

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 28 February 1980

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

PUBLICITY AND DESIGN SERVICE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Government Publicity and Design Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I understand that this morning staff members of the Government Publicity and Design Service, the office and equipment of which is situated on the 12th floor of the Grenfell Centre, were told that the service was to be disbanded. This service has provided skills for use by Government departments in their various essential publicity and promotional efforts. The service also processes all Government advertisements.

Until recently it also produced the prestigious quarterly publication *Vantage*, which was one of the first casualties of the Tonkin Government. The service brought together a variety of professional talent: artists, graphic designers, photographers, journalists and researchers to provide a central pool of talent on which the entire Public Service could draw. It was economical, it had a high reputation in the trade, and it was efficient. Some recent publications produced by the service have drawn the highest critical esteem: for example, the *Bulletin of the Art Gallery of South Australia*, produced in 1977; the *Hans Heysen Centenary Retrospective*, which was produced some time ago; and a publication produced for an exhibition that is due to begin shortly at the Art Gallery, *Leonardo, Michelangelo and the Century of Genius*. All these publications are well known and well acclaimed for their quality.

Apparently, although nothing as yet has been spelt out to the staff—who were only informed of the decision this morning—they will be split up and dispersed throughout the Government—a photographer here, an artist there, and a journalist somewhere else. Clearly, a team of this kind needs to work together, and if it is split up into various Government departments it will be completely ineffective. I understand that this dismantling was approved by Cabinet, and I suppose the Government will say that it is in the interests of economy or in the interests of its commitment to free enterprise.

I suggest that it is probably just its commitment to free enterprise, because any argument based on economy does not stand up. The Publicity and Design Service works for a margin of only 10 per cent: can the Government maintain that the work that the service does at present could be done by private enterprise for a margin of only 10 per cent? A tremendous amount of its output is for the Tourist Bureau, which has traditionally had a close relationship with the service. In fact, the Publicity and Design Service used to be located in the Tourist Bureau building.

Work handed over to private advertising agencies would cost far more than 10 per cent and would inevitably (and this is an important matter that the Government has not taken into account) go to other States, because many of these agencies operate from an interstate base. The budget for tourist publicity will go sky high if this plan is carried through. Members of the staff do not know where they

stand. Apparently, word of their plight came this morning from the Director-General of the Premier's Department, who told them about it and then left for Melbourne, leaving them to contemplate the result.

It is clear, if my information is correct, that this efficient group will be broken up and dispersed throughout the Public Service. Presumably, these people will not be able to use their skills if they are dispersed in other areas throughout the Public Service because they will not be part of a team. So, rather than save money, this will clearly cost the Government more than it currently contemplates, because these people will not be able to do useful work, and apparently the work that they did will be let out to private interests. So that, in addition to such work costing more through private interests, these people who are permanently on staff will be dispersed throughout the Government service and unable to carry out their trade or profession or to use their skills.

It seems that this is the first of such Government enterprises to suffer at the hands of this Government's commitment to hand matters back to the private sector willy-nilly, irrespective of whether or not a cost benefit is involved.

First, has a decision been taken to dismantle the Publicity and Design Service's design team? Secondly, why was it decided this week to dismantle this Government body, particularly as this team has been so effective in producing Government publications of a high standard?

Thirdly, who will now perform the work previously done by this design team? Fourthly, before the decision was taken, was any analysis carried out of the comparative costs of work done by the existing Government team and other sources and, if so, what was the result?

Finally, what will be the duties of these personnel in other departments? How can their talents be utilised when dispersed throughout Government services?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Publicity and Design Service is under the direct responsibility of the Premier, to whom I will refer the honourable member's questions and bring back a reply.

FESTIVAL OF ARTS

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Arts a question about the Festival of Arts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The *Sunday Mail* of 24 February 1980 contains the following report on page 3, under the heading "Festival reaches crisis point":

Sharply declining attendance figures and a growing budget seem to indicate that the Adelaide Festival has reached saturation point.

The basis for this article was a book entitled *The Festival: The Story of the Adelaide Festival of Arts*, by Dr. Derek Whitelock, which is due for release in early March. However, there appeared to be little in the article to justify the headline. Would the Minister care to comment on this article and, more particularly, comment on the level of bookings for the 1980 Festival of Arts? Also, will he indicate whether these bookings are, in his opinion, at a satisfactory level?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I believe that the article did create some pessimism amongst art enthusiasts in this State, and there were not really any grounds for that. I asked my department to inform me, after I had read the article, as to the current state of bookings for the Adelaide Festival of Arts. It would appear that the percentage of

bookings which the Adelaide Festival of Arts Board has set for the festival at this stage is the same as the actual bookings which were obtained for the 1978 festival. Compared with the 1978 bookings, the proportion of bookings is practically the same. Bearing in mind the economic position in South Australia, and considering that some of the costs for the current festival are quite understandably higher than those in 1978, I do not believe that there are any grounds for pessimism. It must be acknowledged that some people leave their bookings a little late, while other people wait until the reviews come out before they make their choice as to which performances they should attend.

