The Speech Pathology Unit is also located on that campus.

The Minister will know that there are problems with speech pathologists in regard to their recognition. I do not wish to canvass these matters in depth but to bring them to the Minister's attention. There is a deal of uncertainty within special education as to its future. It has recently transferred from Underdale. One can understand that there are problems with the settling down of the whole course. Nevertheless, that does not explain entirely what I find to be a lack of morale. There is a need for co-ordination in special education. I have mentioned the ELIC course at Wattle Park. There is a school of special education at Flinders University. Close co-ordination and co-operation will be needed between Flinders University and the Sturt campus in this matter.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is what the South Australian Institute tries to do.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, it is vital, in my opinion. It is rumoured that we will get a new principal for the South Australian College of Advanced Education. That, in itself, will be unsettling. The appointment of a new principal, if it happens, will be vital for the future of special education, amongst other activities of the total college. The new principal would want to give a great deal of attention to special education at the Sturt College. A problem exists with recognition of some other work done in special education at the Sturt College and within the whole College. I believe the Minister ought to look at those matters. I am quite prepared to talk to him privately about some of the things I have heard. He needs to undertake an investigation, which I recommend to him and to the House.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I wish to give some words of support to the member for Flinders and defend his eloquent plea for the retention of a killing works at Port Lincoln. Whilst I have not lived on Eyre Peninsula for some 40 years, I did have the privilege of having my birth and infant nurture in that part of the State. I never cease to marvel at the progress it makes each year and each time I go there. I listened to the member for Flinders with complete interest and it does come as a shock, accompanied with feelings of great sadness, to see the headline in today's *Stock Journal* that the Port Lincoln abattoir is to go. Full recognition should be given to the honourable member's remarks of yesterday and today.

Eyre Peninsula is an area that has probably the largest potential in South Australia. Each year we see the high quality livestock, better management of pastures and better facilities available for grain growing and laying up of hay. It is all going ahead in concert. Port Lincoln, with a population of 10 000, is a growth centre. The honourable member has referred to that and, in recent times, we have heard announcements of progress in shipping, of the establishment of a marina, and in tourism.

I have the privilege of being the guest speaker at Stokes just prior to Christmas when the National Trust had its annual remembrance day to the pioneers of that place. It was, indeed, a thrill and a realisation to me that it is very much of age. I do not doubt for one moment that the Minister has problems with the accounting of the works, but there is a need for a killing works at Port Lincoln. Presently, it is carried, on and we see the *Troubridge* still serving Eyre Peninsula with large consignments of livestock going from Kangaroo Island. The closing of the works will sociologically affect Port Lincoln and will have an effect on other areas. The productivity will not decrease but will increase.

We are at the stage of analysing the situation. I cannot place too much emphasis on the fact that there must be a killing works at Port Lincoln to serve the district and to provide incentive for growth. The member for Flinders put directly and succinctly where the economy of his district lies. If one takes the trouble to look at the output statistics, one will see that it is going in the right direction all the time.

Lower Eyre Peninsula enjoys a very reliable and assured rainfall. It is not an area that is subjected to the more serious ravages of drought. They have these problems in the 'top end', as it is colloquially known over there. But, Lower Eyre Peninsula is one of those areas akin to the fringe areas of Yorke Peninsula and the Lower South-East. It has reliable productivity. I want to underline and dot all the i's and cross all the t's of what has been said by the member for the district.

The article in today's *Stock Journal* must make sad reading for residents of the area, but it does point up the fact that people there, and indeed I think other people in this State, want to see some sort of rationalisation and retention of a killing works at that site. I have some personal regrets about

this, because I can remember my father being on a local committee many years ago when I was a very small boy. I remember the committee members going to meetings with people like A.H. Pfitzner and J.K. Schramm, full of expectation about laying the foundation stone for what was to be a milestone in developing an important part of this State. It would be wrong to see that valuable works closed. I take the point that was very strongly made by the member for Flinders. What he says is true. On the other hand we look at the figures quoted. Money is not everything. There has to be some rationalisation. The unit needs to be kept going, perhaps by scaling it down to required needs. Maybe it is antiquated, but I am sure that it would be wrong to close it. Perhaps there should be a holding operation so that it could be put in working order. At a time of drought those works will be needed. Areas in the north of Eyre Peninsula which become susceptible to drought cannot send their stock to Adelaide to be killed.

The other matter I want to speak about is not a grievance, but perhaps a word of praise for our House Manager, Mr Temay, and the Joint House Committee for setting up an eating place downstairs for all the people who work in Parliament House. I remember raising this matter with Mr Dunstan, the then Premier, some years ago. I think that at the time there was some difficulty in doing it, although the then Premier was not against the idea, but of course renovations had not been made to the House at that stage.

But, charity starts at home. A large group of people works in this place. I once heard an old philosopher in the services say that, if one wants to know people well, one should travel with them; if one wants to know them better, one should sup with them. This facility must help those who work in the House and must give rise to greater understanding. I have availed myself of the services offered. It is good to see that the Blue Room provides an amenity for anyone and everyone who works in this place. Of course, the main dining room is for the members, but it does not do a member any harm to go down to this facility and have a cup of coffee.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They have cappuccino down there now.

Mr RODDA: Yes, nice cappuccino! The staff members are doing an excellent job. I say, 'Full marks to Mr Temay for setting up this facility in Parliament House!' Journalists see that the public knows what we do here. *Hansard*, the attendants, and all the others in this place go there and it is good to see them having their 'inner man' being looked after there. Indeed, the Blue Room provides comforts which I am sure are appreciated by everyone in this place. With those remarks, I hope that what flows from this debate will be of value to the people of Port Lincoln. Also, I know that everyone here greatly appreciates the facility that has been made available to us in this Parliament.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Briefly, I will talk about Wanslea, which is a very worthwhile institution in the electorate of Mitcham. But first I will talk about some of the philosophies about treatment of individuals and certainly treatment of the aged. This reflects on some standards and changes in thinking about home help, as opposed to institutions. Members will be well aware that there have been some dramatic changes in thinking about how people should be assisted when they are in unfortunate circumstances due to injury, illness or old age. Until a few years ago when people suffered sickness or infirmity they became part of institutionalised care.

We have a number of institutions which are set up for that purpose. We have hospitals which deal with injuries, old age homes for those who can no longer cope, and women's shelters to cater for those women who have fallen on hard times and whose domestic situations have deteriorated to the extent that they need some outside form of assistance. Of course, a number of other bodies such as Minda Home, Strathmont and Julia Farr (which will be in my new electorate), also cater for the needs of certain select groups in the community.

One of the important developments which originated in Scandinavia and which has spread across the developed world is the new demand that people should not be institutionalised if it is humanly possible to avoid it. To that extent we have seen the Commonwealth Government take action to limit the type of person who can enter an aged persons home or nursing home, as they are called today. I believe that this is healthy. Demands for institutionalised care as we once knew it have changed dramatically. Of course, there must be something in its place.

We are now seeing an upsurge in domiciliary care and other forms of assistance which will make it possible for those people who would perhaps like to enjoy more of their lives and who have not in the past been able to, except within four walls. These changes of attitude have assisted those people to remain where they are and to receive assistance of a different type. Of course, as an economist, I believe that this is more cost effective than putting people in homes.

We hear that the number of prisoners in South Australia is falling because it is apparent that rehabilitation is more readily obtainable out in the community, if the community at large can be protected at the same time. In the mental health area far more people are living at home with relatives or with some form of assistance so that they can adjust as well. This means that the number of people who require long-term care is actually falling, which is significant, because the number of people at risk has increased. So, we can see that the institutions themselves have not outlived their usefulness. But, certainly, their role is changing to those areas of most critical need. Consistent with this thinking one would imagine that the Commonwealth and State Governments would pay attention to the needs of families in crisis when the family unit is retained. We have seen the increase in funding for shelters, as I mentioned. We have more programmes to look after homeless youth, yet when it comes to families in crisis very little is done.

Wanslea has played an important role in South Australia over many years in providing such care, and some members of this House have used the services of Wanslea. Basically, the services take a number of forms: at one stage care was provided within Wanslea. It has provided home aides to spend all their time in a home assisting the mother or father to adjust to a situation, whether it be because of a difficult pregnancy, a breakdown or mental illness in the family, a death in the family, or whatever. Generally, it has concentrated on families with children, because it is very difficult for the spouse to cope when someone has died or the mother or father becomes ill suddenly.

It has provided an admirable service over a number of years, and I have had discussions with the people who not only operate the organisation but also some people who have benefited from it. There is no doubt that on each occasion when a difficulty has arisen the availability of a trained and trustworthy home aide has been of immeasurable assistance to those people. There are no other mechanisms available as we see them today. Of course, interstate Government moneys are provided for public support in this area. Home aides are trained and funded by Government instrumentalities. In South Australia we have a cost effective and worthwhile organisation in Wanslea. However, for some years it has been battling with a financial problem, as members would understand.

Money from donations from the public has become very finite in the last few years. In fact, I would imagine that, if someone graphed the funds from the public to charitable organisations, it would show that in real terms there has been a decrease. That means that those organisations are no longer able to carry on their business in the way they have in the past, and they have been a mainstay of help in South Australia to disadvantaged people. Thousands of people and many hundreds of organisations provide assistance to the community. Wanslea is having enormous difficulty not only getting donations in the present economic climate but also in getting some form of Government assistance.

If Wanslea is not able to continue, then the families in crisis no longer have that medium of assistance available to them and the Government will have to set up some mechanism to provide aid. That is not cost efficient. There is no guarantee that the standards that Wanslea maintains can be maintained in a public sector enterprise. There is no doubt that the ladies (and they are all ladies who have participated in the past in the programmes) will be as dedicated as they have been in the past because, as members would be aware also, it is a thankless task if one considers it in terms of monetary salaries and wages.

The people involved in this programme are paid low salaries and wages, so they are not there because of the remuneration: they are there because they believe in the service they are providing. I will make some approaches to the State Government and indeed the Commonwealth Government on this matter because I believe that Wanslea is an organisation of great repute and provides a service that is essential in helping people in distress.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Several weeks ago I brought to the attention of the House by a question to the Minister of Lands (and I am pleased to see that he is here this afternoon)—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I'm always happy to oblige.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Good—I hope that the Minister listens equally to what I have to say to him and takes some action. I brought to the Minister's attention the fact that there had been some misconduct and possible misappropriation of Government funds in the Lands Titles Office. I asked a question and the Minister said that he had received a brief report. Then the Minister sent me a further reply. My question was on 10 April 1984 and the Minister replied on 12 April 1984 as follows:

> The present position is that the Crown Solicitor's investigation has been completed, and a recommendation made that the matter be placed in the hands of the Police Commissioner with a view to prosecution. This recommendation has been accepted, and the Police Commissioner has been given the relevant papers. It is not appropriate to suspend the two officers as this would require charges to be made under the Public Service Act. Copies of land titles are available from the Registrar-General's Office for a charge of $2.50 per copy. It is alleged that the officers concerned did not collect this fee on behalf of the Government when dealing with some private clients, but received payment in lieu which they retained for their own purposes.

The reason I raise this again is that some startling new evidence has come to my attention, that I think the Minister should consider and take appropriate action. About 10 years ago similar allegations were made that there was misconduct and possible misappropriation in the Lands Department, and at least one person was suspected at that time. I understand that the person who is now suspected of the most recent case was, in fact, the person suspected 10 years ago and that that misappropriation of Government funds has been going on for 10 years.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Were charges laid previously?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, they were not, I understand, and that is what I am about to ask the Minister to take up: what investigations were carried out then and why were charges not laid against the individual? If he has been carrying it on now for 10 years, I think that it is a fairly serious sort of situation, particularly as it was known 10 years ago that he was at least suspected of doing this. I point out also that because no action was then taken against him (and I do not know how hard the evidence was or how thorough the investigations were) that has now spread. In my original question I indicated that I thought that two people were involved. I understand now that four people are involved and suspected of misappropriation of Government funds: two of those people more recently, but two others have been apparently carrying on that misappropriation for some time.

I understand also that certain procedures have been instituted in the Department that now require junior officers to receive authorisation from their senior officer before being allowed to copy a title that has been searched. However, the people suspected of the misappropriation are senior enough to escape the requirement of the new instruction. All junior officers have now been brought under a new restriction, but the more senior people involved, who are suspected of the misappropriation are not caught by that procedure. I find that incredible.

I also find incredible that no action has been taken under the Public Service Act against these individuals. I believe that, if they are under police investigation for misappropriation of Government funds (which is a fairly serious sort of charge), the least that should occur is that they should be suspended, using the powers of the Public Service Act, during the period of that investigation. However, that has not occurred: in fact, the individuals involved are carrying on normal duties. I also find that the person suspected of this activity 10 years ago has since been promoted to the position of Senior Technical Officer (TO3), and is now in line for a further promotion.

When I put all of these facts together I start to become alarmed. It is well known that this is apparently the case within the Lands Titles Office. I understand that the staff morale in that office is extremely low, particularly in regard to the more junior staff who have seen what appears to be a rather *laissez faire* attitude towards those people who appear to have been involved in wholesale misappropriation of Government funds, in some cases for an extended period. Therefore, I believe the Minister of Lands should obtain a full report on the misconduct and misappropriation of Government funds within the Department of Lands, and that he should present a report to Parliament as soon as possible.

Although the Minister of Lands has now acknowledged that misappropriation of funds could have occurred, at which time the police investigation was initiated, I believe the extent of the misappropriation is far more extensive than was originally thought. As I have indicated, similar allegations were made 10 years ago, but no action was taken. I understand that the evidence reveals that some of the people involved now were also involved 10 years ago, and that misappropriation has been going on for all that time. In addition, rather than two people being involved, as originally expected, apparently four people are now involved. The Minister should investigate why something was not done 10 years ago to prosecute the officers involved. Why has this misappropriation not been detected earlier? What amount of public funds has been lost?

New procedures have been adopted requiring that junior staff obtain authorisation from senior staff before copying lands titles. However, the officers involved in this misappropriation of funds are not covered by this new procedure and are not required to obtain that authorisation. I would like the Minister to investigate why that is the case. The staff have explained the position about the low morale within the Lands Titles Office as a result of the misconduct

of officers and the apparent lack of action taken against the people involved. One officer, suspected of misappropriation 10 years ago, was promoted to the position of Senior Technical Officer (TO3) and is now in line for another promotion. Will the Minister of Lands undertake an investigation of this matter as a matter of urgency? I believe there is sufficient evidence to warrant a full investigation and a full report to this Parliament.

The other matter I want to refer to briefly concerns the stoppage of trains in the metropolitan area that occurred on 10 April this year as a result of a dispute between the Electrical Trades Union and the Australian Railways Union because of the ETU employees' refusal to work with both the fitters and linesmen from the ARU who are made available to the State Transport Authority from Australian National. At the time I commented on the nature of the stoppage. The Minister was involved in some negotiations as a result of which a seven-point peace plan was devised. The first point was that:

> The State Transport Authority will roster electrical fitters or linesmen without discrimination whether they are members of the ETU or ARU to maintain or repair any signalling or communications equipment in the metropolitan area.

It has been drawn to my attention that since the dispute that most important clause has not been adhered to. I know that at least one linesman and two fitters have not been rostered on a normal basis since that settlement was laid down by the Minister of Transport. In fact, I understand that one of the linesmen has been sitting in the store since 10 April with nothing to do and has not been called on to do normal work. Those two fitters and the linesmen belong to the ARU. So, the dispute is still proceeding, and my fear is that unless action is taken very quickly to uphold the agreement reached on 10 April, we will see another stoppage within the railway system of metropolitan Adelaide. As I have now warned the Minister about this, if such a stoppage does occur the responsibility for it will be on the Minister's head. He must take immediate action.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to speak about road conditions generally, and if time permits I will refer to speed limits and safety factors. It seems to me that by and large South Australian country roads have not been improved but have been allowed to get worse over the years. This is of great concern to me as a person who uses regularly many country roads. I have two choices in regard to using a road between my home at Maitland and my office at Port Wakefield; the coastal road from Ardrossan, or the centre road up the middle of the peninsula. The coastal road is a longer route, but I can get to my office in about the same time as it takes to get there using the centre road, that is, about three quarters of an hour, because the centre road is in a disastrous state of repair. It is in such a state that if I travel on that road after just having finished a meal it is not unusual for me to feel rather queazy while travelling on that road, such are the ups and downs. In fact, at times when I have allowed someone else to drive to enable me to do some last minute preparations I have had to ask the driver to stop while I walk around the car.

It troubles me that as well as the need for these roads to be upgraded there are many other roads on the peninsula that as yet are not even bituminised, and having regard to the amount of traffic that uses them, they require upgrading and bituminising. Many of the old bitumen roads will need to be ripped up and relaid. It seems to me that part of the Highways Department policy at present is to repave over the existing bitumen on roads. This was done recently on the road between Port Wakefield and Kulpara. That is fine in certain places where the road is smooth, but unfortunately the contractors paved over all the undulations as well. At one point when travelling in a Commodore I find that my head hits the roof of the car when travelling over undulations, and this is while travelling over a newly laid paved road. This is a most unsatisfactory situation. Surely a few extra thousand dollars could have been spent on a 100m stretch of road to get rid of all the serious undulations on that road.

