

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 10 August 1982

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

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

By Command—

Mitcham District By-Election 8 May 1982—Statistical return of Voting.

Pursuant to Statute—

Electoral Act, 1929-1982—Regulations—General Revisions. 'Electoral Regulations, 1982'.

Highways Act, 1926-1979—Regulations—Goolwa—Hindmarsh Island Ferry.

Justices Act, 1921-1982—Rules—Forms.

Racing Act, 1976-1980—Rules of Trotting—Driving Changes.

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—

Mount Gambier
West Torrens.

Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982—Regulations—Transfers of Marketable Securities.

Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Supreme Court Rules—Civil Appeals and Fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Geographical Names Board of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.

Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1982—Regulations—Life Insurance Limits.

Waterworks Act, 1932-1981—Regulations—Fee for Encumbrance Certificates.

City of Adelaide—By-law No. 10—Street Traders.

District Council of Loxton—By-law No. 28—Traffic.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Forestry Act, 1950-1981—Proclamation—Forest Reserve Proclaimed.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading them, replies to questions without notice asked during the previous session. These replies have been sent to the respective members by letter. Leave granted.

GROUP APPRENTICESHIP SCHEME

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (9 June).

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: With reference to your question on 9 June 1982, concerning group apprenticeship schemes, particularly in relation to the Western Metropolitan Regional Organisation, I believe the following information will clarify the present situation for you.

The Western Metropolitan Regional Organisation (W.M.R.O.), which consists of the seven local councils of Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide, Thebarton, West Torrens and Woodville, does not currently operate a group apprenticeship scheme. A recent report on 'Local Employment Prospects' prepared for the W.M.R.O. by Dr Dorothy Cloher of INFODEC Consultancy recommended *inter alia*:

"... that representatives from Local, State and Federal Government, as well as private enterprise in the region,

consider a scheme in which the Western Regional Metropolitan Organisation constitute itself as group employer for the purpose of establishing a Regional Group Apprenticeship Scheme".

This report was forwarded to me on 15 April, 1982 for my information and consideration. Officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment have since studied the report and I met with a delegation from the W.M.R.O. on 24 June to discuss the issues raised in the report, including the concept of the W.M.R.O. becoming an employer of group apprentices.

If at some stage in the future the W.M.R.O. should become an employer of group apprentices it could only do so after submitting for approval a proposal to the State Government in line with the joint Commonwealth and State policy for the support of group apprenticeship schemes.

The guidelines in the joint Commonwealth/State policy for the development and support of group apprenticeship schemes were designed to ensure:

- that all apprentices so employed are additional; and
- there is an improvement in the quality of training through the expansion of the breadth of the on-the-job training.

Since March 1981 when these guidelines were formulated 14 group schemes have been approved under the joint policy providing new training opportunities for 1 180 young people around Australia. A further 18 schemes are currently being negotiated, or have been notified by the States to the Commonwealth.

In South Australia there are two group apprenticeship schemes operating at this time. The schemes are run by the Master Builders Association and the Metal Industries Association and currently the combined total of additional apprentices under training in the schemes exceeds 120. (It is expected that this number will increase as the schemes develop). In 1982-83 it is hoped that further group schemes will be established in South Australia. Target areas include plumbing, electrical, automotive and painting and decorating industries. Indeed, at this time a proposal for the development of a group scheme for the automotive industry, under the auspices of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, is nearing completion and it is hoped that this scheme will commence before 1983.

At this stage there is no specific reference in the joint Commonwealth/State policy to encourage girls to undertake apprentice training nor is there a special provision reserving a quota of apprenticeships for girls in group apprenticeship schemes. However, a review of the Commonwealth/State policy is to be undertaken in the near future and this may involve consideration of the issues you have raised concerning the employment and training of girls as apprentices in non-traditional areas.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT FUNDS

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (2 June).

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: The Commonwealth/States Agreement on the Rural Adjustment Scheme requires the States to bear the administration cost for Parts A and B (farm build-up, debt reconstruction, farm improvement, rehabilitation and household support), less than 1 per cent of the value of approvals for that year for those forms of assistance, to help defray the costs of administering the scheme. Other than this 1 per cent of the value of approvals there is no direct Commonwealth grant paid to cover administration costs. The non-repayable component of 15 per cent of Commonwealth funds provided for Part A assist-

ance is made available to off-set losses, excluding administration costs.