I am quite confident that the arrangements for the Adelaide Festival, as far as the bookings are concerned, are going very well indeed. Honourable members know that Parliament is going to rise in two weeks to give them an opportunity to involve themselves in the festival and attend many performances, which I am sure they will enjoy. It is my wish to see the many happy faces of honourable members at the various festival functions in two or three weeks time.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Blevins. I have asked for order and I intend to have order when I call for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a personal explanation, as I was misrepresented by the Minister of Agriculture in the House of Assembly yesterday.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yesterday, in the House of Assembly, the Minister attacked my wife and myself in a number of inaccurate statements. I wish to set the record straight by giving a factual account of the events surrounding the refusal of the Minister to release an audio-visual kit on dry land farming techniques and his actions with regard to Chinese translations of two books on South Australian farming practices authorised by me.

I do not wish (and, of course, Mr. President, I am not allowed by Standing Orders) to debate the motives of the Minister in this matter, but I am sure the facts will speak for themselves and underline the maliciousness which the Minister exposes in his attack on me in the other House.

In regard to the audio-visual kit, the history of this matter is quite simple. Last year, I went overseas on a trade mission to West Asia and North Africa. This mission was very successful, and the present Minister (after a false start or two) has been quick to become associated with some of the initiatives of that journey. My wife accompanied me on that journey, as is the normal practice.

In my discussions with Ministers and senior officials associated with agricultural policy-making in those regions, it became obvious that almost all the technical literature we had supplied to these countries in English, French and Arabic had failed to answer their particular problems. This is not a criticism of the officers who wrote the material. The problem was that they had written the texts from the point of view of Australian farmers, and they took for granted an acceptance of agricultural practices that are still quite foreign to our potential client countries.

My wife, who is a very well qualified rural journalist and who worked for many years with the A.B.C., made extensive notes on the questions that were fired at me and my replies. When we returned to Australia she began to rewrite the script of an audio-visual kit that had been prepared on dry land farming. Although about 80 per cent of the original script was rewritten, that is totally irrelevant, because what she successfully did was change the kit from one for an Australian audience to one for a specific overseas audience. While the script was written in her own time in the evenings and at weekends, by the time of the election there was still considerable work to be done in editing and polishing the final draft.

The Director-General of Agriculture rang my wife to say that it had been decided to continue with the kit after the election and to translate it into French for North Africa and Arabic for West Asia and would my wife continue to have an input into its preparation. He also talked over the matter with me. My wife readily agreed to go on with the kit and it was clearly understood by all concerned that it would be available for me to take when we went overseas privately in December.

I know that Liberal members will find my wife's agreement to continue this work hard to believe, having spent all their period in Opposition rubbishing the State, but my wife was quite prepared to assist in the preparation of material that would further promote our agricultural technology. She continued to work on the kit, translations were arranged, and we were constantly assured that we could take the kit with us to present as a gift to Ministers of Agriculture and senior officials.

On Friday 14 December my wife telephoned the Department of Agriculture to notify a time for collection of the kits, only to be informed that they had been confiscated by the Director-General and locked in his room. No explanation was available. I telephoned the Director-General to see whether this incredible story was true and was told that there was no reason: it was the order of the Minister.

Naturally, I telephoned the Minister to see whether I could obtain an explanation for this seemingly irrational behaviour, but he merely said that he wanted to look at the kits, despite the fact that the English version had been in the department for three weeks. It was at this stage that the Minister took action to divert attention from his own clumsiness in handling the issue and brought up the red herring of copyright. I told the Minister it was paradoxical that the kit was to be made available to a wide audience and the only person specifically denied access to it was the author, my wife. I said we would have to consult legal opinion as to whether my wife could not claim, under copyright, access to her own material that was being denied her. The Minister chose to interpret this as a threat, and obtained a Crown law opinion.

He tabled this opinion and some handwritten notes of the Director-General of Agriculture yesterday in the House of Assembly with many amateur Perry Mason-like flourishes. I am sure the Crown Law opinion is very good but, of course, it is based on misleading information.

My wife and I left for North Africa on Monday 17 December at 5.20 p.m. from Adelaide. At no time had the Minister made any attempt to see the kit or to get it to me, even though almost four days had passed since he had confiscated it in order to check that it was free from political content, or whatever it was that he suspected.

My wife and I had a very successful journey through Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The reaction to the news of the confiscation varied in different countries. Some Ministers and officers merely laughed and dismissed it as a new inexperienced Minister trying to assert his authority

but making a fool of himself, but others took it as a hostile act, similar to the denial of technology to the Russians by the Americans. Obviously the new Government is totally unaware of how sensitive the issue of technological transfer is, and how easy it is to damage the good image of South Australia in this field.