Due to the last Easter road toll the Minister said that he would look seriously at the speed limit applicable to vehicles travelling on our roads. I do not think that that will do one thing to reduce the road toll overall. I do not deny that to some extent the road toll is related to the speed of vehicles travelling on the roads, but I refer to an interesting letter that was published in the *News* yesterday written by a K.D. Man, of Sturt, who stated:

> If it was not for the times I have heard the screams of victims as you try to get them from their mangled cars, I could almost laugh at the Transport Minister's attempts to sound concerned about deaths on our roads over the Easter break.
>
> Will a 10 km/h drop in the State open speed limit really be the difference between hit and miss? . . .
>
> Surely, it is the attitude and lack of driving judgment and ability which cause these accidents, not that they were going 10 km/h too fast.
>
> At present one is given a licence to drive a weapon as potentially lethal as a motor vehicle on the minimum ability to drive a car around the city and to park it without letting tyres touch the gutter.

I think that person identifies an important factor: a need for training in the handling of cars at high speed. I personally believe that the speed limit on some of our major highways could be increased to 120 kilometres an hour and I doubt whether the road safety aspect would be affected and, in fact, it might even improve road safety.

I believe that the most dangerous time to travel on the Port Wakefield Road is on a long weekend or late Friday afternoon, when there is increased traffic. At those times invariably the speed drops to about 80 or even 60 km/h and on one occasion I even had to stop because of the stop-start movement of the traffic when we were getting close to Port Wakefield. They are the times that I feel least secure on the road; when the speed is very low and people are determined to get past. If we drop the speed limit to 100 km/h, there will still be times when we have to travel at 60 km/h; people will want to get past, and that is when so many accidents occur.

I believe that we could consider having different speed limits on different roads. I believe that some unbituminised dirt roads in the country are positively dangerous if they are traversed at 110 km/h. I would dare people to travel at that speed on some of those roads; yet the speed limit is 110 km/h. The speed limit could well be reduced to 80 or 90 km/h on such roads. People from outside the area have told me that they find the non-bituminised roads treacherous when they have had no experience on them for many months or possibly many years. When they have to travel on them they find that they lose control easily. I hope the Minister will not consider a blanket drop in the speed limit, because the people who will be most penalised will be the rural people who have to travel extensive distances regularly. That would mean that they would be wasting more hours a day driving because they will be travelling at a lower speed. Also, they could be tempted to exceed the speed limit more than they are doing now, and perhaps involuntarily breaking the law.

I now turn to the 2c surcharge on petrol imposed by the Federal Government some time ago for road development programmes under ABRD grants. That is a specific sum which will at least go into roads. However, I am concerned that the Federal Minister for Transport has indicated that this surcharge will be increased with c.p.i. adjustments (in other words, 2c could possibly become 2.5c) and that the

increase will not go into road development programmes but into general revenue. I think at a time when we need to make every effort to upgrade our country roads, this is a most retrograde step. It occurred to me that country roads might be deteriorating partly because much of the electorate lives in the Adelaide metropolitan area. My calculations, based on the 1982 South Australian electoral roll, indicate that 70 per cent of voters live in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and only 30 per cent live in country areas. I wonder whether politicians are influenced at all by the fact that they are happy to spend money where 70 per cent of the voters live but not in areas where only 30 per cent of the voters live—even though many of the people in the 70 per cent bracket travel extensively into the 30 per cent areas.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This week the Minister of Water Resources tried to justify why growers in Government irrigation areas should pay the highest water charges in this State and in Australia. In trying to convince Parliament and the irrigators that this is necessary, the Minister said that the Government operates both large irrigation undertakings and small irrigation undertakings and that is why the Government irrigators have to pay the highest irrigation charges in Australia. That is absolutely absurd. If the Government is not capable of operating its irrigation undertakings competitively with the private sector, the growers should be given the opportunity to operate those undertakings in a manner similar to the other private irrigation areas of South Australia.

The Minister is endeavouring to blackmail growers into accepting the higher charges by saying that, if the growers were to take over the irrigation undertakings, they would have to find capital amounting to about $53 million. Once again, that is patently absurd. The Minister and the Government would be well aware that the Government of the day can enter into agreements with any person or recognised body in the State, especially if it is established by legislation of this Parliament, whereby the assets can be leased to a recognised group within the community at an agreed rental satisfactory to both the Government and the group concerned. What the Minister is saying is absolutely ridiculous. If the Minister had any real knowledge of irrigation undertakings, he would realise that the costs involved in irrigation are common throughout the world. Governments support irrigation undertakings, particularly the headworks and distribution systems, because of the absolute need and desirability of having fresh fruit and vegetables available on a daily basis.

If the irrigation undertakings were not supported in some way by Government, not only in Australia but in other major Western countries, the cost of fresh fruit and vegetables, which are so essential to a community's daily needs, would be available only to those families in higher income brackets, and that would be totally unacceptable in a country such as Australia.

It is high time that the Minister went to the Riverland and discussed this issue with the growers and learnt something about it. What I have said is that immediately on taking office a Liberal Government will enter into negotiations with irrigators in Government irrigation areas to establish terms and conditions under which the rehabilitated Government irrigation areas can be handed over to growers to operate and maintain. This can be done simply by legislation in this Parliament on an agreed basis between the Government of the day and the irrigators. It is no use the Minister standing up in this place and saying that it cannot be done because it would place a millstone around the necks of the growers. The growers are sick and tired of paying the highest water rates in Australia when they have to compete in the same markets in Australia and overseas as their counterparts who grow the same products in Victoria and New South Wales.

The variation in water charges is quite dramatic from one area to another. When one takes a like situation of a given quantity of water per hectare plus the drainage charge and then looks at the variations which exist, particularly in Victoria (and I am talking about irrigation areas of various sizes where water has to be pumped; I am not talking about gravity irrigation schemes), and compares that with the charges made by the State Government in South Australia, there is absolutely no comparison. The Liberal Party is determined to give growers in Government irrigation areas of South Australia the opportunity to run their own affairs, and in so doing to be competitive and to have charges comparable with other privately operated organisations in South Australia.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I take this opportunity to refer to three matters. First, I add my support to the remarks of the member for Fisher regarding the preservation of the Bridgewater mill, which is to be put up for sale soon. As a former Minister for Environment and Planning responsible for matters pertaining to the heritage of South Australia, I realise that it is not possible to save everything that is old. I have often said that it is a matter of determining priorities as to what should be saved and preserved. Indeed, it would be irresponsible to try to save everything that was old. However, the Bridgewater mill is a subject of the highest priority in my opinion and in the opinion of many other people and, in view of the history associated with the structure, it must be retained.

The Minister said that, because the mill is on both the Commonwealth and State heritage listings, any further development of the structure would be controlled—but that is not enough. We have seen what can happen, because of the double standards of the Government, with structures such as the A Division at Yatala Labour Prison and the Grange vineyard. It is vitally important that the Minister clarify his intentions as to the future of the Bridgewater mill. Representations have been made by various organisations that have plans for its development, and many of those plans have considerable substance that could well be supported by the Government. Because of the urgency of the situation, I request the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning to consider the matter immediately so that a determination may be made. It is essential that the mill be retained, not merely for the people of Bridgewater and district, but for the sake of South Australians generally because of the history and heritage associated with it.

I am conscious of what has happened to a mill at Mount Barker that the Government put on the heritage list while I was Minister. That mill, which has been bought privately, is being renovated in an excellent fashion. It was one of the first steam-driven mills in this State and its purchasers are to be commended for the way that they, in consultation with the Department of Environment and Planning, are developing it. It is essential that the Bridgewater mill, one of the first mills built by John Dunn, who is recognised in this State for his contribution to milling in the early days, should be preserved. Secondly, and again in support of the remarks of the member for Fisher, I request the Government to get off its backside and act to tackle the problem of millipedes.

Mr Hamilton: What?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Let the honourable member laugh. He should come up and find out what it is like to

have to live with millipedes in their present numbers. This problem concerns many people, and it should concern the State as a whole. The millipedes are not affecting only an isolated area: they are spreading rapidly, and obviously they are not under control. For the Government to be talking about spending $4 000 to send Dr Baker of the Department of Agriculture overseas to continue the research that he has already done is not good enough. If any member, whether the member opposite who sees this as something of a joke or any other member, wishes to find out what it is like living with the millipedes, I suggest that he or she come into the area and find out personally. Many letters have been written to the Minister of Agriculture, and many contacts have been made with the Department as regards this problem. Personally, I have received correspondence from the Minister in reply to questions I have asked. Not being satisfied with his replies, I have written to him again expressing dissatisfaction about the lack of action by the Government and requesting him to do something positive about the problem soon because this is an emergency situation.

The third matter to which I refer relates to representations that I have received over a considerable period from dairy farmers, especially in the Lower Murray area of my district, who have complained about the excessive increase in water rates imposed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Only recently I was given figures pertaining to these increases. In 1980, the rate was $23.16 a hectare; in 1981, $27.44 (an increase of 18.48 per cent); in 1982, $31.72 (an increase of 36.96 per cent); and in 1983, $40.60 (a staggering increase of 75.3 per cent).

As the dairying industry is at a low ebb, I believe that these excessive increases are crippling it further. Representations have been made on this matter to the Minister of Water Resources, but there has been little evidence of action on his part. Concerning the provision of a private water scheme, with which I have been involved for some time in the hundreds of Burdett and Ettrick, east of Murray Bridge, I refer to the following letter written by one of my constituents to the Minister of Water Resources in reply to a letter he received from the Minister on this matter:

I refer to your letter dated 12 January 1984, in reply to a letter from Hon. D.C. Wotton MP.

You suggest that making finance available for such a private scheme through your Ministry would represent an entirely new departure for the allocation of Government funds. We see this as a very weak excuse. This is why we prefer to vote for enterprising MP's who can see when changes are needed and act on them for the good of the State.

May I suggest that $1 million would do over 20 schemes like ours. If your priorities don't allow for expenditure like this, may I suggest you make available long-term loans with concessional interest rates on a rotating fund basis. If the Government put in $1 million for several years, until it started rotating, I am sure the benefits to the State would far outweigh the slight loss on the interest rate.

It must have needed some enterprise to find the hundreds of millions of dollars needed to filter Adelaide's water to put on roses, while most of the free rain water runs down the drain. If this money came from taxpayers' money, then I am paying for it and can't get the river water myself. If the user is paying for it within water rates, then the Government must have been loaning it to them, because they are not paying it back in 30 days as you suggest we have to.

We suggest, Sir, that you take a good look at unprecedented things that enterprising Government has done recently, that is:

(1) Allocation of millions of dollars for the incoming and outgoing ceremonies for the bi-centennial celebrations.
(2) A $1 million loan for the building of a yacht for the next America's Cup Challenge.
(3) Government supporting the use of taxpayers' money for the takeover of radio stations.

The letter says that many other such projects could be cited. I hope that, when the Minister receives this letter, he will note it well because many of the suggestions contained therein are worthy of action on behalf of the Government.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I refer to a topic that I know is close to the hearts of members on both sides of the House, and that is where employers are asking people to discontinue their employment at the age of 18. That is bad in itself but I have a more serious complication from that because of what the Minister said in the House recently, that the Government will inquire into this matter and consider some form of legislation to make it more difficult for employers to do so.

I am not objecting to that so much, but some employers have contacted me who in the past admit employing 16 and 17 year olds until the age 18. However, they have told the young people at the time of employment that they are giving them the job only until they are aged 18, when they would be expected to leave. Three employers who contacted me have made the point that, if they have to continue to employ those people after 18, there is a risk in knowing what their capacity will be when they first employ them, and they are locked into a situation of having to keep them. The reason for employing young people has been not so much that they were the best for the job: in fact, in many cases a more senior person with experience and knowledge of a particular job, and perhaps a greater desire sometimes, because of their age, to retain the job—that it is better to employ the more senior person if one is looking for productivity.

However, one lady and two gentlemen employers explained that they have employed young people because they believe that they need an opportunity to get work experience before age 18, if they are to have any chance of a job at all. They have done that because of the publicity over the months and years about giving young people experience and the opportunity to get a job. They have taken up that challenge, but now they are fearful that, if a law is introduced to make it more difficult to put employees off at 18 years, they will not want to employ them.

I am sure that the Government realises the danger. I am not saying that it is hell bent on making employers continue to employ people after 18 years, but it would jeopardise the opportunity for them to get work experience. I refer to that matter in all sincerity. There are many other things I could grieve about in my district that are more local and perhaps more important to small or large groups, but this matter concerns me deeply. I want to make sure that the Government does not do anything to jeopardise the job opportunities for young people.

In saying that, I am conscious that high schools and colleges are doing all in their power to give young people the opportunity to get job experience with different employers and sometimes Government departments, as well as the private sector. They try to give young people the opportunity of understanding the transition from the study area to the direct employment area: sometimes they are joined together as they have to continue studying whilst being employed.

So, my plea to you, Mr Speaker, as a member of the Party that now governs, is to not jeopardise young people's opportunities of obtaining these jobs with the hope of retaining them. I know that the Minister for Mines and Energy who is here now will pass it on to the relevant Minister. He understands my concern and I hope that he will take it back to the Minister so that the Minister can make some statement within the next few days to indicate to the public that the Government supports the concept that young people are given the opportunity to get work experience, but at 18 years they may not be allowed to continue. Where that is the condition of employment, then the employee should understand their likelihood of continuing after 18 years is remote, and that there is no breaking of a contract. At least that is being fair to both sides.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I wish first to address the stupid situation that has arisen in South Australia at present as a direct result of the way that the Government has decided to alter its policy in relation to cemeteries. Recently, in the *Advertiser* of 18 April, it was stated that the Labor Party has decided to reduce the term of the lease on graves of people in cemeteries throughout this State which come under the care and control or in some other fashion under direct or indirect control of the Government, even though it may have no responsibility to care for those graves. Many of them are in places in South Australia that were surveyed as towns last century but which are no longer towns under the present use of the land, even though they may still have the certificates of title issued, there is no-one living there.

Many of those towns are in the District of Mallee. This is really the pits, it goes as low as one can: not only has this Government decided to increase over 80 charges, none of which it gave any indication it would increase prior to coming to office—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It gave an undertaking that it wouldn't.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, on the contrary, it gave an undertaking, as the member for Chaffey points out, that it would not do so, and it gave an undertaking in the light of what it claimed was its clear knowledge of the state of the Treasury prior to the election.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Got into Government under false pretences.

Mr LEWIS: You're not kidding! It is definitely in Government under false pretences, there is no question about that in anyone's mind who would like to think about the undertakings given prior to the auction, and the consequences of the result of the sale when it was done. The people who bid for the product (the voters) have really been taken for a ride, and there ought to be a law against that. However, the point I make is not only have there been 80 charges increased, but on top of that the Government has to get into the grave: it is taxing the dead. That is the lowest that one can go! To require people or their estates to pay into Government coffers, after they are dead or wherever they are left to rest, a sum such as to secure their peace in permanence is to my mind unthinkable.

It was bad enough when there were succession duties and death duties. With a change in the taxation structure, I could perhaps see the necessity to re-examine that area, perhaps. It was bad enough when we had that along with income taxes and the like, but we have now a situation where after abolishing that this Government decides to reintroduce a tax on the dead, not on their estates, but where they lay in peace, presumably. No longer in peace! They will be hounded for eternity if Labor stays in office that long. What I intend to ask the Premier during the course of the questions on the Bill before us is how much revenue he expects to raise through this measure. More particularly, I want to know how much of the revenue so obtained will be obtained on charges for Aboriginal graves, which we are told are sacred sites and which cannot be desecrated at all.

So, on the one hand there is a law for the whites and on the other hand there is a law for others—people with black skin. As someone who has had a lot to do with multicultural societies and a variety of different cultures over the years, having worked closely with them wherever assistance was needed or indicated it was needed, I understand the sensitivity with which differing values need to be considered by other human beings not of the same culture or subculture or ethnic background. However, wherever I have gone throughout my experience of life on this earth and found laws that discriminate in favour of one group based on skin colour against another group or groups based on skin colour—otherwise known as apartheid—they have failed to produce the development of a society in which tolerance grows and understanding is respected. In fact, it does just the opposite.

That is exactly what this Government is doing, not only through the legislation that has been debated and passed through this Chamber earlier this session, but also by virtue of what I bet is this Government's policy in relaton to Aboriginal grave sites compared to those of people of European descent who have been buried in cemeteries on lots established by title since European arrival here. I wonder whether any Aborigines, whether full blood or otherwise buried in such lots, will have to pay the same fee as the Government proposes at present to charge everyone else. If there is to be that difference, why should it be so?

Clearly, there is to be the difference. We will not be taxing the grave sites of Aborigines on what are said to be dedicated lands for their purposes now. There are already exclusions placed on other grave sites that contain the interred remains of Aborigines where they have been discovered since European settlement within the remainder of South Australia outside those lands that have been dedicated to the people of the Pitjantjatjara and the Maralinga tribes. So, I say it is a distrimination of the most blatant kind. Indeed, it appears to be all part of the degrading policy the present Government has of the rights of these people who properly exercise those rights under the law as it was then. I see this as retrospective taxation. At no time when those lots were taken out was there ever any indication that they would be treated in the way they are to be treated in the future. I think it is sick.

I turn now to another matter: development of an industry, which I regard as being absolutely essential to the spectrum of primary industries in South Australia, if we are to make best use of the natural resources at our disposal. I refer to aquaculture—the industry of producing fish. It is the farm below the waves, whether fresh or salt water. The animals produced do not necessarily have to be vertebrate fish, which have fins and scales; they can be molluscs, such as oysters, or crustaceans, such as yabbies (*cherax* destructor). There is an enormous prospect for development of self employment opportunities, particularly in South Australia using a number of species in both salt and fresh water.

I have recently, after encouraging results from discussions I had since becoming the member for Mallee in this place, been disappointed to find that the Crown Law Department has drawn up proposed lease arrangements which are said to be five-year leases but which in fact are nothing of the kind: they are six-month leases. They are grossly inadequate in terms of their duration. It will make it impossible for anyone who wishes to invest in the development of production facilities in aquaculture to get any security of tenure of their sites for the investment of their capital. I urge the Minister to re-examine the clauses included in those proposed leases by the Crown Law Department for him at his request.

They give the Minister the right to kick the lessee off without any compensation whatever at six months' notice, even though the lease was signed for five years, and they give the Minister the right to kick the lessee off if what he is doing is in future likely to cause a nuisance or annoyance to the public. There is no provision whatever for the matter to go to arbitration.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time having expired, I call the member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Something has to be done about the Labor Government's Home Assistance Scheme. I express my concern and that of many of the councils I represent in the western and southern suburbs about the quite inappropriate guidelines that have been set down by the Government for this scheme. Honourable members

would be aware of the former scheme under the name, the Home Handyman Scheme, how it worked and how it was appreciated in the local community. We now have a scheme that has been revamped, called the Home Assistance Scheme, brought in by the present Government.

As I said, I would like to draw honourable members' attention to the inappropriate guidelines of this scheme, and devote the time that I have allotted to me to highlight some of the deficiencies in the scheme. Also I bring to members' attention some of the problems being experienced by councils, which I will list quickly, then discuss them. First, every job requires detailed costings, to such an extent that it becomes a time-consuming exercise for council administrations. Secondly, every job must meet a $500 maximum criteria. So, honourable members will realise that jobs undertaken under the scheme are very small, although costs involved in administering them are high. Thirdly, there is a large amount of clerical work for senior and junior council staff, and that means that overheads are great in administering the scheme. Fourthly, the scheme requires that the grant money be spent on labour costs only.

Councils must then move to bear the cost of materials and other costs involved with each job. It is not just the cost of the job being picked up by the scheme: the grant picks up the labour cost and the councils pick up the rest. I quote an example of some of the dilemma being caused. Say a council from the scheme employs a painter and carpenter to carry out a particular job, during the course of which, say in someone's home, they find that a small electrical repair needs to be carried out—for example, a three-point plug may have to be repaired. Council has no option but to bring in a fully qualified electrician on full labour costs, and pay those costs itself, then try to absorb them in the overall cost of the scheme.

I emphasise that in a small job essential repairs such as the example I have given the House must be carried out by the council at council expense. There is no other way within the scheme to allow that cost to be picked up. That is one of the reasons why councils are apprehensive about getting involved in this scheme. If one casts around Adelaide one finds very few councils that have picked up the scheme, and grant money is going to waste or not being used. Some councils have estimated that their contributions to the scheme are as high as 50 per cent, which is very high. One can understand councils being reluctant to move if they receive $50,000 in grant money and are required to pay up to $50,000 out of rate revenue.

Another point is that no contribution is made by persons receiving the benefit. This could have been the Government's intention, but it is argued by councils that some elderly people would prefer to pay something towards the work involved: however small a contribution it is, they would like to do so. If this was allowed by changing the guidelines, councils would then have the opportunity to spread the work out over a larger field. Clearly, the potential costs to the council to administer the scheme are what is killing it, or should I say preventing it getting off the ground. I hark back to the many councils that are not using the scheme: Glenelg is not using it, but I am not sure about Brighton.

Mr Mathwin: No, they have their own scheme.

Mr OSWALD: They have their own scheme. It is not good enough to ask councils to contribute towards the cost of materials equivalent to 30 per cent of the cost of the project. When one adds on council's administration costs and any other extra costs resulting from minor essential work that has to be performed, such as the small electrical job to which I referred, the council contribution towards the project reaches 50 per cent.

I think that this scheme has to be revised. Clearly, it is one of the greatest inhibitions against getting what could be a good scheme off the ground. Surely, it is better that grants be paid direct to councils and they be allowed to administer them under more appropriate guidelines. Because local government has a close proximity to the public through the very nature of the organisation of local government, it is in a far better position to administer the scheme so that the small resource that is available through the Home Assistance Scheme (and there is not a vast amount of money there) can be disbursed as far as possible.

In closing, I refer to a letter I received from the Southern Region of Councils, which will place on public record what their views are on the Home Assistance Scheme. The letter states:

Dear Mr Oswald,

As you may be aware, none of the five member councils of this region has applied for funding under the Government Home Assistance Scheme. The region has expressed its concern about the inappropriate guidelines for the scheme and is supporting a Local Government Association approach to the Minister to seek various changes. The region's primary concerns are:

> The scheme excludes work such as gardening, lawnmowing, external painting and installation of new equipment. These items of work are important to elderly people, and may be the basis of decisions about remaining in or surrendering their own home. The region believes any worthwhile home assistance programme must include these items.

I hasten to point out that, by helping people in gardening, lawnmowing, and external jobs such as those, one is keeping people out of hostels and nursing homes, which is an extraordinary cost on local government and Government generally, and anything that we can do to keep people in their homes should be applauded. The letter continues:

> The administrative system involved in seeking approval for each individual item of work, and then seeking reimbursement is needlessly complex. It would appear adequate to establish eligibility criteria and leave approval to councils to administer.
>
> The requirement that all labour be recorded for the CES is impractical for a range of tasks which are part-time or irregular, such as electrical work, plumbing, or the respite transport, and social support elements of the scheme. This requirement does not encourage a constructive or imaginative approach to the social support elements of the programme, and further restricts the practical range of home-handyman tasks available.
>
> A number of the most successful home-support schemes already in existence (including one at Brighton) rely on a flexible arrangement whereby a co-ordinator has the task of matching job requests with suitable skills. These schemes operate with either volunteer or paid labour. At present, however, the Government's scheme excludes eligiblity to employ a co-ordinator on the hourly-paid basis of employment. Schemes operated with a co-ordinator are more flexible, provide more appropriate skills for tasks, and emphasise community self-help.

The region believes the guidelines for the scheme are limited to those emphasising employment objectives, with too little sensitivity to the needs of the recipients, or to the experience of successful home-support schemes. Whilst the Government can argue that the funding is available primarily to provide short-term employment, it is this region's view that home support is a vital service and should be organised and operated in a way best suited to the recipients. This can in our view be managed without compromising broader employment objectives.

I appeal to the Government to do something about the Home Assistance Scheme. When one has the situation in my district alone of seven councils not picking up the scheme because of the administrative costs on the councils, it is a resource going to waste. We desperately need something along the lines of the former Liberal Government's home handyman scheme, which can be made to work and which can be a very useful adjunct to the whole community welfare attitudes to the needy at the grass roots level through local government. The Minister of Local Government would do local government generally a service if he were to do something about it.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I bring to the attention of the House two matters of concern to me and constituents in my district. First, one of my constituents has written to me in relation to the tourist mine he has set up. He has complied with all the requests and regulations of the Department of Mines and Energy and the local inspector at Coober Pedy, but I received the following letter from him on 1 May:

In approaching the South Australian Insurance Company (SGIC) in order to comply with Regulation 6, 'Appropriate insurance to cover visitors to the mine shall be held by the owner(s) of such mine' in the guidelines we were duly informed that they are not prepared to provide us with any public liability cover for the mine and further suggested that we might find coverage through an overseas company.

Given our endeavour is a South Australian enterprise which can only benefit tourism within the State, and has been given active support from the Mines Department, then it would seem incongruous that a South Australian sponsored insurance company is not prepared to support a State initiated venture with all its built-in safeguards.

We would enlist your support in having the State Government Insurance Commission to re-evaluate its stance regarding our business venture and provide us with adequate cover at a reasonable price. We are quite prepared to pay expenses for them to send a representative up here to assess the situation.

I understand that they also approached the Premier. Other colleagues of mine have spoken in relation to matters of concern to them. I spoke last night in relation to education problems, and I have received a letter from the Quorn Area School Council under the signature of Mr Des Wallace, the President of the School Council. The letter is addressed to me and states:

Recently, the Principal of Quorn Area School, Malcolm Evans, wrote to the Education Department Regional Office at Whyalla inquiring once again about the proposed Phase II of the establishment of Quorn Area School. The disturbing reply is that, despite a high regional priority on this work, no definite date for its commencement has yet been set. As projections at present go as far ahead as 1987 this means the school has to look to the 1988-90 trienium, at the earliest, before redevelopment will commence. This is a totally unacceptable situation. The history of this development is as follows:

(1) When the Quorn Primary School and Quorn High School were joined together to form the Quorn Area School in 1968, the relocation was to be in two stages. Stage 1 was the establishment of the SAMCON primary blocks and the temporary accommodation of the secondary section in the old high school and a series of old and portable classrooms.

(2) Despite constant applications by this school since 1968 no moves on Phase II of the development have taken place.

(3) The temporary accommodation is particularly inadequate in the science area where the school only has one science room equipped as a laboratory. Schools of this size need at least two full laboratory type facilities.

(4) The temporary accommodation is now in particularly poor condition. One of the portable classrooms needs thousands of dollars in internal panel work. The art room complex which was reclad a few years ago is concealing a multitude of problems; the flooring is collapsing, the doors are unlockable, etc., etc. All are symptoms of old age. Repairs are going to result in throwing good money after bad as the facility really needs demolition and replacement.

(5) It is also of concern to School Council that when the school was established as an area school in 1968 very little was done to help with grounds development. This School Council has inherited a legacy of extensive undeveloped areas. It has endeavoured to do something about this with assistance from various Government and volunteer bodies and progress has been made, but the overall task is daunting to say the least. We feel that more should have been done initially and development grants should now reflect a recognition of the fact.

From the above it is apparent that Quorn Area School needs the promised upgrade now. The educational needs of this community are being overlooked. By 1988 the situation will be that much worse. Surely after 16 years the parents of Quorn can expect the final part of their school to be completed.

I am sure that, as member for Eyre, you will concur with the above expressed sentiments, and we hope that you can achieve something to help alleviate the situation.

I certainly concur with those comments, as I have visited the school on a number of occasions. I am perturbed about the situation that has arisen in that part of my electorate.

There are one or two other matters that I want to raise. Last week, when I was travelling around the northern part of my electorate, I was advised that a number of doctors had been appointed to the North-West, in the Pitjantjatjara lands. I think that is a very good idea. I sincerely hope they will be in a position to assist those communities with their health problems. In one or two areas I was perturbed to see dogs that clearly, in my judgment, were a health hazard. They were suffering from mange and some of them had hardly any hair. Some had many open sores. Obviously, in most communities that would not be tolerated. When I made inquiries as to why they had not been destroyed I received responses with which I was far from satisfied. If we want to take positive action to improve the health and welfare of people in those areas, appropriate health inspectors should be sent up to ensure that action is taken to have dogs in that condition destroyed.

It is no good our trying to encourage people to improve their sanitation and standard of living if we allow animals in that condition to wander around. Clearly, if dogs in that condition were walking around in parts of Glenelg, Streaky Bay, Tailem Bend, or anywhere else, the public would demand that the local governing authority take action to get rid of them. There are no local councils in the North-West with that sort of responsibility. I feel that council inspectors, operating under the Local Government Act or whatever, ought to go there and take action in regard to having those dogs destroyed. Many of the dogs appeared to be inbred and some were of the oddest sizes and shapes. This situation should not be tolerated. I was most concerned to see those animals wandering around, and it perturbs me that children come into contact with those dogs. I believe the time has come to rectify that situation.

In conclusion, I want to say one or two things about the Maralinga situation. I called in at Maralinga last week. There has been a lot of discussion in the newspapers about the current situation. I hope that certain people are not using this publicity as a political weapon to hit certain Governments over the head. I thought it was an amazing situation that the Premier of South Australia, endeavouring to get information, should take up the matter with the Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom. Surely the appropriate manner to handle the situation is for the Premier to approach the Prime Minister, and for the Prime Minister to approach the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. In my judgment that would be the appropriate way to handle the situation. I believe that the Premier has breached Westminster traditions and that the situation should have been handled on a Prime Minister to Prime Minister basis, or even on a Premier to Prime Minister basis.

I personally would like to know what is at Maralinga. I have been there many times and have been advised of various courses of action undertaken and of things that took place there. I, too, would like to know the facts. I think it was inappropriate for the Premier to take such a political course of action; he should have written to the Prime Minister. What can the Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom do? He would not have any idea; he has never been a Minister in the United Kingdom Government, so how would he obtain the information? Perhaps some of his shadow colleagues might have some information, but I believe that it was political grandstanding on the part of the Premier to take the action that he did and that it would have been far better for him to get the Agent-General to make some inquiries—that is what he is there for. The Premier really should approach the Prime Minister so that the matter is handled on a Government to Government basis and he should not have been involved in the nonsense of writing to the Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom. Clearly, it was political grandstanding.

Mr Mathwin: The Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom is a lightweight anyway.

Mr GUNN: Yes. It was probably as a result of actions taken by some of the Premier's whiz kids in looking for publicity for the Premier. Finally, I indicate my support for the measure. I hope that some of the problems that have been brought to the attention of the Government can be rectified. I sincerely hope that the Highways Department will give urgent consideration to the repeated requests from the school council at Leigh Creek in regard to having the Arkaroola to Nepabunna to Leigh Creek road upgraded, as it is in a very poor condition. It carries a large school bus every day and is far below what could be considered to be an acceptable standard. I believe that urgent action should be taken to upgrade that road.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I strongly object to the shocking treatment that has been dished out to the public, to unemployed people and pensioners, by the Government and, in particular, the Minister of Education. In an eagerness to punish this section of the community and gain a little extra revenue by way of the back door, the Government and the Minister have created fear, upset and hardship for pensioners in South Australia. The raising of fees for adult education enrichment courses is rather shocking and its effect will be felt by many people in South Australia. A number of people will be unable to afford the complete leisure interest stream 6 courses offered by TAFE in 1984. There is no doubt about that at all.

It will now cost pensioners $50 a year to complete courses which up to now have been provided at no cost. For instance, a pensioner doing a course of 10 lessons of two and a half hours each would pay 45 cents an hour, making a total of $33.75. They are now required to pay an additional $15 for materials and a $5 general service fee, making a total of $53.75. I know that in promoting himself as a great beneficiary to these people the Minister has said that for pensioners the cost will be waived in cases of proven hardship. What a situation to place people in. He is asking people to prove extreme hardship, and then he will give back something that was previously available to them. This is most undignified and most unfair.

A number of people who attend the pottery class at Brighton have contacted me. Problems have occurred at Brighton before when not many months ago the Minister decided to close down Brighton college as the headquarters and to move it up to O'Halloran Hill, saying that it would not make any difference, that there would be no problems and no changes to any of the courses. Currently, the pottery course is attended by many retired people who enjoy it, and it provides a very good service for those people. However, because the Minister said that the Government cannot afford to run the course any longer the pensioners will find that it is going to close down. I suppose the Minister will expect those older people from Brighton and surrounding areas of Warradale, North Brighton, Glenelg, and so on, who have attended the classes to go to the classes at O'Halloran Hill, many miles up the hill and not serviced by public transport. I suppose that that is what is in the back of the Minister's mind. If that does not cause hardship I do not know what will. A person has written to me in relation to this matter, stating:

Mr. J. Mathwin.
Dear Sir,

I am appealing to you on behalf of a large group of pensioners who have just been deprived by the Education Department of their right to a concession at adult education enrichment classes. A big percentage of these people are widowed and existing on a single pension and cannot afford the exorbitant fee of $50 per term for a 2-2½ hours a week lesson. These classes were originally formed as occupational therapy and mental stimulus for this group and now that they have been deprived of their only remaining interest it is causing a lot of distress. We are now faced with the grim choice of going on a starvation diet and paying up or eating and vegetating.

That is the alternative for them. The letter continues:

I hope the Minister of Education is feeling very proud of himself and elated by this: his mastermind stroke of saving the economy. We would deeply appreciate any assistance you could give to help rectify this injustice.

Surely that letter indicates to the Minister what he has done by altering the system. This has been going on for some time and I am sure the Minister will have had brought to his attention the concern about the increase in fees that has been brought about by too many retired people attending courses, resulting in the courses not paying. The courses were derived to bring more than just pleasure. They are important to these people and the increase in fees is causing hardship and indeed creating a fear in these people.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What courses are you talking about?