Soon after I returned to South Australia, I received a letter from the Premier in reply to my complaint that the Minister of Agriculture was denying me the opportunity to promote South Australia overseas. It was obvious that the Minister of Agriculture had by then seen the kit and had at last understood that it was a purely technical explanation of the South Australian farming system designed to promote the use of South Australian technological and agricultural inputs. I assume that the Government agreed on the desirability of distributing it widely, because the Premier wrote to me:

Officers of the Department of Agriculture will ensure distribution of the material to the appropriate people, and copies can be forwarded when available to the appropriate contacts nominated by you.

I also assume that the Premier took this action to get out of the incredible bungle created by the Minister and get the kits moving to influential people overseas.

A further confirmation of this policy is a letter I received a few days ago from the Director-General of Agriculture confirming that the kit had been sent to one of the people I nominated. The Premier and the Director-General seem to be doing what they can to end the farrago of fantasy built up by the Minister and continued by him in the press after I left Australia.

But from yesterday's performance it seems he is determined to pursue the matter until his foolishness is exposed to all. The second matter that the Minister raised yesterday was the question of the farming books translated into Chinese for the Chinese.

The decision to translate these books was taken by me early in 1979 as it became increasingly obvious that China was interested in our agricultural technology. The Chinese Vice-Minister for Agricultural Machinery visited South Australia that year and I was able to give him an advance copy of the book on pasture seed which, together with a film on dry land farming with a Chinese sound track, made a very favourable impression. He was travelling throughout Australia but we were the only State to take the trouble to translate anything into Chinese, and we received extremely high praise from the Department of Trade and Resources for this initiative.

Indeed, this was an important factor in the Federal Government's decision to pay half the cost of the translation. This considerable lead by South Australia has now been squandered away, as I saw last week in the *National Times* that the Victorian Development Corporation is now advertising in Chinese. For the benefit of the Government, I hasten to add that these advertisements are appearing in China.

It seems that part of the difficulty the Minister of Agriculture has had over the objective of the books is that neither he nor his colleagues seem to understand that Chinese is the language of China. I was shocked yesterday to find that Mr. Gunn, when asking the arranged question that set the Minister off, said:

Many people were interested in these particular publications but when they sought to read them they found that unfortunately they were printed in Chinese and were of very little, if any, benefit.

The Minister responded:

The particular books in question were written in Chinese and were of no use whatever to our South Australian based primary producers.

Further, I received an answer to a question on the matter of their distribution, as follows:

There has been great difficulty in disposing of the vast number of books printed in Chinese without promoting courses in the Chinese language.

That answer came, as honourable members will recall, from the lips of the Minister of Community Welfare. My personal explanation of the matter is that the present Government should understand that the Chinese speak Chinese. Chinese farmers and agricultural officials speak Chinese and these books were printed for their benefit. There are 800 000 000 Chinese, and about 80 per cent of them are involved in agriculture. The books, incidentally, have been available in English for Australian farmers for some years.

The Minister said that the books were extremely costly to produce and has implied that my decision to translate them was extravagant. Let me repeat that the Commonwealth Government was so impressed with the initiative taken that it contributed a substantial sum towards the cost of translation. Secondly, if the books had been distributed, as I had arranged with the Chinese Embassy, it would have been possible to claim a considerable part of the remaining cost—perhaps 60 per cent—from the export development grant scheme through SALGER.

I am sure that the Minister's "embarrassment" at the cost of the books will be dissipated when he gets moving and distributes the books as he now claims he will, and no doubt the people of South Australia will benefit from the trade opportunities that the transfer of technology will create.

The Minister asks why I keep raising the matter of the Chinese translation. The answer to that question is very simple; it is in order to achieve the results that I have achieved in getting the Minister to take action on this distribution.

Finally, the Minister of Agriculture and his colleague Mr. Gunn had already acquired in Opposition an unsavoury reputation for using Parliamentary privilege to make contemptible attacks on my wife. I am disappointed that on acquiring the title of a Minister of the Crown Mr. Chapman has not acquired the sense of responsibility that normally goes with that office. I do not intend to reply to these attacks in any detail but merely state that they say more about his and Mr. Gunn's own insecurity with intelligent women than about any charges he is attempting to fabricate.

STATE PREFERENCES

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier as Minister of State Development, a question about State preferences.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I wish to refer to the practice of State Governments and their statutory and local authorities granting ever-increasing preference to locally made products under their official purchasing policies.

For many years Queensland has been the most protectionist-minded State in Australia. In that State a local manufacturing company receives a 10 per cent preference when it tenders to Government departments, and a further 5 per cent is added if the company is located in a non-metropolitan area. This policy also extends to statutory authorities. The Brisbane City Council grants a flat 10 per cent.

As in international trade, when one country puts up

tariff barriers, other countries tend to follow suit. This has happened within Australia, and each State now grants preferences of at least 10 per cent to local suppliers to its respective Government departments, albeit to a slightly lesser extent than Queensland. At the Premiers' Conference in 1978 Mr. Hamer said that the Victorian Government had decided with great reluctance to give preference to local manufacturers tendering for public contracts. Mr. Hamer urged other States to revoke their existing schemes so that manufacturing companies within Australia could operate in a competitive environment and achieve some economy of scale.

Mr. Hamer added that the application of preferences would be made on a reciprocal basis with individual States, and, if any State was willing to abolish its preference scheme, Victoria would do likewise. As far as I am aware, Mr. Hamer's plea has fallen on deaf ears. I suggested to the previous Government, in this Council, that since South Australia annually sends about \$700 000 000 of manufactured products (on a value added basis) to other States, and, since we are a net exporter to Victoria, it must be in our interests to take up Mr. Hamer's offer. In a written reply, Mr. Dunstan agreed with my argument, but nothing eventuated.

Does the Minister agree with the system of State preferences, or does he believe that they hinder manufacturing industry and that it is a short sighted system in a country with a small population located in centres geographically remote from one another? Secondly, does the Minister agree that the cost of interstate freight which is constantly increasing because of fuel charges should in most instances provide sufficient protection for local manufacturers? Thirdly, will the Minister accept the invitation extended by Mr. Hamer and negotiate to abolish State preferences on a reciprocal basis between South Australia and Victoria?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of State Development and bring down a reply.

PUBLICITY AND DESIGN SERVICE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Although I realise that the Attorney-General is not the Minister directly responsible for the Publicity and Design Services Division, I believe that he does hold a position in Cabinet, although one could be excused for thinking that that is not the case, given the distinct lack of information that the Attorney gives the Council on behalf of Cabinet. As a member of Cabinet and as Leader of the Government in the Council, can the Attorney-General say whether Cabinet has taken a decision to dismantle the Publicity and Design Services Division? If it has, for what reason was it dismantled?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have already indicated that the Premier is the Minister responsible for the Government Publicity and Design Services Division, and I intend to refer the Leader's question to him. As the responsible Minister, the Premier will then be able to give an appropriate reply.

NATURAL RADIATION

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about natural radiation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Like many other people, I was surprised to learn recently that we are all exposed to a certain amount of natural radiation and radioactivity from various materials in the environment. According to an article on the front page of the *Advertiser* yesterday (27 February) this includes cosmic radiation and radiation from "the ground, the buildings we live in, the air we breathe and the food and water we consume", as well as man-made radiation such as X-rays. I understand that in some countries and in some States of Australia this natural radiation has been measured in relevant places.

As the Government is apparently contemplating the mining of uranium in South Australia, which will of itself create and diffuse radiation and radioactivity, which in turn will add to the natural radiation to which we are already exposed, will the Government consider initiating an inquiry into natural radiation in South Australia and make the information public?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring back a reply.

DEPARTMENT SEPARATION COSTS

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (1 November).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Details of requirements have not been determined for the project. However, from information available, commissioning is estimated to cost in the region of \$45 000.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment, a question regarding the Coast Protection Board.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I was recently contacted by a constituent who was very distressed about a proposal to build a large bitumen car park on the Bluff at Victor Harbor. The construction is apparently to be undertaken by the Victor Harbor District Council with the full support of the Coast Protection Board. Indeed, the board has apparently allocated quite a large sum of money to assist with its construction.

According to my constituent, the car park is to be built right on the skyline or saddle of the Bluff. It will be a 64 m by 40 m sea of bitumen, clearly visible from the Encounter Bay and Victor Harbor areas. The Bluff is generally considered to be a natural geological wonder and part of our priceless national heritage. However, the environmental outrages of the plan do not stop there. Apparently, the plan shows a circular lawn area surrounded by paving, a roofed seating area facing the prevailing wind, a flower bed, litter bins, seats, and, astonishingly, shade trees.

Of course, the site is far too cold and windy for picnickers, and it is laughable to suggest that shade trees could be grown. All that could perhaps be grown in that area would be a few very hardy native shrubs, but certainly not shade trees.

The cost of this plan could be as much as \$19 000. Toilet facilities have also been discussed at further cost of \$6 000 to \$10 000. Of course, this matter raises the much wider question of the role of the Coast Protection Board, which was originally established to advise the Minister. Perhaps more important, it was a device under the small statutory authorities arrangement to borrow money. At present, it has a total of about \$1 500 000 to spend on coast

protection work annually.

The Act envisaged that some of this money could be allocated for foreshore work associated with coast protection. However, it was never intended that the board should be the principal provider in South Australia of car parks and toilets.