Mr MATHWIN: The adult education enrichment courses. I thank the Minister for his interjection. As my time is short, I ask him to read with interest the submission I have put today and my appeal to him to right the wrong that I believe has been done to this section of the community.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous, $3 500 000.

Mr OLSEN: Last year the State Transport Authority had an operating short-fall of $75 million before applying an annual contribution from the State Government of $64.9 million. Will the Minister advise the estimated operating shortfall for State Transport Authority operations for the year 1983-84?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not have that overall information available to me. The Committee will be aware of the additional funds made available because of an overrun on the State Transport Authority's operations. They would be available, I guess, by comparison of these Estimates with the original Budget documents that were placed before the Parliament earlier in the session. I will certainly get that information for the Leader.

Mr OLSEN: It is indicated that $1.5 million is required to offset lower payments from Australian National due to different patterns of use of tracks and facilities. What revenue was estimated from that source in 1983-84, and to what extent will revenue decline from this source in 1984-85?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Again, I do not have that detail of information available for the Committee, but I will certainly undertake to get that.

Mr BAKER: My question relates to the indicative nature of the Estimates used—and particularly this item. The Premier said that there are a number of balances because some areas have received greater revenue than was expected and others have had greater expenditure than was expected. Is the $3.5 million to be allocated the total increase in net expenditure increase over the period?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certainly, we are looking at the full year, not simply the balance between now and the end of the financial year.

Mr BAKER: In the second reading explanation the Premier has said that these are being used only as examples, and are not totally representative of the $14 million difference which is being asked for in the Supplementary Estimates. Under those circumstances, is the $3.5 million the net increase in the amount that has to be found?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I reiterate, as the Treasurer explained in the second reading explanation, the effect of the amendments to the legislation in 1981 is that we now look at consolidated accounts and the Treasurer is able to

fund overruns of up to 3 per cent of the total overall vote. A strict adherence to that would of course mean that we would not be having this debate at all. Given that the Government thought it important for the Parliament to have an opportunity, as is traditional at this time of the financial year, to debate the Estimates, the three areas of greatest overrun were chosen for consideration. Other overruns which might occur in other areas can be handled administratively under the legislation I have mentioned. Certainly, the honourable member's assumption is correct in relation to this vote. The figures are rounded, as they always are.

Mr OLSEN: In this instance, I do not expect the Minister to have the figures at the table and I would be pleased if he would accede to obtaining them for me. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that interest on funds employed for Roadliner operations (I am sure the Minister understands my interest in this) is not included in the published operating results. If the figures are not available at the moment, will the Minister advise the cost of Roadliner funds employed and also release to the Committee the results of the inquiry carried out by the Minister in relation to the operation of the State Transport Authority Roadliner?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The answer to the first question is, 'Yes', and the answer to the second question is that I will certainly take it up with the Treasurer.

Vote passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, $7 500 000.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister advise those areas where Budget overruns are expected so as to justify the additional expenditure of $3.6 million?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certainly. There is the $3.6 million in price increases from the Budget provision in round sum allowances. The $1.7 million is the South Australian share of a likely shortfall in the level of fees to be collected in 1983-84. Provision was made in the round sum allowances for this item. The sum of $2.2 million is arrived at as follows: after adjusting for variations in Commonwealth programmes, the level of gross payments in 1983-84 is likely to exceed Budget by $3.1 million, which is an impact of about $2.2 million. The Health Commission received $7.5 million in Supplementary Estimates, $5.3 million being met from the round sum allowances, leaving a net impact on the Budget of $2.2 million.

Mr OLSEN: The Attorney-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983 revealed inadequate controls over stock holdings at Flinders Medical Centre and stated that excessive stocks were being held. Since that report was tabled, has stock been inspected regularly at that hospital and are stocks being held at more cost efficient levels?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: During the second reading debate, I expressed concern about the management of the health budget, which is an extremely large part of the State Budget. Specifically, I expressed doubts about the capacity of the Minister of Health to manage his budget in view of his performance in 1982-83. In the current year this area, which is the largest area of expenditure, has the largest overrun. I understand that round sum allowances have been used because there have been some unders and overs. I point out that the year has not yet ended. Will the Minister arrange to have provided an up-to-date estimate of each of the items contained in the 1983-84 Budget showing a breakdown in all areas so that members may see on which lines there will be an overrun compared to the Budget Estimates?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Obviously, the Government would want to get as much information as possible for the Committee, but the financial year has not yet finished. There is obviously an element of prediction in providing figures for a Budget and the more closely one tries to define the areas under review the less precision is achieved in the outcome. The overall figure often runs close to prediction, but it encompasses a variety of swings (to use an electoral term) in the component lines, with certain items under Budget and others over.

Mr BAKER: I appreciate that some items, both revenue and expenditure, will be greater or less than Budget estimate. However, I have a specific interest in this area because over a period the health budget has escalated. In the light of the recent debate on dental health care for a wider range of people in a wider range of areas, will the Minister secure from his colleague a detailed breakdown of expenditure in the area of dental health for the current year?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. When dealing with the health area two factors must be kept in mind. First, the Committee is dealing with a large budget in which a small percentage overrun may mean a significant sum. Indeed, the ½ per cent of the Commission's budget about which we are talking may represent many dollars. Secondly, the health budget is a collection of mini budgets. There must be an element of prediction in the budget of every hospital that goes to make up the totality. Over the years Parliament has been concerned about the quantity of information available to members. For instance, in the 1980-81 financial year, I think only one figure was written into the State Budget without specific figures from the mini budgets involved. An enormous quantity of information would be required to give the total picture and it is a matter of providing for members sufficient information to give them an idea of what is happening while, at the same time, not being snowed (and I use that word in its kindest sense) by the enormous amount of information available to them. Health will always have that problem. However, to the extent that it is possible to get the information we will do so and make it available.

Mr OLSEN: The second reading explanation of the Bill states that there is a short-fall of $1.7 million in the State's share of fees to be collected for the 1983-84 year. The Auditor-General's Report identified inadequate controls over raising charges at all major hospitals in 1982-83. Which major hospitals expect shortfalls in their Revenue Estimates for 1983-84? Is the Government satisfied that the raising of patient charges and the follow-up of outstanding accounts are now being carried out in accordance with the Auditor-General's instructions?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that that is the case, but I will get specific details.

Vote passed.

Education Department, $3 000 000.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister provide a breakdown of the total of $3 million?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The total of the Supplementary Estimates is $3 million, of which $2.1 million is made up of round sum allowances and $900 000 is matched by receipts, the net impact on the Budget being zero. The $2.1 million is represented by price increases and the cost of increased long service leave and of terminal leave payments in 1983-84. Provision for these items was included in the Budget as round sum allowances. I remind members that long service leave payments have been around for some time, and this item involves the age structure of the teaching force and also a strong Government commitment requiring people to take long service leave as it becomes due. I imagine that Minister of Education will be grappling with this problem for quite some time. The increased payments of $900 000 is from Commonwealth programmes: the participation and equity programme and the computers in education programme.

Mr OLSEN: There is certainly no disagreement with long service leave being taken when and as it falls due. That

principle is certainly supported, but in 1983-84 has there been an increase in the number of teachers seeking long service leave entitlements? Has it blown out above projections? Is there a reason for that or is it just a matter of the system operating in that way?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that there has been such an increase. It is not simply that there is a quantum increase: the number of people taking long service leave is significantly more expensive than was previously the case. So, it is greater participation. I do not know the reason for it, but I will consult with the Minister of Education and let the member know.

Mr BAKER: I cannot see any adjustment for the wage determination made on behalf of teachers. Has that been facilitated by the employment of less staff than was envisaged, or is there some other explanation for its non-appearance, because it would seem to be one of the major items of adjustment?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, the teachers' increase is covered by the $8 million, which is part of the $67 million provided as a round sum allowance. There has been no element of slowing down in the appointment of teachers to vacancies or any manipulation of the overall shape of the teaching force to take account of that. As it is fully provided for in the $8 million, it is not necessary to give further account of it.

Mr BAKER: The shortfall of $5 million in E & WS receipts must have been the result of a trade-off. Only three items are used as examples of the $14 million to be needed to present the Supplementary Estimates. Is it appropriate that I ask my question now or when the Bill itself is considered?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): The questions must relate to the three items before the Committee. The vote refers to education, therefore the questions must refer to education.

Vote passed.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Issue and payment of money by Treasurer.'

Mr BAKER: In his second reading explanation the Premier said that there had been a $5 million shortfall in receipts for water supply. To what extent has the decrease in water useage had an impact on the projected receipts, and what decrease in water pumping costs resulted from the better weather conditions that prevailed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There will be some offset against this loss of revenue because of the reduced necessity to pump water from the Murray River. I do not have that information immediately available. It is difficult for me to comment further on the $5 million shortfall which arises out of less people going into excess, except to say that obviously it has to be a rounded figure. I imagine that this is one of those figures that does not sharpen up until late in the financial year, for obvious reasons. Some estimates were provided by the Minister of Water Resources early in the summer about the savings that would accrue from less pumping from the Murray supply. I have not seen anything recently but I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: In his speech the Premier said that land tax receipts had decreased by $500,000. Many landowners have reported to me that their land tax payments have escalated. Since there has been an obvious increase in some areas, probably due to an increase in property values in some areas, why is there a drop in the land tax receipts?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I point out that the dramatic changes to the land tax legislation which occurred under the Liberal Government are such as to largely render land tax receipts exempt from the sort of boom in the land market that is presently occurring. This is because we are dealing with urban land and an inevitable increase in land prices as land stocks serviced at mid-1970s prices decline. The new land that comes onto the market will have to be serviced at early 1980s prices, and this generally has a gearing up effect on land prices. People have to expect that with the best will in the world there will be some considerable increase in land prices in the next few years. However, we are talking about an urban situation and blocks of land which are exempt from land tax collection.

As to the specific matter which the honourable member raises there is a considerable element of estimate involved in such a figure. I will endeavour to obtain more specific information from the State Tax Department and the Registrar General for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clause 3, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1), 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 April. Page 3776.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Obviously, the Opposition supports this Bill. It is a Bill which is traditionally supported by both sides of the House, because it provides supply for the Public Service during the interim period when the House does not sit, that is, from 1 July until the House can process the main Appropriation Bills for the financial year. In that respect, to avoid delaying the proceedings of the House I will conclude by saying that we traditionally support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I will refer to a couple of matters raised earlier today, and I will correct some facts presented specifically by the Deputy Premier. In his response today the Deputy Premier indicated that the Opposition did not have quotes from market research companies substantiating our claim that the Government had paid excessively for the ANOP market research poll commissioned by the Minister of Health. In this instance, 'Wright' is wrong. There is no doubt that the Deputy Premier is wrong. The Opposition obtained quotes from two South Australian market research companies on the cost of conducting a drug related survey commissioned by the Minister. To clearly indicate the inaccuracy of the Deputy Premier's statement, I refer to a letter from the Market Research Society of Australia dated 26 April and signed by the President of that Society, as follows:

As requested, two members of the Market Research Society have costed the job. We would like to preface the estimates with the following caveats. The survey has been costed on the basis of developing the questionnaire, organising and selecting start points and attending briefing sessions, presenting results etc. as well as conducting the research, computer analysis and report writing.

In other words, it was a complete quotation on the development, presentation and analysis of the market research. I go further and cite the two quotations established and given to me by the Market Research Society on behalf of the two companies.

In relation to the drug related part of the survey, Company A would charge $22 000, and Company B would charge $18 000. We all know that the cost to the South Australian taxpayer was $32 000. Quite clearly, the 11/26ths of the

survey that we were not told about, until we pressed the Government to release it, is covered in extra cost of $10 000 to $14 000. Quite clearly, by not going to tender and by selecting ANOP (a company with which the Labor Party has very close ties), there has been a *quid pro quo,* which has cost the taxpayers of South Australia between $10 000 and $14 000 for the political questions. What is more, even though taxpayers paid for it, Parliament has yet to see the results. One can only assume that the results are not too encouraging for the Government and it does not want to release them for anyone else to look at. Perhaps that applies to some of the approval ratings and the voting intention aspect of the survey. I have no doubt that this Government, if it could make any snippet of mileage out of it, would have circulated the survey results to the media with great supporting statements. Whenever anything is good, the Government distributes it; when it is not good, it just puts it in a drawer and hopes that the whole thing will go away, which is rather selective.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Or it is tabled by mistake.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, that has happened once or twice. There is no doubt that as it relates to market research, the credibility of Mr Rod Cameron has been decimated—not by what I have said in this Parliament nor by what the Opposition has said in this Parliament but by Mr Cameron's own actions. His credibility has been put at rank zero. It was his letter which clearly indicated that he and the Minister knew that there were political questions. Yet, Mr Cameron was prepared to send the media off on a wild goose chase by saying that the Minister was not aware. What utter nonsense!

Quite clearly, the Minister made a desperate phone call to Mr Cameron on Thursday morning asking him to get him off the hook, and Mr Cameron obliged. The net effect is that Rod's credibility does not seem to hold too much water around this place. For that reason, and because we paid too much for the survey, Mr Cameron should be struck off the list for future polling in this State. True to style in the spirit of wanting South Australia to win, as the Government has professed, the Government should start spending some of that money in South Australia rather than feathering the nest of interstate cohorts of the Australian Labor Party.

I understand that a Dorothy Dix question was asked in the Legislative Council today in relation to the Central Linen Service. That does not surprise me, because we heard a Dorothy Dix question in this place today on the water component commercial that I put to air on Sunday night. I was going to address that question, but the member for Chaffey (the shadow Minister of Water Resources) demolished the weak attempt by the Minister to put down the case that I established. In view of the fact that that has been done and, because the Minister wants to go home early, I will leave that matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What about a replay?

Mr OLSEN: I will be delighted to make a replay available to the Minister if he wants to learn about the real economic direction that this State should be taking and the real way that we can remove the taxation slug from the hip pockets of small and big businesses alike in this State. I would be delighted to oblige him with a private showing.

I now refer to the Central Linen Service. There was a letter to the editor of the *Advertiser* today (surprise, surprise!) in relation to the Central Linen Service. It was written by a Mr Edwards, who makes a number of claims to which I will respond. First, as it relates to services from the Government run Central Linen Service and as it relates to services provided by the private sector, it can be established clearly that there is a differential of between 10c and 50c per kilogram cheaper. I refer to theatre linen, which costs 125 cents a kilogram through the Central Linen Service, and 102 cents per kilogram through the private sector operator. The Central Linen Service's charges were obtained from the latest Auditor-General's Report tabled in this Parliament.

I do not think that there is a more authoritative basis for making an assessment as to the cost than the Auditor-General's Report, tabled in the Parliament. However, I did not simply rely on the Auditor-General's Report: before any public statements were made about the matter my office checked with the Central Linen Service and was told that those charges still applied. We did our homework: we checked the matter, and our figures can be substantiated. There are many similar examples of Government-operated enterprises which could be sold to the private sector. I stress that the policy and direction of the Liberal Pary will be to provide far greater competition. The private sector ought to undertake those services that are currently duplicated in the Government structure.

If we get rid of the duplication, inefficiency and wastage, we can go down the track of lowering Government taxes and charges and create jobs in the private sector. It has been clearly established that increases in State taxes and charges have been a major contributing factor to the loss of jobs in this country. I refer to two comments which appeared in the *Institute of Public Affairs 1984 Summer Review*, as follows:

> Even after adjustment is made for inflation and some boost to revenues from improving economic growth in 1983-84, it is clear that in a number of States there has been a very heavy increase in the real level of taxation.
>
> Broadly, the Labor States, Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and South Australia are pursuing higher tax policies. The more small and big business alike is taxed the less opportunity that business has to maintain, let alone, create jobs.

Quite clearly, that has been the case in South Australia, where to 30 June this year it is anticipated that the tax level for the two-year period will be increased by 26.7 per cent. That is a massive tax slug, and it is eroding the capacity of small and big business alike to create job opportunities for South Australians, let alone maintain those existing job opportunities. In outlining the policy initiative that the Labor Party meekly attempted to put down today, I gave a clear unequivocal commitment in writing to the United Trades and Labor Council and the Public Service Association that no Government employees will be retrenched.

Employees of enterprises that we sell will either move with the enterprise, as part of a commercial transaction, or will be re-employed in the Government workforce. I understand also that the Minister of Health was wrong again in the Legislative Council today when responding about the Central Linen Service. He talked about the fact that I had the mistaken belief that the Central Linen Service was located at Stepney and not Dudley Park. For the benefit of the Minister, he has got it wrong again.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He wasn't deliberately wrong, was he?

Mr OLSEN: It is very hard to say whether he is deliberately wrong these days. It seems that he is often wrong. It has been proven on the record and with such frequency that he has deliberately misled Parliament that one cannot determine when he is trying and when he is not trying to mislead Parliament. The message and the commercial identified clearly the location of the service. It happened to be a media report and not I which gave the incorrect location. Once again the Honourable Minister of Health has got it wrong. The other factor as it relates to the Central Linen Service is not only the extra operating costs that we are paying for through that service—and I understand that there have been some inroads to increase efficiency in some areas of the Central Linen Service recently—but if the group laundry is to be re-equipped, become effective and efficient it will have to undertake a capital programme of some $3 million. That money should be spent by the private sector,

not by taxpayers' funds, upgrading a structure of capital asset that is merely duplicating what is already available in the private sector. We must also consider staffing levels in the operating costs. Not only are we paying more for that service than a similar service which can be provided by the private sector but also we have to undertake an extensive and costly capital improvement programme to head down that instrumentality to a more efficient line.