The board has now become something of a monster. Almost 40 per cent of its funds are allocated either directly or indirectly to foreshore development, which in many cases is quite unrelated to coast protection. People no longer talk of negotiating with the Minister, the Department for the Environment, or the Coast Protection Division: they now refer to approaching or negotiating with the board.

In negotiating with local councils particularly, the board frequently raises hopes regarding funding, and gives assurances to such a degree that, by the time recommendations arrive on the Minister's desk, there is enormous pressure on him to approve them. In short, the board has become a monster. I was well aware of this during my brief period as Minister, and I was moving as rapidly as possible to correct what I believed was a most undesirable situation.

I therefore ask the Minister how much money the Coast Protection Board has allocated to the Bluff project at Victor Harbor. Secondly, will the Minister take whatever steps are necessary immediately to stop work from commencing while the project is reassessed? Thirdly, will the Minister take urgent steps to ensure that the Coast Protection Division of the Department for the Environment is given real, as well as nominal, control of coast protection in South Australia?

Fourthly, will the Minister restructure the Coast Protection Board to ensure that it fulfils an advisory role only? Fifthly, will he ensure that the board no longer involves itself in foreshore development work, especially car parks and toilets?

Sixthly, will the Minister take active steps to ensure that local councils in particular, and the public generally, are made aware of who is in charge of coast protection in South Australia? Finally, if foreshore development works are to proceed, will the Minister ensure that the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs is involved and that these developments are divorced from direct involvement with the Coast Protection Board?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: This "monster", the Coast Protection Board, was set up by the former Government.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I am aware of that. Don't insult my intelligence.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is a sensible thing to say that this monster, about which the honourable member is now complaining—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I was complaining about it while I was Minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:—was set up by the former Government, and the Opposition now seems to be worried about the result. I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I am sick and tired of not being able to hear anything while that damn Minister sits there and mumbles away. He is a damn nuisance. Get him out of the place for 10 minutes; it will do him good.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope that there is no further outburst like that, or I may have to take action in relation to putting someone out. This afternoon's behaviour by some Ministers and former Ministers, who should at least

know that, when they are called to order, they should come to order, and present some sense of decorum, is quite incredible.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Mr. Foster loudly shouted the words "damn nuisance". That language is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the matter has been resolved, and we will leave it at that.

PUBLICITY AND DESIGN SERVICE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Leader of the Government in the Council a further question regarding the Publicity and Design Services Division.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Council will recall that my first question to the Leader of the Government today related to whether or not the Government had decided to dismantle the Publicity and Design Services team, which is currently a part of the State Government. In addition to that, I asked some further questions that perhaps required a little more detail to be obtained. I wanted to know, if such a decision had been taken, why it had been taken, and who would perform the work previously done by the team. I also asked whether any analysis of cost benefit was carried out, and what the duties of the personnel transferred would be in future.

I realise that, in that question, there are a number of matters to which perhaps the Leader of the Government could not be expected to know detailed answers. So, to accommodate the Minister, after he had replied that it was completely a matter for the Premier and that he did not know anything about it, I said that I would simplify things for him. I then asked two quite simple questions, one of which was whether Cabinet had decided to dismantle the Publicity and Design Services Division and, if it had, what was the reason therefor. Apparently, that, too, was too much for the Leader of the Government, who does not know whether that decision has been taken. As I said previously, the Minister is a member of Cabinet, as Attorneys-General usually are, and Leader of the Government in the Council. One would therefore at least expect him to have a cursory idea of what happens in Cabinet. Apparently, however, that question was a little too much for the Leader of the Government also.

I should therefore like to simplify the matter even further by asking the Leader of the Government, first, whether he was at a Cabinet meeting at which the future of the Publicity and Design Services Division was discussed and, secondly (and I will keep it very simple), whether he can answer the simple question whether a decision was taken to dismantle the Publicity and Design Services Division.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have at no stage indicated to the Leader that I did not know whether or not any matter had been discussed or decided. The point which I tried to make, but which did not appear to sink into the Leader, was that the Publicity and Design Services Division is responsible to the Premier and, as this is a matter for which the Premier is responsible, and because of the complexity of the preamble that preceded the questions, and the questions themselves, it is a matter on which the Premier ought to be able to express a view.

I am not prepared to tell the Leader of the Opposition whether or not I was at any particular Cabinet meeting or what was discussed at a Cabinet meeting. The Hon. Mr. Sumner knows that the matters discussed at Cabinet

meetings are confidential until they are made known publicly by the responsible Minister.

BERRI ROAD BRIDGE

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about the provision of a road bridge at Berri.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Mr. Arnold, now the Minister of Water Resources and the member for the area of the State referred to, stated in his policy speech during the last election campaign that the building of a bridge over the Murray River at Berri was a matter of great urgency. Those of us who have visited Berri know that it is a very active and thriving community in the midst of other large thriving towns. Berri seems to be accepted as the regional centre of the area, and the South Australian Government has given approval on a number of occasions for the construction of regional offices in Berri.