I believe that this area should be handled by the private sector, not the Government sector. The Government has no business in merely duplicating services provided by the private sector. It has a responsibility to provide essential services, such as education, health and welfare services that obviously are not provided in total by the private sector. Clearly, there is a community need and a responsibility of the Government to provide those services. Obviously the Government should concentrate on the provision of those welfare services—services essential to us all—and not merely duplicate what the private sector can do more efficiently and effectively than can the Government sector.

The Liberal Party's determination of this new policy direction is quite clear. We have as a bottom line an objective to remove the tax slug on South Australians. That can be done only if we redirect the economic direction of this State. We have outlined a clear, new economic direction which maintains essential services and which does not sack an individual in the Government sector but provides job security. It is a direction which can, following the first term of a Liberal Government, save $50 million annually in taxes. That means that we can start winding back this massive tax slug that has been applied to South Australians over the past 18 months.

If we are to maintain jobs in the manufacturing sector of this State we clearly have a responsibility to people employed in that sector to ensure that the unit cost of production is such that we have access to markets in the Eastern States—those capital markets, those intensive markets, where the population base is. If we cannot have a unit cost production that can overcome the transport costs to those markets, we will see an exodus of manufacturing industry from this State along with an exodus of job opportunities. I am sure that no South Australian will aspire to that objective. For that reason, we have to take some hard decisions, take a new economic direction and implement the policies that I have outlined. If we do that, we can return South Australia to a competitive advantage and, in so doing, we will maintain existing jobs and have the opportunity and the capacity in due course to create job opportunities for other South Australians.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May. Page 3836.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Amendment of second schedule.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate the inclusion of this provision, as it will affect quite dramatically an action by one of my constituents in relation to an injury he suffered while working in local government. The Hon. Mr Griffin in another place raised with the Attorney-General the question of the difficulty in which that person and many other people have been placed as a result of a changed circumstance within the industrial magistracy about three weeks ago. The speed with which the Government has reacted is commendable, and it will ensure that the people involved in this matter will not have to pay the costs associated with a re-hearing, and will not have to go through the trauma of again appearing before the courts. This is commendable legislation, which arises from the questions asked and the representations made about this matter.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May. Page 3836.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I make quite clear that although this is a rather short and simple Bill, the Liberal Party is opposed to it. There are two effective measures in the Bill: we are opposed to both of them. The Bill attempts to increase the percentage of the contribution paid by the Highways Department to the Police Fund for road safety services from 12 per cent to 15.4 per cent. Secondly, the Bill provides that the Minister be allowed to further vary the percentage, after giving notice in the *Government Gazette*. The increase in percentage of money paid from the Highways Fund to the Police Road Safety Services Fund will mean that in the next financial year, 1984-85, an additional transfer of $2 276 000 will be made. I point out that almost 12 months ago, on 13 May 1983, the Government put up a similar provision to increase the percentage from 9.8 per cent to 12 per cent. In the space of 12 months the present Government has increased the percentage from 9.8 per cent to 15.4 per cent, almost doubling the percentage of contribution transferred from the Highways Fund to the Police Road Safety Services Fund.

In opposing this Bill I make absolutely clear that the Liberal Party gives the highest priority to road safety services provided by the Police Department. I want there to be no doubt whatsoever about that. However, we believe that the funds for that should come from General Revenue and not from funds dedicated to highway construction. By transferring funds from highways construction across to the Police Road Safety Services Fund, the Government is contributing to the creation of major road hazards, and an increased danger of road accidents and trauma throughout South Australia.

I have made no secret of my view that for the past 12 months insufficient funding has been directed towards road construction in South Australia. Because of this, roads are deteriorating to the point where there is now significant risk to road users in certain areas. I shall highlight some of those shortly. The Government is constantly telling people in the community who ask for urgent work to be done because a road hazard exists that it cannot do that work because of insufficient funds. The Government maintains that it cannot afford pedestrian crossings at certain locations because of insufficient funds, and yet the Government is bleeding the source of funds for road use in the dedicated Highways Fund, which should be used only for road construction. The Government is transferring these funds to what the Government describes as the Road Safety Services Fund of the Police Department.

I suspect that those funds are going into the more general areas of the Police Department and certainly are covering

an area that has been traditionally covered from general revenue of Government. That is the ground on which we oppose the first measure. The transfer 12 months ago meant that an additional $1 million was transferred out of the Highways Fund to the Police Department. The transfer this year means a further $2.2 million will be written permanently into the formula. What is more, as fees escalate so will that permanent base escalate. The Government has taken $3.2 million out of the Highways Fund and put it into the Police Department, when in fact it should take that money out of general revenue. I repeat that this does not in any way lessen what we see as being the priority of the Road Safety Services of the Police Department, but we believe that adequate funds should be provided from general revenue.

Also, about seven months ago this Government imposed on South Australian motorists an additional 1c a litre fuel tax, but it did not put that money, as has always previously occurred, into the Highways Fund; it put that money into general revenue. I forget the exact figure that will be collected in a full year, but I think it is about $11 million for the remainder of this year and about $15 million in a full year. A significant sum will be collected from the 1c a litre fuel tax that should have gone into the Highways Fund for road construction but instead went into general revenue.

Additionally, during the debate last year on the Estimates we found another convenient accounting ploy of this Government whereby it has asked individual departments to pay for their own accommodation, whereas previously that has always been covered by the Public Buildings Department. That meant that a further $1.1 million which should have gone into the Highways Fund was transferred from the Highways Fund into accommodation for the Motor Vehicle Registration Division. We have had $1.1 million for Government accommodation, $1 million for what was transferred last year, and a further $2.2 million for what was transferred this year, which is a total of $4.3 million that has been so far transferred out of the Highways Fund. In addition to that $4.3 million, a further $11 million this financial year will be lost from the extra fuel tax. That means that up to $15.4 million has been lost to road construction in South Australia through the actions of this Government in the past 12 months alone.

During the Estimates Committee I cross-examined both the Minister and the Commissioner of Highways on what funds were to be supplied for road construction this year, and the Commissioner of Highways openly admitted in front of the Parliamentary Estimates Committee that in real terms funds for the Highways Fund in 1983-84 have decreased compared to 1982-83. That means that between 1970 and 1981 (in 1982 constant dollar terms) the funds allocated by the Federal Government for road construction and maintenance in South Australia fell from $100 million down to $64 million, which is a decrease of about 40 per cent in real terms for road construction in South Australia.

There is a great urgency in certain parts of the State for unsealed roads to be sealed and made as quickly as possible. Earlier this year I attended a local government conference on Eyre Peninsula. I discovered that about 60 km of the Lock to Elliston Road is being sealed at the enormous rate of one kilometre a year. In other words, in 60 years time at that rate the Lock to Elliston road will be finally sealed. That is an example of the sort of crisis that people in South Australia are facing through the lack of State and Commonwealth funds for road construction. It is well known that there are now serious congestions and serious road hazards developing through the lack of road funds, particularly for road maintenance and construction.

I bring to the attention of the Minister a letter sent to the Opposition (and I assume to the Minister) from the St John Ambulance crew at Kingston, who have highlighted the very sadly depleted state of the road, Pacific Highway No. 1 (one of our major national highways) in the Kingston area. They said that about 20 km of road has a crumbling base and an uneven surface where the base has sagged to the point where the centre of the road is lower than the edges of the road. In wet weather water accumulates in the centre of the road, and when heavy trucks pass there is a constant sheet of water being sprayed out from underneath the trucks, making it virtually impossible for vehicles to pass the trucks. I know that my colleague the member for Mount Gambier who regularly drives up and down that road has complained to me about the sad and unsafe state of that road.

The situation is that funds have been allocated on the basis of about $100 000 a year to upgrade that 20 km of national highway, and at that rate it will take years and years to correct that unsafe situation. I could cite numerous similar situations. Earlier this week when the Minister of Transport was not in the House I raised the question of the need to do something about the intersection of Highway 1 and the road leading from Port Pirie, where quite tragically three people were killed on the Easter weekend. The Mayor of Port Pirie wrote to me and drew to my attention the unsafe nature of that intersection and the fact that it has been like it for some time. He stated that several fatalities have occurred there and that it was time action was taken to correct the situation. I also said that the truck driver involved in that tragic accident had also complained about the nature of the corner. Again, I would imagine that the final response will be that the Government will say that nothing can be done about it because insufficient funds are available. Funds are not available because the Bannon Government is bleeding off funds from the Highways Department for other purposes.

Mr Hamilton: It has been there for 15 years.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The point I am making is that the Bannon Government is bleeding the Highways Fund for other purposes. Let us make that quite clear. Because of that there is a serious depletion and deterioration of the highway system in South Australia to the point where the roads are becoming unsafe.

The responsibility for this must lie fairly and squarely on the head of the Premier and Treasurer, who has given his riding instructions to the Minister of Transport, and to the Minister himself who is so meek and mild as to be willing to lie down and be kicked by his Premier so that money may be transferred from its legitimate use on our roads into the general revenue.

I remind members that this is a serious situation and not a one-off thing. Indeed, the Royal Automobile Association, which represents over 400 000 South Australian motorists, is very much concerned with this trend. Indeed, its executive expressed concern last year when the Government introduced legislation to increase the percentage from 9.8 per cent to 12 per cent. Today, the General Manager of the RAA has expressed to me serious concern at this additional increase from 12 per cent to 15.4 per cent. The Minister has admitted that the funds for road construction and maintenance this year will be less in real dollar terms than they were last year, despite the crisis that already exists. We now have before us a further erosion of those funds as well as a commitment embodied in legislation passed last year that there is no obligation on this Government to increase the percentage of funds in the Highways Department beyond what it was in 1982-83 in constant dollar terms, let alone real dollar terms.

In other words, this Government has committed itself to an erosion of between 8 per cent and 10 per cent, while the current inflation rate applies, in moneys available for road construction in this State each year as we progress, again due to a legislative amendment introduced by this

Government and passed by Parliament. It is for these reasons that the Liberal Party opposes this Bill. Last year, members on this side reluctantly supported the amending legislation, but I warned the Minister then that we would not tolerate a further erosion of the Highways Fund. Yet, in the past 12 months alone this Government has bled the Highways Fund of an effective $15.3 million, with a further erosion to occur as a result of the legislation passed last year.

The next part of this so-called simple and innocuous Bill, which the Minister has introduced at short notice and expects members to debate in the same week as it has been introduced, gives the Minister the right, without recourse to Parliament, to vary the figure of 15.4 per cent. Obviously, he will not vary it downwards: he is likely only to vary it upwards. The Premier and Treasurer wants to get his sticky little fingers on even more of the road funds, and again it seems that the Minister is willing to sit meekly by and let him do so. It is incredible that the management of the Budget in this State is now being put into effect by means of notices in the *Government Gazette*.We can alter the Budget and the whole balance of the State's finances, especially in respect of the area of road transport as controlled by the Highways Department and the Police Department, and transfer as much money as we like simply by publishing a notice in the *Government Gazette,* without reference to Parliament.

Again, the Liberal Opposition will not stand by without protesting while this erosion of the powers of Parliament takes place. We strongly oppose that provision as well. Frankly, I am surprised that the Government has had the hide and the gall to introduce such an amendment. The least it could have done was to provide that such action should be taken by regulation. I do not believe that the Government should have the power at all, but the Minister should have done the thing more decently and provided for promulgation by regulation rather than by notice in the *Government Gazette.* Possibly, the notice will be slipped in to the *Government Gazette* on the day before Christmas, when it is hoped that no-one will notice it.

For those reasons the Opposition opposes the Bill. It represents a serious erosion not only of the Highways Fund but more importantly of moneys that should be used to ensure that our roads are safe and convenient thoroughfares on which to drive. The motorists of this State, who have been constantly bled by the Federal and State Governments, can no longer stand by and allow themselves to be browbeaten by such money-hungry Governments as the ones we have. From the price of every litre of petrol the motorist buys, he contributes 27c in State and Federal taxes: 2.5c to the State Government; to the Federal Government, an excise duty of 7c a litre, a tax in respect of the Bicentennial Roads Programme of 2c, and an import parity levy of 16.4c a litre.

As an indication of the greed of the Federal Government, it has now decided to index on an annual basis all its taxes on fuel, and the 2c a litre now taken for the Bicentennial Roads Programme has been indexed with the index part going not to roads, as was the original purpose of the programme, but to the general revenue of the Federal Government. It was the Hawke Government that further increased the tax on petrol late last year, and announced that every six months the tax would be indexed in accordance with the consumer price index. So, in the past 12 months Australian motorists, as a direct result of the actions of the Hawke Government in Canberra and the Bannon Government in South Australia, have been bled of their finances with none of that money going into road construction so that our roads might be safer.

I draw to the attention of the Minister (and I hope that he will comment later on this) the fact that the Australian Road Research Unit, headed by Dr McLean at the University of Adelaide, has been extremely critical of the state of our roads and the lack of regard given by the Highways Department to road safety. In presenting evidence to the Parliamentary Accounts Committee, to a State Government forum, and to the National Conference on Road Safety, Dr McLean has criticised the way in which certain items in road design or obstacles on the edges of roads have been paid no attention by the Government and especially by the Highways Department.

Certain characteristics and features of our roads are known to be dangerous for motorists. There are specific spots, such as crash barriers at the edge of the road that have straight edges rather than curved edges that would be safer. Presumably, this fault results from the insufficiency of available funds. Some cars crashing into the ends of those crash barriers have been cut open as if by a knife. Why are those crash barriers left in their present condition? It is because insufficient funds are available to remedy the defect. When questioned, the Highways Department has said that corrective action would be too expensive to extend the barriers back from the the highway and to put a rounded end on them so that a car crashing into it would deflect off.

This Government must have the worst possible record in terms of road safety of any State Government in recent years. It has done nothing for road safety: it has bled the road funds so that the money could be applied in other areas that should be covered by general revenue.

I oppose the Bill, and I do so in order to help promote the safety of our motorists, to get better roads for South Australia, and to stop this enormous theft of money from Australian motorists by the Bannon and Hawke Governments, and to ensure that the money now taken from the Highways Fund is left there to be spent in the area in which it was intended to be spent rather than in other areas where it seems to be needed because of Government economic mismanagement.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose the Bill. Has the Minister taken the trouble during his term of office to visit country areas and travel along country roads and see what a shocking condition many of them are in? I invite him to visit many of the roads in Goyder to see what a shocking state they are in. I refer to the road north from Minlaton through Maitland, to Curramulka. From Maitland north it is almost unbearable to travel on at present. One could compare it to riding a boat in a rough sea, it is so up and down. The road west from Port Wakefield has just been resealed. We should say, 'Thank you very much', but it has been resealed over all of the bumps and one can still hit one's head on the roof of the car when travelling on it.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am talking about roads generally. I refer to the road from Balaklava to Riverton. It reminds me of the roads that I see in television films in Spain where one is lucky to get around a road because one is likely to go off the edge.

Mr Oswald: They turned the pot holes upside down!

Mr MEIER: Maybe so. The road down to Marion Bay along the coast shatters a vehicle's suspension. When talking about Highways Department moneys, if this State needs anything it is an increase in moneys, and yet the Minister is asking in this Bill for $2.2 million to be taken out of the Highways Fund and put into road safety. Surely, the highway roads need to be upgraded. The Minister made a statement after the tragic Easter road toll that he felt that the speed limit might need to be looked at. In my view, a reduction in the speed limit will not make any significant difference to road fatalities, but part of the problem is due to the speed at which people travel on certain roads under certain

conditions. On many roads in Goyder and other rural areas of South Australia one should not travel at anywhere near 110 km/h. At the same time, there are certain other roads where 120 km/h would be a very safe speed.

The shadow Minister pointed out in his speech that the Federal Government seems to be in collusion with the State Government, or vice versa. The 2c per litre which was supposed to be for ABRD funds is still there, but the indexed amount will go not to road funds but into general revenue, just as so much else of supposed road funds from petrol taxes is not going towards roads. I suspect that part of the reason is—and the Minister would possibly agree—that some 70 per cent of the electors in this State are in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, so why should the Government bother about the 30 per cent out of the metropolitan area? That is not where the majority of votes is found, but it is the area where tourists want to go and through which many people travel. The roads need more money rather than less, which will be the case under this Bill.

I have written to the Minister personally about the upgrading of an intersection north of Port Wakefield, and the Minister in his reply indicated that the matter was being considered and that he was awaiting a report. Reports cost money, and I have nothing against them in real terms, but so many areas are past the report stage: it is blatantly obvious and clear that something has to be done now. For millions of dollars to be taken from the Highways Fund is another step backwards for South Australia. I hope that the Minister will rethink this matter.