Loxton is a large thriving town a few miles distant. One can travel from Berri to Loxton by road the long way around. However, one can cross the river by punt not far from the main street of Berri but it is slow and at busy times one faces a tedious wait. No doubt Mr. Arnold was right in advocating the immediate construction of a river bridge for Berri. What action has been taken to implement that promise? If no action has been taken, when does the Government consider some action likely?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring back a reply.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Housing a question about Housing Trust rentals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The recent announcement by the Minister of the Housing Trust's subsidised rental scheme has generally been well received. I say "generally" because there have been a couple of criticisms of not so much the scheme but the limits placed on the scheme. In today's *Advertiser* a group known as the low-income housing forum made some criticism on the basis that the Highways Department owns a large number of homes which, at times, are empty for long periods. The low-income housing forum has made a suggestion that the Housing Trust could take over these empty homes from the Highways Department and use them within a scheme of subsidised rental homes. On the surface, that idea has some appeal. The only other point of criticism that I have heard so far came from the Secretary of the Plasterers Union. Mr. Carroll commented that the Housing Trust had, in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, large numbers of homes built for sale which it had been unable to sell and which are therefore empty. It appeared to that union (and this has some appeal also) that these homes could be incorporated into the trust's scheme, which I generally commend.

Has the Minister given any consideration to the proposals of the low-income housing forum for the Housing Trust to take over 700 homes owned by the Highways Department? Will the Minister provide the Council with details of houses built for sale by the Housing Trust in the metropolitan area which are not yet sold?

What is the longest period that any of the houses have remained unsold? Will the Minister confer with the Housing Trust with a view to having any unsold houses incorporated into the trust's subsidised rental scheme?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will seek the statistical information for which the honourable member has asked regarding numbers of houses held by the Highways Department as well as numbers of houses in the fringe suburbs which are completed and now available for sale and which, the honourable member suggests, as a result of publicity might be available for rental purposes. I believe that one or two points need clarifying. The scheme that was announced generally is a method by which some of the \$7 500 000, which the Commonwealth Government has made available to this State for rental assistance grants (and I stress the word "grants" as against normal loans or advances), can be used for the purpose of housing people who are in urgent need of accommodation. Particularly involved in that sector of the community are the very people who would be represented on the body that has written to the press today—the low-income group. These are the people whom the Commonwealth Government and I want to help. They, in the main, comprise the 15 000 people who are on the waiting list. They include age pensioners, and one-parent families—a group which is increasing in number. Indeed, 35 per cent of the names placed on the waiting list today comprise single-parent families.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Sole-parent families.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is right. The list also includes handicapped people, homeless youth, and so on. Indeed, the great challenge to the eighties facing the public housing authorities throughout Australia is to house these diverse low-income group people. However, when we endeavour to house them satisfactorily, it is very questionable whether we should go out into the fringe suburbs where the housing authorities in Australia have considerable numbers of unsold homes. It is the policy of the present Government that sole-parent families will not all be housed in the fringe suburbs. The Government does not want to see a position where all sole-parent families are in the same street in the fringe suburbs.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It might be the lesser of two evils.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It might be. In a dire emergency it would be seriously considered. While there are opportunities to obtain housing in the settled and established areas, the social aspect of housing such low-income people remains an important aspect and can be satisfied. Therefore, we are looking in established areas for houses which the Housing Trust is willing to rent at market value and which will be let to applicants at subsidised rentals. We believe that these people with that accommodation will be more happily settled and housed than if they were all placed in the new suburbs on the fringes of metropolitan Adelaide.

The social aspect of housing these people is a very important point. Regarding the Highways Department, negotiations are in train at present in which the Housing Trust may make arrangements with the Highways Department and, in effect, manage homes that are owned by that department. Members will recall that it is a fact of life that the Highways Department owns a great number of homes. This has been occasioned because, during the last 10 years of the Labor Government, that Government did purchase on the MATS routes in metropolitan Adelaide a lot of homes in its acquisition programme, because the Labor Government, during those 10 years, carried on the planning for the MATS scheme.

It is proper that the houses should be used to best

advantage and, again, this large number of welfare applicants should be considered as potential tenants for such homes. I will report back on what stage has been reached in negotiations regarding the trust's managing those houses owned by the Highways Department and I will bring down information regarding the number of houses still owned by the trust that have not yet been sold.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Will you look at the State Transport Authority, too?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: If the S.T.A. also is involved in ownership of any appreciable number of homes, I will bring that information down.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on the matter of dental technicians.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The previous Government indicated that it would be prepared to legislate to provide for the registration of dental technicians and also to provide for special courses and conditions for training dental technicians to become clinical dental technicians who would then be able to deal direct with the public.