This Bill is worse when one considers that the Minister can vary this percentage by publishing a notice in the *Gazette*, and I wonder what the figure will be. In this Bill it has gone from 12 per cent to 15.4 per cent (it went from 9 per cent to 12 per cent not long ago). Will 18 per cent be the next figure pulled out of the hat? It should reverse and go back to a 5 per cent figure or even less. I strongly oppose this amendment to the Highways Act and I ask the Minister to reconsider the Bill before this House.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I too join this debate and express my opposition to the Bill. I am speaking on this matter having been preoccupied with another issue for the bulk of this week, but nevertheless any matter which deals with road funding is of the utmost concern to all country constituents. The principle of the Bill is to allow funds to be redirected, and that is of the utmost concern to me. Most people would believe that the principle should be the other way around, in other words, to tie additional moneys to road funding.

Roads are an issue which will be never ending and with Governments structured as they are and with the political influences that appear from time to time and the metropolitan numbers that influence those political decisions, those in the outback will be disadvantaged more and more. The principle of the Bill, to allow moneys to be redirected into general revenue or elsewhere, should be opposed.

The issue that took up the bulk of my time this week related to the closing of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln. Roads will become more important because of that, because another 300 000 head of stock will have to be transported by road to the metropolitan masses (that is, assuming that SAMCOR at Gepps Cross can operate). That indirect influence, the decision to close SAMCOR, will put greater pressure on the highway network. Needless to say, 300 000 head of sheep, up to 7 000 head of cattle and 13 000 pigs will add considerable pressure to the highways system, and that is only a very minute part of it. I, too, oppose the Bill and I would like to think that the Government was able to tie more funds to the road network rather than allow them to be redirected into other areas.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I am a little surprised at the Opposition's opposing this measure, particularly since, during its term of office—I think on two occasions—it made amendments identical to those now before us. There was a slight difference in the move: we do not necessarily have to come to Parliament annually to try to increase the amount of money from the Highways Fund to the Police Department for administering the Road Safety Act, so far as road safety services are concerned. Apart from that one major difference, and perhaps the increased percentage, there is no difference in this proposal from those introduced by the previous Government, and by my Party when it was in government prior to that, since the early 1970s.

I might have had a slightly different view about this measure had Treasury not made available in the last Budget the money about which we are talking. It was made available for this purpose. In the early 1970s it was decided that a figure of six per cent would be made available as a contribution from the Highways Fund to the Police Department for road safety services. That six per cent at that time represented 75 per cent of police costs. When the Act was amended last year to provide for the current 12 per cent, I indicated that it was desirable in the interests of road safety to restore the contribution over the next few years to approximately that 75 per cent that originally existed. This Bill increases the 12 per cent to 15.4 per cent from 1 July 1983, and that represents 66 per cent of police costs.

Let us look at police traffic costs for this very purpose. In 1980-81 the police costs for road safety services amounted to $7.053 million; in 1981-82 they rose to $10.295 million; in 1982-83 it was $11.405 million; and in 1983-84 it rose to $12.1 million, which is only an estimate. That shows how police costs have risen. In 1981-82 the 9.8 per cent amounted to $4.4 million from the Highways Fund. In 1982-83 the 12 per cent amounted to $6.2 million, and in 1983-84 the 15.4 per cent will amount to a contribution of $8 million, which is a large amount of money. The $8 million and the police costs, as I mentioned, for 1983-84, which were only an estimate, amount to $12.1 million. In the 1983-84 Budget an amount of $1.5 million was provided to the Highways Department for this measure to offset the increase between the $6.2 million and $8 million that will be required this year. Motorists are paying for the maintenance of our roads, road safety and also maintenance of road rules.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Most of their money goes into general revenue.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: We cannot argue against that and the honourable member's colleague, when he was Minister, referred to that point. If the honourable member would like to check that, I think he will find that when this amendment was before the Chamber the then Minister made that same comment. I supppose one could say that it represents less additional money that could be made available for roads, which I think is true, but where do we draw the line? I would dearly like to get more money for roads, but at whose expense? From whom do we take money to make it available for roads? Will Governments ever have enough money for roads? Will the Police Department ever have enough money to cover the cost of its road safety services? Do we take it from education, health or welfare? Where do we get it?

Rather than amending the Act yearly, which is a cumbersome process, provision is made for the contribution to be determined by the Minister from time to time and published in the *Government Gazette*. Alternatively, the contribution could be made by regulation. No amendment is forthcoming. I am not opposed to that if the Opposition desires that it be done by regulation. I would be happy to

go along with that, but the Government prefers the option of the Minister's determining the amount and publishing it in the *Government Gazette*. I would like to see one other thing, which I have suggested to the Commissioner of Highways. I asked him in his discussions with Treasury, and I will see to it that this point is made to Treasury when we are talking about the next Budget, to request that a specific line be made in the Highways budget for this very purpose. That amount should be allocated for contribution to the Police Department for road safety purposes. Then I do not think there would be any argument. It would be an amount provided for this purpose, spelt out in the Budget. I do not think there would be any more argument about it.

The member for Davenport talks about lost money for roads. Let us look at gross expenditure of the Highways Department over the past two or three years. In 1981-82 there was $122.5 million. In 1982-83 it rose to $145.1 million. These figures are taken directly from the annual report. They include funding under the ABRD programme.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Which was a Liberal Federal Government initiative.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Was it? Good heavens! It was introduced by the Federal Liberal Government. Is the honourable member suggesting that that is the only good thing that Government did? In 1983-84 gross expenditure by the Highways Department totalled $180.3 million (only an estimate at this stage; it could go higher than that). So, when one considers the amounts being spent on roads this measure will not have any effect on the roadworks programme. No road will suffer as a result. Certainly, I would like to get more money for roads. What is the limit? Where does one get the money from? I would like many more millions so that we could fix all the roads.

I refer briefly to comments of the member for Goyder and also perhaps by the member for Flinders. I visited Eyre Peninsula last week following a visit by the member for Davenport. I looked at the roads to which he referred. I agree that they are in a very rough state and that something is definitely needed. I sympathise with the local government authorities in the area. I was happy to announce the additional $1 million that I made available to local government authorities around the State, a portion of which, of course, went to Eyre Peninsula.

Some people admitted during my visit that they thought they would have some difficulty spending that money by the end of the financial year. Some would have no problems in spending that money, but one or two might. We want to make sure that they can spend it, and hopefully we can increase the contribution next year to those areas. The Federal Minister (Mr Morris) visited that area prior to the member for Davenport's going there. He was very sympathetic to the points of view that were made. I intend to write to him, asking for additional funds for roads for that area, over a five to ten-year period. The member for Goyder mentioned the Minlaton road. That is the first time that that has been drawn to my attention. I have not had any representations made to me nor have I heard anything about it before. I would be happy to talk to those people, if the honourable member would like to bring them over, and discuss their road funding.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: What about the Burra-Morgan road?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Additional money has been provided for the Burra-Morgan road.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yes, we have made available additional money to the Burra Burra council. I can give the honourable member those figures.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has already spoken on this debate.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It gets back to the question of the measure before us. It was supported, moved and introduced by the former Government on two occasions. We supported it when we were in Opposition. We expressed the concerns that have been expressed by this Opposition, and they concern me also. However, I think that, if we can get a specific Budget line for this purpose, then it would stop this annual argument every time we bring a measure into the House to increase the contribution. I hope that all members support the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Mr Abbott (teller), Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Bannon. No—Mr Becker.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Cont from 11 April. Page 3529.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports this Bill. The provisions are completely satisfactory and in line with current day financial aspects, and on that basis it is supportable and is given full marks by the Opposition. It has been suggested that the opportunity be taken whilst the Bill is before the House to perhaps consider other issues. One such issue which was canvassed was to suggest that the Phylloxera Board ought to have an opportunity to require those vineyards which were not being kept in a reasonable condition either to be demolished or in some other ways brought up to standard because they posed a threat as a disease problem. However, in preliminary discussions there appears to have been no suggestion that phylloxera has been a problem in South Australia; in fact, it has not been a problem in all these years. We are aware also that because phylloxera has not been here one can really not claim that other forms of disease which would be controlled by exercising an arrangement whereby vineyards had to be kept to a minimum standard would necessarily be advantaged under the terms of this Bill.

However, I mention this because it is a matter of concern within the vine growing industry. Perhaps the matter will have to be taken up in conjunction with local government on the basis that a derelict vineyard is an eyesore or that it is likely to become vermin infested and therefore create a problem. Also, other vine diseases could be harbored in some areas, as well as phylloxera. Perhaps the Government or the Board should have a look at the issue on a broader basis. That would obviously be an extension of the original intent of the Phylloxera Act. Therefore, at this juncture the Opposition will not promote that matter any further other

than identifying it as a problem that may well need further consideration by the Minister in another place in consultation with the industry and probably with local government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. It is very true that it is an important measure to ensure that South Australia maintains freedom from phylloxera attacking grapevines, because the damage that would be done to the industry would be devastating if that occurred. Only a few weeks ago someone was telling me the story of a French vigneron who, upon tasting our wines, said, 'These are wines such as have not been tasted in France for 60 years'—and that comment was prompted because of things like phylloxera attacks having occurred in France. I think that really does indicate just how important Bills like this are. I have noted the member for Light's comment on the possibility of derelict vineyards harboring phylloxera, possibly in years to come, or other diseases or vermin, and so on. I shall draw that matter to the attention of my colleague in another place and ask him to ensure that the Department of Agriculture and the Board take that matter into consideration.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3), 1984

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2—After line 6 insert new clauses 4a, 4b and 4c as follows:

4a. Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by striking out paragraph VII.

4b. The following section is inserted immediately after section 13 of the principal Act:

13a. (1) Subject to this section, where the Governor makes a proclamation uniting two or more areas, the Governor may by the same proclamation or by a subsequent proclamation appoint, or make provision for the election of, the first members of the council to be formed by the union of the areas.

(2) Where the first members of a council are appointed by the Governor under subsection (1), those members shall retire at the conclusion of the next annual election.

(3) Where the Governor makes provision under subsection (1) for the election of the first members of a council, he shall also make provision for the retirement of those members.

(4) Where the proclamation uniting two or more areas is made upon the presentation of an address from both Houses of Parliament and that address makes provision for the appointment or election of the first members of the council to be formed by the union of the areas, the Governor shall act in accordance with the terms of that address.

(5) Where the Governor does not make a proclamation under subsection (1) before a union of areas comes into effect, the membership of the council of the area formed by the union shall, until the conclusion of the next annual election, consist of all of the persons who were, immediately before the union came into effect, members of the councils of the areas being united.

(6) A proclamation may be made under this section in relation to a council that is to be formed by the union of two or more areas notwithstanding that a proclamation for the union of those areas was made before the commencement of the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1984 (but a proclamation shall not be made if the union has come into effect).

4c. Section 24 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after paragraph *(i)* of subsection (1) the following paragraph:

(j) exercising the powers conferred by section 13a.

No. 2. Page 4, lines 8 to 13 (clause 23)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert new subsection as follows:

(2) A by-law forwarded to the Minister under subsection (1) must be accompanied by a certificate, in the prescribed form, signed by a legal practitioner certifying that, in the opinion of the legal practitioner—

(a) the council has power to make the by-law by virtue of a statutory provision specified in the certificate;

and

(b) the by-law is not inconsistent with this Act or the general law of the State.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 and 2 be agreed to.

These amendments introduced in another place are designed to overcome a problem that has occurred in relation to the new council formed as a result of a problem that arose from the amalgamation of the District Council of Kadina and the Corporation of the Town of Moonta. The Government agrees with the intent of the amendments.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I do not agree with the Minister's views concerning the effect of the amendments. The first amendment is relevant to the matter referred to by the Minister and was designed with that matter in mind, although I note that it is couched in terms that will assist other amalgamations that might occur before the Local Government Act as amended comes into effect. The Opposition fully endorses that. It will assist in a very material sense, and the provision is much more practical in the sense that there will now be only a normal composition of council around the table rather than the some 21 people, or an excessive number of people, seeking to benefit the new Northern Yorke Peninsula Council.

The second amendment is in line with the view expressed in this place during the passage of the Bill when it was indicated that a more rational approach should be taken in regard to certification of local government by-laws. Concern has been expressed about the fact that there might be more than 60 or 70 solicitors giving advice to local government and that because this was not an area in which they work on a regular basis there may be some variance of wording involved which would eventually create a field day for the legal profession or, more particularly, the Mr Howie's of this world. Previously I indicated that, although it is desirable that people like Mr Howie should be acting constantly as watchdogs on these matters, it is important that Parliament should ensure that legislation is not full of loopholes and that a more rational approach should be taken in regard to guaranteeing certification in regard to by-laws. That proposal was promulgated with the by-laws. The Upper House has taken up that point, and although it has fine-tuned it in another way the resultant provision is completely satisfactory. A legal practitioner will be required to complete a form to be submitted together with the by-law involved which will indicate on a professional basis that he has fulfilled all the requirements of checking the by-law against the prescriptive nature of the Local Government Act. This provision strengthens the Bill, and the Opposition has no hesitation in supporting the amendments.

Motion carried.

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

No. 1 Page 2, line 19 (clause 6)—After 'Treasurer' insert ', having regard to proper principles of financial management,'.

No. 2 Page 3, lines 4 to 11 (clause 6)—Leave out subsection (1) and insert new subsection as follows:

(1) Subject to subsection 8d, compensation shall be paid to a registered beekeeper in respect of any of his bees, hives, combs or appliances—

(a) that are infected with, or affected by—

(i) American Foul Brood;

or

(ii) any other disease declared by regulation to be a disease in respect of which compensation may be paid under this section;

and

(b) that are destroyed—

(i) in accordance with a notice given by an inspector under section 7;

or

(ii) by an inspector under section 8.

No. 3. Page 3 (clause 6)—After line 32 insert new paragraph as follows:

(ab) the property in respect of which compensation is sought became infected with, or affected by, disease as a result of neglect on the part of the beekeeper;

Consideration in Committee.

Suggested amendment No. 1:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

The Government believes it is an unnecessary addition to the Bill and serves no purpose.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I have no specific brief on this matter but, because the amendment seeks to ensure certain accountability in financial areas, I believe that it is highly desirable. The Opposition suggests that the Government reconsider its position and accept this amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes—(23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M. F. Arnold (teller), Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes—(21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Bannon. No—Mr Becker.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested amendments Nos 2 and 3:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos 2 and 3 be agreed to.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Opposition is thankful that the Government accepts these two amendments. As I mentioned to the Minister privately, it is interesting to note that amendment No. 3 refers to neglect (neglect in this case of beehives), and in the most recent Bill we discussed neglect of vineyards. There was a juxtaposition of the two cases: it is important to recognise that no Government measure should seek to provide an escape for people who are unwise in their management or who fail the industry they represent in the proper conduct of their business. On that basis the Opposition is glad that this matter was picked up. It is a worthwhile point that is consistent with the attitude I expressed in relation to vineyards.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Opposition's support is noted, and we appreciate the point made by the member for Light. It certainly does have a similarity to the point made in connection with the other Bill. That particular amendment will not only be well received by beekeepers but I am sure that the bees of South Australia will be equally as happy to know that this provision has been incorporated in the Bill.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 1 was adopted:

Because it is an unnecessary addition to the Bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The provisions of this Bill implement the recommendations and the Seventieth Report of the South Australian Law Reform Committee—*Locus Standi*—Prisoners Rights. At common law anyone convicted of treason or a felony and sentenced to death or outlawry was said to be 'attainted'. This consequence had two principal effects. First, he suffered forfeiture of his property and of most causes of action which were available to him. Secondly, he suffered 'corruption of the blood', that is, he became incapable of holding or inheriting land, of transmitting title or sustaining a claim in a court of law. The common law rule that the property of persons convicted of treason or a felony was forfeited to the Crown was abolished in 1874. However, persons convicted of treason or a felony were placed under certain disabilities during the service of their sentences. These disabilities included the incapacity to hold certain offices, and the inability to bring legal proceedings for the recovery of any property, debt or damage. The legislation authorised the appointment of a curator of convicts' property, and gave the curator power, *inter alia*, to pay the costs of the convict's prosecution and other debts owed by him and to institute legal proceedings on behalf of the convict. The curator was also given absolute powers to deal with the convict's property, and was not required to take into account the wishes of the convict in its management.

In 1966, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act was amended to place all persons undergoing imprisonment, other than those on remand, under the same disability. That is, provisions designed originally to ameliorate the position of felons at common law have been extended to all prisoners, placing persons imprisoned for even minor misdemeanours or for failure to pay a fine under significant disabilities.

The Law Reform Committee recommended that the restrictions on prisoners to bring actions and deal with their property in Part X of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act should be repealed and in its place it should be enacted that a prisoner is under no disability to bring any action, make any contract, or exercise any conveyance, transfer or other dealing with property.

The procedural restrictions on prisoners commencing civil actions in the courts are anomalous and out of keeping with modern views concerning the rights of prisoners and the proper limits of the punishment of imprisonment. No matter how serious a person's crimes, the punishment of the loss of liberty does not warrant, in addition, denying to the prisoner access to the courts for an impartial determination of their claims according to law.