I understand that legislation to put this into effect was in the process of being prepared before the election, but in the six months since then nothing further has been heard of this matter. I am sure the Minister of Health will be aware of the proposals that had been worked out by the previous Government in consultation with the Dental Technicians Association, the Dental Association, and other interested bodies. I ask the Minister whether the present Government will be proceeding with this matter of providing for registration of dental technicians and clinical

dental technicians and, if it does intend to proceed, will he say when the necessary legislation could be expected in Parliament?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and request a reply.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question concerning Roxby Downs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the Minister is aware, the defence, science and technology group of the Australian Parliamentary Library has produced a research paper which concludes that the Roxby Downs project would be economically viable without the sale of the uranium ore. The Government claims that this is not possible. Could the Minister indicate why he thinks the Federal Parliamentary Library report is wrong, and whether his information is based on sources independent of the mining companies themselves, which have a vested interest in misrepresentation?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 6 November about Public Service transfers?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to have the following answer inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is a reply to a question asked in the early part of the session that has been replied to by letter since.

Leave granted.

Officer	Transferred to	Section of Act Used	Remarks
J. P. Kunst	Department for the Environment	Section 57	—
F. Verlato	Department of the Public Service Board (seconded to Legal Services Commission)	Section 57	—
V. M. Drapac	Department of Local Government Initial transfer to State Libraries Division, then to Ethnic Affairs Division	—	Internal transfer. Ms. Drapac resigned in December 1979 to take up full-time studies.
G. Velardo	Department of Local Government	—	Internal transfer
N. Marovich	Department of Further Education	Section 57*	*At present in the Department of Further Education as extra assistance. To be transferred pursuant to section 57 following approval by Treasury that funds are available.

The PRESIDENT: Call on the business of the day.

WHEAT MARKETING BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is complementary to legislation of the Commonwealth and other States. It will allow the Australian Wheat Board to continue to exercise sole authority for the export and domestic marketing of wheat. The previous five-year plan

for wheat stabilization expired in 1979 and the new scheme will extend for five years until 1 October 1984. At the present time, certain basic elements of the new scheme are operating in South Australia by regulations made under the outgoing legislation. This transitional arrangement will cease to operate when the legislation proposed in this Bill becomes law. By far the most significant change proposed is the new guaranteed minimum delivery price that takes the place of the traditional first advance payment. This will be set at 95 per cent of the average of the pool returns for three years—for the past year, and the expected returns for the present year and the year ahead.

It is expected that the guaranteed minimum delivery price will provide relative income stability while providing the necessary price signals from the market place. Annual movements from one season to the next will be subject to a limit of 15 per cent. Any deficiency between the net pool return and the guaranteed minimum price will be met by the Commonwealth Government. The price of wheat for human consumption will be fixed by legislation for the year commencing 1 December 1979 at \$127.78 a tonne. In subsequent years it will be varied annually according to a formula. Movements in the price from year to year will be subject to a limit of 20 per cent.

The pricing formula is based on three principles. First, a degree of short-term isolation from sudden, large cost increases is provided. Secondly, price stability is incorporated by using a portion of the previous year's domestic and export prices in the formula. Thirdly, the formula is designed to give a price that will, over time, generally parallel longer-term price trends on international markets at a level approximating 20 per cent above export prices.

Production of wheat in Tasmania is insufficient to meet local requirements and the deficiency is made up with supplies from the mainland. In 1977-78 this amounted to 89 000 tonnes. The cost of the freight to Tasmania has been met by a levy on all human consumption wheat, and this has been a regular feature of wheat stabilization arrangements. The domestic market price for wheat for stockfeed and industrial purposes will be determined by the Australian Wheat Board and shall be the same throughout the Commonwealth at any one time. To assist the board in setting a price for stockfeed and industrial wheat, a consultative group will be established that will consist of producers and users of such wheat.

The prices set will not be subject to a ceiling, but a safeguard will be provided against inappropriate decisions by reviews of such decisions, if necessary, by Ministers at meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council. In the new five-year plan growers will be able to engage in grower to buyer transactions, provided they pay a share of the cost of handling facilities by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. They will be required to pay, also, other charges, such as the research levy and the grower fund deductions. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 to 4 are formal and clause 5 defines certain expressions used in the proposed Act. Clause 6 provides that the proposed Act is to operate subject to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act. Clause 7 will confer certain powers on the Australian Wheat Board, including power to receive and sell wheat delivered to it. Clause 8 provides that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is an authorised receiver and may enter into agreements with the Australian Wheat Board. Clause 9 provides that the Wheat Board is subject to the direction of the Commonwealth Minister in the exercise of its functions.