The denial of prisoners' access to the courts is contrary to universally accepted standards of human rights as spelled out in the International Bill of Human Rights. For example, Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal in the determination of his rights and obligations. Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provides that all persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals.

The repeal of Part X of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the enactment of provision that a prisoner is under no disability to bring any action requires a consequential amendment of section 88 of the Trustee Act, 1936. That section provides that a beneficial interest in property shall not remain vested or become vested in the convict either for himself or as a trustee or mortgagee. As the Law Reform Committee said, it may well be highly inconvenient to have a convict as trustee but the remedy for that is provided by the law already, namely an application to discharge a trustee who is unable to look after his trust property and to appoint another trustee in his place.

Another related matter which requires attention is section 296 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This section provides that a person convicted of a felony and sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour for a term exceeding 12 months loses any office which he may hold under the Crown or any public employment, and any superannuation payable out of a public fund. As the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee pointed out in its Fourth Report on the Substantive Criminal Law (at page 386) this disqualification does not follow a conviction of misdemeanour followed by a similar term of imprisonment. There is no justification for the discrimination and the section should be amended to remove the discrimination. The section is also amended to remove reference to publicly funded superannuation funds, thus providing that a convicted person does not forfeit his entitlement to superannuation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the Act. The reference to Part X is removed. Clause 3 amends section 296 of the principal Act by removing the distinction contained in that section between felony and misdemeanour. The reference in the section to publicly funded superannuation funds is also removed. Clause 4 inserts new section 329 into the principal Act. The new section provides that a person who has been convicted of treason, a felony of any other offence, shall not, by reason only of that fact, be under any legal disability except as it is prescribed by any Act of the State or the Commonwealth. Clause 5 repeals Part X of the principal Act. Clause 6 repeals section 88 of the Trustee Act, 1936.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

It brings into effect the Forty-sixth Report of the Law Reform Commission of South Australia relating to the form of oath to be used in courts and other tribunals. In addition, it revises and updates the laws relating to perjury. The investigation by the Law Reform Committee of the form of oath that should be used in South Australian courts and tribunals was initiated some years ago. The report that was submitted by the committee noted that there were (as is still the case now) three forms of oath in common use in this State. None of the oaths have statutory force. All have been in use in South Australia for a very long time and are well understood by ordinary people as well as those presiding in courts. The Committee provided a detailed analysis of the forms of oath in use and discussed their origins, and finally concluded that it did not consider it appropriate that any change be made to the forms. This recommendation has been accepted by the Government.

As part of the committee's discussion of this topic, the committee also suggested that the requirement of section 8 of the Evidence Act, 1929, that a person who objects to being sworn must come within a prescribed qualification, is inappropriate. Instead, the proper consideration should be what is appropriate to the person taking the oath. The committee therefore recommended that section 8 be amended. This recommendation is also acceptable to the Government, and is implemented by this Bill by a provision that a person may make an affirmation instead of an oath in all circumstances in which an oath is required or permitted by law.

Furthermore, in light of other matters contained in the committee's report and because of the necessity to amend section 8 of the Evidence Act, it has been decided to take the opportunity of reviewing all three sections of the Act that are concerned with the taking of oaths and the making of affirmations. Accordingly, it is proposed to repeal sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Evidence Act and substitute two new sections in a more acceptable form. Such a revision allows also for the implementation of one other recommendation of the Law Reform Committee's Forty-sixth Report concerning the general power of courts and persons authorised to hear and determine matters to administer oaths or take affirmations. It is proposed that a prescription of this power be provided in the Evidence Act, and consequently other provisions duplicating the power may be repealed.

Finally, as part of this review of the law relating to oaths, this measure provides for the reform of that provision of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935, relating to the crime of making a false statement under oath. Presently, the crime of perjury is provided for in a number of statutes. It is submitted that a general prescription of the offence is preferable, and this has been undertaken. It is also of interest to note that one aspect of the reform of this section is consistent with a recommendation of the Law Reform Commission in its Second Report concerning the concept of committing a crime 'wilfully and corruptly'. The section presently refers to 'wilful and corrupt' perjury but, as was discussed by the Law Reform Committee, the use of the word 'corrupt' is undesirable as it is either redundant or unduly restrictive upon the operation of such a provision. The concept of making a 'false statement' under oath is far easier to comprehend. A new section is therefore proposed.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 provides for amendments to the Evidence Act. The revamped definition of 'court' takes into account a recommendation of the Law Reform Committee that a general statement of the power of a 'court' to administer an oath or take an affirmation be included in the Evidence Act, in preference to the Acts Interpretation

Act. The reform of present sections 6, 7 and 8 is also undertaken in light of the recommendations of the Committee. Proposed new section 6 (1) *(a)* re-enacts present section 6. Proposed section 6 (1) *(b)* deals with a point made by the Committee concerning the difficulties that a court may sometimes encounter if witnesses do not have beliefs that are consistent with the norm. Accordingly, the provision will ensure that a court may administer any oath that is binding upon the conscience of the witness. Paragraph *(c)* makes reference to any other form of oath authorised or permitted by law.

Proposed new section 6 (2) re-enacts the present section 7 III. Proposed new section 6 (3) implements the recommendation of the Law Reform Committee concerning the inappropriateness of the requirements of present section 8 of the Evidence Act that a person must state a ground of objection before he may make an affirmation instead of an oath. It is proposed that a person be permitted to make an affirmation instead of an oath in all circumstances in which an oath is required or permitted by law. Proposed new section 6 (4) is similar to present section 8 (3). Section 6 (5) provides that an affirmation has the same force and effect of an oath. Oaths and affirmations are not to be invalidated by procedural or formal error or deficiency. Proposed new section 7 is consistent with the proposal that provision be made in the Evidence Act in relation to the power of 'courts' to administer oaths and take affirmations.

Clause 4 provides for the recasting of section 239 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The section will now provide for an offence of perjury constituted by making a false statement under oath. 'Oath' is defined to include 'affirmation', and provision is also made to define the concept of making a 'false statement'. At the same time, the offence of subornation of perjury, or inciting, procuring, inducing or aiding the commission of perjury, is provided in new statutory terms. Section 7 (3) provides a useful evidentiary provision. Subsection (4) allows any court to direct that a person be prosecuted for perjury. Proposed subsection (5) provides that corroboration is unnecessary in order to obtain a conviction for perjury or subornation of perjury. Finally, a penalty of four years imprisonment is retained.

Clause 5 provides for the repeal of sections 41 and 51 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915. Section 41 allows any court, judge or other person authorised by law to hear any matter or thing to receive and examine evidence, and administer an oath or take an affirmation. A comparable provision is to appear now in section 7 of the Evidence Act. Section 51 provides for the crime of wilful and corrupt perjury. This will now be provided for under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Clause 6 repeals section 299 of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926. Again, this provision provides that a person is guilty of perjury if he wilfully and corruptly gives false evidence. It may be repealed. Clause 7 repeals section 29 of the Oaths Act, 1936. This section provides that a person who makes a false oath, affirmation or declaration before a Commissioner is guilty of perjury. It may be repealed. Clause 8 provides for the repeal of sections 37 and 118 of the Supreme Court Act, 1935. Section 37 is concerned with the power of certain persons to administer oaths. The provisions of new section 7 of the Evidence Act will now be sufficient. Section 118 is concerned with perjury.

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

PUBLIC INTOXICATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 April. Page 3770.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition supports the Bill, which repeals the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act of 1961 and abolishes the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board. The Bill also modifies previously enacted provisions abolishing the offence of public drunkenness which were enacted in 1976 and have never been proclaimed. It is perhaps ironical that South Australia was the first State in the Commonwealth to enact the abolition of public drunkenness but the last State, I understand, to give effect to that enactment. Debate in another place on this Bill dwelt largely on the provisions pertaining to the abolition of public drunkenness and did not give much attention to the other important aspects of the Bill, namely, the repeal of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act and the abolition of the Board as a statutory body.

I pay a tribute to members of the Board and of its staff whom, during my term as Minister of Health, I grew to know and admire very much. An examination of the annual reports of the Board and conversation with people in the health services, as well as with people in the general community who are familiar with the work of the Board, indicate that the Board enjoys a high regard. It is a cost effective and efficient organisation working in an extremely demanding and a rather unrewarding (in terms of glamour and prestige) area of health care. In many ways I regret the abolition of the Board and its removal from the Statutes.

In paying a tribute to the Board, I refer especially to the work of its first full-time Secretary (Mr Colin Haynes) who came to the Board from the Mental Health Services in the late 1960s. Many people in the South Australian health services who know Colin Haynes will agree with me that he is a practical and immensely hard-working man. Under his guidance and through his energetic advocacy and determination to get things done, the Board acquired its treatment service premises at Elura, Osmond Terrace, and other sites, and developed its work through voluntary agencies such as Archway and Bethesda. Colin Haynes and others who were administering the Board at that time recognised that they would get far better value for the taxpayers' dollar if they used the voluntary services working or willing to work in the field of alcohol and drug treatment.

The enormous achievements of the Board in a comparatively short space of time (about five years) when Colin Haynes was its Secretary certainly are an indication of the dedication that he brought to his job. Mr Haynes left the Board in the mid-1970s to become Chief Administrative Officer to the Minister of Health. I believe that no Minister ever had a more loyal or dedicated Chief Administrative Officer or one who ran a happier office than Colin Haynes. It is not surprising to realise that the Alcohol Board, in the person of the Chief Administrative Officer to the Minister of Health, had a friend at court. The Chief Administrative Officer, the former Secretary, provided a direct link from the Board to the Minister and, in terms of his closeness to successive Ministers (the Hons Don Banfield, Peter Duncan and myself), he enhanced the Ministers' understanding of the work of the Board. As inevitably occurs when someone is working in close proximity to a Minister, special interests can come into the conversation at any given time, and I know that Don Banfield's and indeed Peter Duncan's understanding of this area was enhanced, as was my own.

These comments are relevant to the Bill because, with the abolition of the Board as a statutory body, the whole area of alcohol and drug addiction treatment loses some of its status and prestige—there is no doubt whatsoever about that—and with the retirement of Mr Colin Haynes in 1982 another advocate was lost. For some groups this may not be so important, but in this area of health care, which lacks high-powered lobby groups and certainly has no glamour whatsoever attached to it, such advocacy is needed.

With the repeal of the Act and the abolition of the Board, I hope that the necessarily high and important profile of alcohol and drug addiction treatment services in South Australia will be in no way diminished. The Opposition supports the repeal of the Act and the abolition of the Board, mainly because of its wish to see a reduction in the overall number of statutory authorities in South Australia. The reason we want to see that reduction is because we believe that the proliferation of statutory bodies has in fact led to a diminution of Ministerial responsibility to Parliament.

So, there are arguments for and against the abolition of a statutory body. I will put those against the abolition first, because they need to be taken into account and considered by the Parliament even in the support that we are showing through this Bill. The first argument is that everyone associated with any given area of public administration likes statutory status. They like the recognition and the prestige that it brings, and there is no doubt that statutory status gives a certain authority to the work of any organisation: that of course will be lost. With the abolition of statutory status there will be no longer direct access between the Board and the Minister. The Board has always valued the direct access that it has had to the Minister, and it has of course always valued the reasonable degree of autonomy and flexibility in the use of its funds that its statutory status has brought.

With the abolition of that status the Board (or the council as it will be in future) will now have to do battle along with other incorporated health units in terms of proceeding to implement Government policies in regard to alcohol and drug addiction prevention and treatment. No longer will the Board simply be able to sit down, determine how it will spend its budget (with Ministerial approval), and get on with the job. It will have to obtain approval, there will be more paper work, and all of that, of course, will lead to delays.

These things are mitigating against the work of the Board. On the other hand, there are persuasive arguments in favour of abolition of the statutory status. In the first instance, as I said, where there is no statutory body there is greater Ministerial accountability to Parliament and that is something which the Opposition (the Liberal Party) strongly supports. Incorporation under the Health Commission Act will certainly bring the work of the Board (or the new council) more closely into the mainstream of the health services. This will ensure better co-ordination and I hope a more rational use of taxpayers' funds throughout the health system—I am not suggesting throughout the work of the Board—in the treatment of alcohol and drug addiction.

I tried to achieve such co-ordination during my term of office by appointing former Commissioners of the Health Commission to the Board when vacancies became available. Mr Harry Wesley Smith and Miss Betty Lockwood, former Health Commissioners, were appointed members of the Board when their terms as Commissioners were completed. I know that their experience and understanding of the whole range of the health service was very useful to the work of the Board in co-ordinating its activities. This point of bringing alcohol and drug care into the mainstream of the health services was taken up by the Sax Committee of Inquiry into Hospital Services in South Australia. At page 168 of the Committee's report, the Committee states:

> While the problem may be to contain some services, other less fashionable services may need to be fostered to ensure there is an adequate service provision for the State. The Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board have expressed their concern at the failure to recognise and treat at an early stage the alcohol and drug related problems which subsequently lead to the admission of a substantial proportion of general hospital patients.

I will refer a little later to estimates of the proportion of hospital patients who are admitted with alcohol or drug related problems. The report continues:

> Patients receive excellent treatment for the physical sequelae of alcohol or drug related abuse but failure to recognise this problem at any early stage constitutes a major deficiency in quality of care. The lack of undergraduate teaching and postgraduate training in the recognition and management of such problems and the low status afforded this area of clinical practice should be cause for concern in a State hospital service.

I certainly share that concern. I came to realise very early in the piece as Minister of Health that there were certain glamour areas in the provision of health services which received a lot of publicity, public support and professional interest. They were usually at the top of the health tree, so to speak.

Right down at the bottom of the tree, but forming in my opinion its very strong and important roots, are the services such as the public health services, the preventive services, health promotion services and treatment of alcohol and drug addiction. In its report the Sax Committee, at page 16, recommendation 4.6.8, states:

> A programme to assist in the early diagnosis and treatment of alcohol and drug related problems be introduced into selected hospitals.

There is already an affiliation between the Alcohol Board and the Flinders Medical Centre. But if one looks at the undergraduate and indeed post-graduate training of doctors in South Australia one sees that very little attention is paid to problems of alcohol and drug abuse. The same can be said of undergraduate nurse training. Unless and until alcohol and drug addiction is treated as part of the mainstream of health services it will continue, in my opinion, to be a Cinderella and the health professionals on whom we should be able to rely—that is the local general practitioner, the hospital intern, the physician, the specialist and the general nurse—who should be having a very important input into this area of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation are simply a lost resource because they are not taught in the first instance how to recognise and treat alcohol and drug addiction.

I recall, as Minister, being told of a circumstance when a patient had to be evacuated from a country hospital (one which would be well known to you, Mr Deputy Speaker) simply because that patient was admitted in an advanced stage of intoxication and the nursing staff did not know how to deal with the situation. Consequently, the taxpayer had to foot the bill for an air ambulance to go from that distant country town to an Adelaide teaching hospital or one of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board's facilities (I cannot remember which), simply because the nursing staff in question did not have those skills those quite unnecessary costs were incurred. Primarily on that basis I support the incorporation under the South Australian Health Act of the council which will carry on the work of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board.

It is worth noting and perhaps looking back a little way into history that the Sackville Commission recommended the continuation of the Board as a statutory authority. Members should bear in mind that that recommendation was made in 1979, before the Health Commission was really under way and indeed before, I believe, there was any public or possibly political confidence in the Health Commission's capacity to co-ordinate and rationalise health services in South Australia.

But, at any rate, it is worth interested members referring to the report of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, released in April 1979. My references come from the Parliamentary Paper as tabled. Therefore, the page numbers relate to that and not to the final report. On page 188 of that paper the Commission's report states:

The Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961-1978 (S.A.) gives the Treatment Board extensive functions in relation to the 'treatment, care, control and rehabilitation of persons who are addicted to the consumption or use of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors or certain drugs to excess' ... The Board receives funds from State and Commonwealth sources. Within the limits of the grants made to it, it enjoys considerable independence in the disbursement of funds. It is entitled to retain any surplus it may have at the end of the financial year.

I hope that that considerable independence, governed always by the need to ensure proper co-ordination and rationalisation of its services with other health services, will be maintained. I hope that the sorry story of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council, which was established under the Tonkin Government as having direct access to the Minister which has been subsequently lost under the present Minister, will not be repeated with the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Council. The Royal Commission report continues at page 201:

South Australia has a sound framework on which to build a satisfactory system of treatment for misusers of drugs.

It states further that there are significant defects in treatment programmes and that, whilst criticisms are not intended to reflect on workers in the field, they are intended to point the way to a more effective system. The report envisages for the Board a role which concentrates less on the delivery of services, although this will remain important, and more on planning and co-ordinating a wide range of services. Of course, this emphasis was stressed also in the report of the Smith Committee of Inquiry into mental health services, released in South Australia by the Minister of Health last year. The Royal Commission recommended also that the composition of the Board, which under present legislation consists of three members, be expanded to reflect the functions it should perform. The report further states:

The Board as a policy-making body should comprise members drawn from a number of disciplines and include people experienced in different facets of treatment. This involves enlarging the Board to provide for the necessary skills to be represented and for the expertise required in policy making.