Clause 10 provides that the board may acquire wheat by delivery or by a notice demanding delivery. A notice cannot require a person to deliver wheat if it is retained on the farm for the grower's own use. Once delivered to the board, the wheat becomes the property of the board. Clause 11 deals with the delivery of wheat to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. Clause

12 provides that the proposed legislation is not to apply to seed wheat or inferior wheat which would not be acceptable to the board. Clause 13 will enable a person to obtain a permit to move wheat from one farm to another or to a mill for gristing.

Clause 14 is a new provision in the legislative scheme. Growers will be able to engage in grower to buyer transactions provided they pay a share of the cost of handling facilities by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. That cost will be determined by the board after consultation with the industry. Also the growers will pay other relevant charges such as the research levy and the grower fund deductions. Clause 15 will prohibit the selling of wheat without the written consent of the board. The old provision also prohibited the movement of wheat from the farm where it was grown. The new clause will allow the movement between farms owned by the same person by introducing a permit system for the movement. Clause 15 also introduces a new concept in prohibiting the use of wheat for purposes other than those which may be specified in the contract of sale.

Clause 16 provides that the advance payment made by the board shall be the guaranteed minimum price modified by allowances for quality, variety, locality, cost of transport, charges, and charges under the Wheat Tax Acts and the Wheat Levy Acts. If wheat is delivered after the final delivery day, an additional charge will be made based on additional administrative costs. Clause 17 provides for the final payment. Both clauses 16 and 17 are concerned with the seasons covered by the proposed legislation other than the last two; that is, the seasons for 1984 and 1985. A modified scheme for payment in those seasons is provided for in clause 18.

Clause 19 sets out ancillary provisions relevant to all payments. Clause 20 provides for the furnishing of declarations in relation to old season's wheat. Clause 21 fixes the price of wheat for human consumption for the year commencing 1 December 1979 at \$127.78 and provides a formula for the following years. There will be added to the price a charge to enable the board to meet the costs of shipment of wheat to Tasmania. This clause will also allow the board to determine the price of wheat for stockfeed and industrial use. Clause 22 provides for the keeping of special accounts by the board relating to dealings concerning Tasmania. Clause 23 provides for a quota season if it is necessary to declare such a season.

Clause 24 deals with the appointment of authorised persons for the purposes of the proposed legislation. Clause 25 empowers the board to require the furnishing of information relating to wheat and allied matters. Clause 26 requires persons in possession of wheat owned by the board to take proper care of it. Clause 27 provides that South Australia Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited shall notify the Australian Wheat Board of the proportion of the remuneration that is referable to capital expenditure after consultation with the grain section of United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated.

Clause 28 will empower an authorised person to enter premises for the purposes of searching for wheat and any documents in connection with wheat. They will not be allowed to enter any premises used for residential purposes without the consent of the occupier or a warrant from a justice of the peace. Also, authorised persons will be able to stop and detain any motor vehicle that contains wheat and demand the production of documents. They will also be able to seize wheat which they reasonably suspect is the property of the board or which has been lawfully demanded by the board. Clause 29 ensures that the board may apply its funds for the purposes of the joint Commonwealth-State scheme of which this proposed

legislation forms a part. Clause 30 provides a general penalty section in relation to offences created under the proposed Act. Clause 31 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the proposed Act.

Schedule 1 sets out the details by which the price of wheat for human consumption will be fixed. The formula for ascertaining the price of wheat for human consumption contains three groups of factors. The first allows the effects of sharp rises in wheatgrowing costs to be reflected in the price. The second includes last year's price and last year's export returns and provides both a degree of year-to-year stability and a direct association with world prices. The third part of the formula is a somewhat complex arrangement which, together with earlier parts, will ensure that the human consumption price will average over the longer run, although not necessarily in any one year, some 20 per cent over export parity.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to deal with a question that has been raised in relation to the marketing of oats. Section 14aa of the

principal Act makes it obligatory for growers to sell their oats to the board, subject however to the exceptions outlined in subsection (2) of that section. Subsection (2)(f) permits a direct sale between a grower and a purchaser "where the oats are not resold . . . otherwise than in a manufactured or processed form". The board has interpreted this provision as meaning that a grower can sell directly to a purchaser either where the purchaser processes the oats and resells them in the processed form or where the purchaser does not resell the oats at all, but simply purchases for his own consumption. Some doubts have been expressed about the correctness of this latter interpretation and the purpose of the present Bill is to put the matter beyond doubt. The Bill inserts a new paragraph in section 14aa(2) making it clear that a grower can sell oats directly to a purchaser where the purchaser buys the oats for his own consumption and not for resale.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes obsolete material from section 14 of the principal Act. Clause 3 amends section 14aa of the principal Act. The material amendment is the inclusion of new paragraph (g) which permits a grower to sell oats directly to a purchaser where the purchaser buys the oats for his own use and not for resale.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 4 March at 2.15 p.m.