I understand from reading the debate in the other place that it is the Minister's intention to enlarge the Board to at least five and possibly seven members. Of course, in addition to the work of Colin Haynes other people have played an immensely important part with the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board. They certainly included Mr Haynes' successor, Mr Graham Strathearn, who has been with the Board for nine years and who has qualities of great dedication and enthusiasm. Mr Strathearn has seen considerable advances under the chairmanship of several talented people who have given a great deal as chairmen of the Board as, indeed, have the members of the Board.

I understand that the first Chairman, who served for a short period, was a Dr Crowcroft, followed by Mr Walter Bridgland, who brought to the Board's work an extensive knowledge of the gaol system of South Australia. I believe that Mr Bridgland was a visiting Justice, and at that time of the Board's work there was a lot of emphasis on the prison system and it was important to have someone who had a knowledge of that system. Of course, Mr Bridgland also brought great administrative expertise to the Board. He was followed by Mr Dale Hassam, who I believe was appointed by the member for Elizabeth, who was then Minister of Health. Mr Hassam is a psychologist and I believe that he brought a much needed recognition of the non-medical aspects that are important in drug addiction and treatment. He enlarged the thinking of the Board to approach the problem not just on clinical grounds but on the broadly based health and social grounds that make treatment even more effective.

Following Mr Hassam's transfer interstate, Dr Bill Dibden was appointed Chairman of the Board. Of course, he brought an immense knowledge of the total health system. He enjoyed and still does enjoy a very great respect in health services in South Australia. He had invaluable contacts; for example, he established the Board's affiliation with the Flinders Medical Centre as a teaching hospital and he administered the Board while it was subjected, I suppose one could say, to scrutiny by both the Smith and Sax Committees of Inquiry. The present Chairman is Dr Brian Shea, former Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, who also enjoys immense respect throughout the health services in South Australia and who, if he is able to continue as Chairman of the new council, will I am sure be able to oversee the continuing and progressive policies that I hope will be administered. Both Dr Dibden and Dr Shea, as psychiatrists, bring special insight into the work of the Board.

The Annual Report of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, 1981-82, which I commend to members, outlines some of the significant achievements of the Board under the Tonkin Administration. It refers to the appointment of a new Director of Treatment Services, Dr R.G. Pols, in August 1981. That was a real breakthrough for the Board because it is very difficult indeed to get qualified medical people to work in this field, and Dr Pols' appointment was a great step forward. The movement of the methadone treatment facility from Hillcrest Hospital to the Drug Dependence Clinic at Osmond Terrace, Norwood, was recommended by the Sackville Royal Commission and implemented in 1981-82.

In that year community houses were acquired at Mile End and Renmark. The implementation of medical studentships over the 1981-82 Christmas and New Year period was undertaken and other important initiatives were the appointments of a principal educator and a librarian, the establishment of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Unit, which is immensely important, and the movement of finance related tasks in pay-roll, accounting and expenditure from the South Australian Health Commission to the Board. I can only assume that with the abolition of the Board those tasks may be moved back to the Commission, but I hope not, because I am a strong believer in decentralisation of administration of the health services.

The report refers to the work of the treatment units: St Anthony's Hospital, Elura Clinic, Osmond Terrace Clinic, the Drug Dependence Clinic, and the Family Living Centre. I want to make brief reference to the Family Living Centre because it is a unique facility in the whole of Australia and I believe that it brings together the very best aspects of other experimental units that have been established in other States. The Family Living Centre is a long-term, drug-free, live-in rehabilitation programme designed to assist hard drug abusers to realise and cope with the fact that there is an underlying cause responsible for drug abuse and that addiction is a symptom.

It was somewhat of a step of courage for a Government to authorise the expenditure to establish this unit and I, as Minister, was warned that I could face considerable public criticism if people reacted unfavourably to the freedom that was involved for drug and alcohol addicts, particularly drug addicts, in community based living. However, with trust in the advice that I was getting from the Board and confidence in the people who were to administer the centre, approval was given and that approval, trust and confidence have since been well and truly justified. Mr Gerry Garner and his staff at the Family Living Centre certainly deserve commendation for their magnificent work.

I refer to other services, including the Driver Assessment Clinic; the administration of the Board itself; the education services; the significant library that the Board has to which any member of the public or the medical or any other profession can have access; the Monitoring, Evaluation and

Research Unit, which I have mentioned; the Board's work in industry, community houses, country services; its work with the Department of Correctional Services; its referral and home visiting services as a follow-up programme for patients who have been discharged from the Flinders Medical Centre; and its community health nursing services, which are conducted through various voluntary agencies from the Elura Clinic, the Osmond Terrace Clinic and the Christies Beach and Clovelly Park Community Health Centres.

In addition to all that work, there is the work of the voluntary agencies, including the Archway Rehabilitation Centre; Bethesda, Mount Gambier; the Adelaide Central Mission; and the South Australian Foundation on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence. In other words, it is a comprehensive service and one which largely goes unsung. Indeed, there is very little recognition of the work of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board. Referring to page 14 of the Board's annual report, one notes a trend which I hope the Government will take very seriously indeed and concerning which it will ensure that appropriate provision is made to deal with this trend.

I refer to the growing tendency for alcoholism and drug addiction among women in this State, and indeed throughout Australia. Figures provided on page 14 of the report indicate details of in-patient admissions by dependency and sex for the year ended 30 June 1982, and they identify that the proportion of alcohol dependency among males admitted to the treatment unit was 91 per cent; 8 per cent were admitted for drug dependency; and 1 per cent was admitted for both alcohol and drug dependency. The proportion of women admitted for alcohol dependency was 66 per cent, for drug dependency 30 per cent, and for both alcohol and drug dependency 4 per cent. At this stage there is no specialist group working on a programme for women who are addicted to alcohol or drugs. There are plans on the drawing board for such work to be undertaken, but at this stage no funds are available.

I urge the Minister to ensure that in the forthcoming Budget the necessary funds are made available for special programmes to be established for women. The Board has had a stand-still budget for two years, and it is quite impossible to expect the Board's work to be effectively carried out in the face of growing problems if that stand-still budget is maintained. It is worth noting the following facts: Alcoholics Anonymous has indicated that there are now more than 30 000 female alcoholics in Adelaide and that 30 per cent of that number are in the 16 to 30-year-old age group. That information was contained in an article in the *Sunday Mail* on 9 October 1983—it is a frightening piece of information.

Other information that should be noted by members of the House, the Government and the general public concerns the fact that somewhere between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of patients in hospital beds are there because they are suffering from medical conditions related to alcohol. The Minister of Health put the figure at 20 per cent when speaking in the debate in another place. Professor G. Edwards, who is a leading United Kingdom drug authority, is reported in the *Advertiser* on 31 July 1982 as having put the figure at 30 per cent. He also stressed that great improvements in medical education were needed if this problem was to be tackled effectively.

There is a teenage drinking crisis in Australia. The New South Wales drug authority reported last year that underage drinking was at crisis point, with 90 per cent of New South Wales children between the ages of 12 and 16 claiming that they drink alcohol once a week, and with 20 per cent claiming to drink twice a week. It is a similar story in other States. Mr Max Kau, of the South Australian Service to Youth Council, has confirmed that the South Australian position is just as bad. The *Australian* of 19 March 1982 contained an article about alcohol costs to the community and stated:

> Alcohol is estimated to be costing Australian industry $100 million a year.

The article points out that workers compensation premiums, industrial safety, manufacturing efficiency and marketing are all severely affected, and that a $100 million cost to industry may very well be a conservative estimate. At least 10 per cent of the male work force is believed to have an alcohol problem, and the number of women drinkers is increasing. I believe that that is a point that was substantiated by the now notorious ANOP drug survey that was authorised by the discredited Minister of Health.

I return to the public drunkenness aspect of the Bill. During the Minister's second reading explanation and the debate in another place not a great deal was said about the justification for the abolition of public drunkenness. However, anyone who wants to understand the justification will find it upon reading the report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, commonly referred to as the Mitchell Committee. The first report deals with this problem. In his speech on the Police Offences Act Amendment Bill and the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act Amendment Bill on 1 December 1976 (*Hansard*, page 257), the then Minister of Health, Mr Don Banfield, quoted extensively from Justice Mitchell's report, because he considered that it provided a succinct and persuasive justification for the two Bills then before the House. Key points were made as follows:

> A term of imprisonment appears to have no general or particular deterrent effect upon drunkards. It cannot be seriously suggested that the short term of imprisonment imposed has a rehabilitative effect. It may and often does regenerate the health of the convicted alcoholic. While in prison he has no access to alcohol, is fed regularly and housed. If drunkenness in a public place ceased to be an offence there arises a need for some means of dealing with persons found drunk in public. There are several reasons for this. On humanitarian grounds the drunk should not be left to be run over by passing traffic or assaulted and robbed. The passing motorist should not be required to negotiate a street in which a drunk is lying or weaving his way. The drunk should not be left to die from malnutrition or excess of alcohol. Public order and decorum require that persons who through drunkenness have become an offensive spectacle should be removed from public sight.

Not one of us would not endorse that view. Further on in his speech the former Minister quoted the then Federal Minister for Health, Dr Everingham, who I presume had provided to the House of Representatives figures relating to alcohol abuse. He said:

> Alcohol abuse can be said to be the direct cause of: occupancy of one in five hospital beds—

that reinforces the 20 per cent figure used by the Minister of Health—

> one in five battered children; one in five drownings and submersion cases; two in five divorces and judicial separation cases; about half the serious crimes in the whole community; half the deaths from road crashes; half the deaths from pancreatic disease; and two of three deaths from cirrhosis of the liver (one in 40 of all deaths); reduced resistance to a wide range of illnesses; and a loss of half the working hours of the 'alcoholic' group after the age of 45 years.

In the face of all that, one cannot keep an organisation that is supposed to deal with this monolithic problem on a stand-still budget for three years running. It is not a moral thing to do, and the new council must be given the resources to cope with the enormous job it is facing. I conclude by expressing some concern about the way in which this Bill has modified the original Draconian provisions regarding the civil liberties that are affected when Parliament gives to the police powers of detention for up to 10 hours involving someone who has not committed a crime and who is to be held in custody as a result of this Bill.

I realise that 10 hours was chosen because it provided the need to accommodate police shift requirements. Nevertheless, 10 hours is a long time to be deprived of one's liberty even if one is insensible and has not committed a crime. This legislation must not be allowed to be used by the police as a convenient substitute for arrest, with all the consequent paper work necessary for the court appearance that follows. I am surprised that there appears to have been no comment on this Bill from the Council for Civil Liberties. I notice that comments on civil liberties are very muted when the Labor Government introduces legislation but very loud when the Liberal Government introduces legislation, or a measure that impairs the civil liberty of a subject.

I am told that the police maintain that this legislation will not alter their current procedures. I believe that it is important that very close monitoring take place to ensure that that is the case. I stress the great need for education and training of police in the conduct of their duties under this legislation, because I believe that in other States there is not a satisfactory situation, and I hope that in South Australia we can do a great deal better than has been done interstate. With those remarks, and with my best wishes to the new council that will carry on the excellent work of the existing Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, I am pleased to support the Bill.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I congratulate my colleague the member for Coles on her superb exposition of many of the major facets associated with the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board and the issue of public drunkenness. I rise to express my point of view regarding public drunkenness, which involves one of the major provisions in the Bill. It has been my observation over a number of years that the 'live and let live' philosophy concerning drunkenness has become more and more apparent. It is a sad indictment on Adelaide and on the community's attitude that we allow the decoration of our parklands with a large number of bodies in various states of inebriation. My colleague the member for Coles mentioned the question of civil liberties. Along with the decriminalising of drunkenness, there is the problem of how to cope with the vast numbers of people who have no home, no work and who spend all their money on alcohol. These people rarely eat and have few friends, except when they have a bottle.

In this day and age we find that the best solution is to leave them alone to rot and die, often at a very early age. I can point out some characters in Hindley Street or Victoria Square who have been there for many years, and I doubt whether they will last many years hence. I question our sense of values when we not only allow this situation to continue but also, and just as importantly, allow these people to be present in some of our major areas of attraction. I know that the Minister of Tourism and the shadow Minister of Tourism must be very concerned that some of Adelaide's most beautiful parks and gardens are frequented by a number of people under the influence of alcohol.

The police readily admit that 20 years ago they used to take a paddy waggon out and pick up these individuals, take them to the lock-up for the night, and in the morning take them before a magistrate. The magistrate would prescribe one day in gaol or a fine, which invariably could not be paid, and the drunk may then spend up to a week in gaol. During that time the person at least had clean sheets, something to eat and did not have alcohol—that was important. Today we are more forward thinking and believe that they should decorate our parks and die on the streets because they have some right to do so. It is a sad reflection on our sense of values. While I believe that there is a civil libertarian argument in this situation, there is also an argument that certain people demand attention from the Government. This is one such area.

The Bill provides for the police to do the dirty job they have done for a number of years. As members are aware, it is a job with very little thanks and many hazards. Every member knows that a policeman who has to pick up a drunk risks assault, having to clean his clothes and be confronted with a serious situation, which may include epilepsy involving the drunk. There are many problems associated with picking up a person under the influence of alcohol. I suggest that all members of both sides of the House should go out in a police van one night when drunks need attention. Members would then understand and think about the plight of the police in connection with drunks.

I raise this matter seriously, because it has been shown that the number of people under the influence of alcohol picked up by the police has fallen dramatically. Twenty years ago the police may have picked up 100 people at a time and taken them to the cells. Today they pick up only those who are of nuisance value on the streets. I contend that this Bill will mean that very few people will use the facilities of the centre being made available. Police have no power to arrest: they have power to apprehend. The drunks concerned are not committing a crime. Do the police, who are supposed to exercise law and order and enforce our laws, also have to enforce a non-law?

I call this a non-law. On the one hand, we say that a person is not guilty of an offence, with which I agree. On the other hand, we say that the police must have powers of apprehension to take those people who are causing a nuisance into custody. Whilst on occasions there may be as many as 20 persons a night involved, I can imagine that in the next few years the number of people who are actually taken into custody, taken home or to a friend's place will decline even further.

Where does that really leave us? It leaves us with a vast number of alcoholics, and that number will grow. They will have no protection or alternative means of treatment unless they take themselves to the treatment centre. I welcome the move for higher forms of treatment for the people concerned, but the mechanism will not be available to get them to that venue. Whilst it has been suggested that the police attitude will not change, I can tell the House categorically that it has changed dramatically over a number of years and will continue to do so. It is only in those extreme cases where the person who has offended in association with his or her drunkenness will be taken to the sobering-up centre. I believe that that situation is an indictment on us.

I have grappled with this problem for a number of years. Do we charge people with offences, give them a clean sheet and a bed for a night, take them off alcohol for a time, or do we prescribe measures like this? I, like members on both sides of the House, believe that drunkenness is not an offence. However, I err on the side of practicality which says we must do something that is a little more than we are doing by simply decriminalising the offence. It may be that in one or two years time that happens, but people will continue to present a problem in that way, their numbers growing in the parklands and other public places. We will be forced to organise a group of people to go around collecting certain individuals to at least provide them with some refuge for the night. I conclude on that note.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Clause 2 provides that this measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. I realise that the Minister is at a disadvantage because no officers are present, but I am

interested to know when the Government intends that the Act will come into operation. During the term of office of the previous Government when Budget time was approaching I repeatedly sought to ascertain the attitude of the Alcohol and Drugs Addicts (Treatment) Board to implementing the legislation on abolition of public drunkenness, because we knew that the implementation of the legislation would cost $200 000 per annum, which is a very large sum of money.

I acknowledge that, in the time that has elapsed, lack of opposition to the move and the need, having adopted the Mitchell Committee's recommendations, to implement them rather than just pay lip service to them requires action at some date. But, at the same time, the points I made in quoting the facts provided by the former Federal Minister for Health (Dr Everingham) about the hideous consequences of alcoholism throughout the community made one wonder about the priorities. If about eight or 10 drunks are picked up each day, as I understand it, that should be measured against the need for treatment of those hundreds and thousands of people and their dependants who are suffering from alcohol and drug addiction.

One is placed in something of a dilemma as to priorities. It is very easy for doctors in neo-natal units to appear on front pages of newspapers photographed with appealing little babies and asking for funds. It is not appealing in any way for a photograph of a drunk to be placed on a front page of a paper, because we know full well that it would not elicit much in the way of public funds. So, can the Minister advise the Committee when the legislation will be proclaimed? From that date onwards the $200 000 will have to start to flow.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That is a very good question. When my colleague in another place was asked a similar question he said it would be immediately after the Budget was determined, so long as the money was made available.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It's still contingent on that?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, that is the situation. One is hopeful that the money will be made available, because as the honourable member pointed out it is vital work and needs to be done.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I simply wish to make the point that this clause as it stands identifies a drug as any substance declared to be a drug for the purposes of this Act. It is an improvement on the Bill as it was originally introduced, and the Opposition in both Houses is certainly grateful for the Minister's agreement to the amendment moved by my colleague the Hon. John Burdett which gives Parliament greater power over this aspect than it would have had if a drug was simply a substance declared by proclamation.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1984

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 May at 2 p.m.