WINDANA HOME

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (1 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:

1. Magill Home had Commonwealth nursing home approval for subsidy for 72 patients. The Commonwealth has approved the transfer of these approvals from Magill Home to Windana Nursing Home on a phased basis, commencing on 4 May 1982, when 36 bed approvals were transferred. The remaining 36 approved beds will be transferred at dates to be agreed upon between the Commonwealth and the State over the next 18 months.

In approving the transfer of bed approvals from one location to another, no bed approvals have been lost in South Australia; however an additional 18 approved beds have been granted at Windana from 1 July 1982 for the purpose of providing respite and/or assessment—so that in fact an additional 18 beds have been approved to the State as part of the transfer arrangements.

2. There is presently only one vacant ward at Magill as a result of this transfer of bed approvals. This ward, one of two substandard wards at Magill Home, has been closed with union agreement. The second ward continues to operate—without Commonwealth subsidy—and will be phased down by natural attrition. While there was a transfer of bed subsidy approvals no patients were transferred out of Magill Home.

Plans for the use of the closed ward for other than infirmary care purposes are presently being considered.

3. Seven patients from Glenside have been transferred to Windana; all seven patients had been previously assessed as no longer requiring psychiatric care, and all seven were on the Windana waiting list prior to 4 May 1982.

4. Since September 1979 the following number of Glenside patients has been transferred to private nursing homes:

1979	22	
1980	39	
1981	54	
1982	43	(Jan.—May, including 7 to Windana).

These figures indicate that transfer of patients no longer requiring psychiatric care from Glenside, or other psychiatric hospitals for that matter, to nursing homes is an ongoing routine procedure, and confirm that there is no basis to the allegations contained in the comments preceding the questions.

5. The OB ward closed at Glenside had 20 beds. The overall beds in Glenside were reduced from 575 to 557 on 25 May 1982. This will rise to 560 on 30 June 1982.

6. The residents of Magill Home will continue to receive care as has previously been provided at Magill. In the long-term those assessed as needing nursing home care will be accommodated in approved nursing home beds whenever that is appropriate and where beds are available, due consideration being given to the patients' relatives and/or caring persons' wishes and geographical location as occurs in provision of nursing home care anywhere. The hostel at Magill will always have a requirement for some infirmary type care at the Home but this need not be in approved nursing home beds. No transfers of residents from Magill will occur to nursing homes outside of Magill Home for at least six months. Any transfers which might occur would only be undertaken in accord with the wishes and approval of the residents involved and their families.

7. Windana will have 54 approved nursing home beds from 1 July 1982. This includes the 18 Respite/Assessment beds earlier referred to. Magill Home now has 36 approved nursing home beds eligible for Commonwealth subsidy.

8. Windana Waiting List:

- approximately 125 persons (including the seven patients from Glenside) were on the waiting list at Windana prior to 4 May 1982.
- all of the above were contacted by letter. Many did not reply, some had already been placed in alternative nursing home beds, and a few had died.
- 31 from the waiting list were eventually admitted to Windana following adequate assessment as to their need. (This included the Glenside seven patients). The Department of Veterans Affairs referred an additional three patients and Flinders Medical Centre and Royal Adelaide Hospital referred one each.
- all waiting list applicants will continue to be assessed prior to admission by an assessment team, which is common practice for all State Nursing Homes.
- from the above information it is very clear that 31 of the 36 beds have been filled by patients on the Windana waiting list, and that the claims made by you in this regard are completely erroneous.

It should also be noted that without the transfer of bed approvals from Magill Home to Windana none of the Windana waiting list applicants would have been admitted.

The Commonwealth Government has made it very clear that South Australia already has more approved nursing home beds than the formula used nationwide provides, and therefore could not expect any additional approvals to its nursing home bedstock.

PUBLIC HOSPITAL SERVICES

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (15 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The South Australian Government supports the principles on which the new health insurance arrangements are based, if not some of the details of implementation. The Minister of Health has always acknowledged that some people whose income marginally exceeds the Commonwealth's income criteria for free treatment might be disadvantaged. While it is recognised that problems can exist, this is not to suggest they are on the scale that the Opposition spokesman would wish us to believe.

The Government's policy in respect to hospital charges recognises the problem, and:

- clearly states that no patient is to be denied treatment through inability to pay;
- authorises Hospital Boards of Management to remit accounts in full or part in cases of financial hardship; and
- permits charges to be waived for preventive health services in respect of uninsured patients where such charges would seriously inhibit people taking advantage of those services.

The Minister of Health has always advocated that South Australians have both hospital and medical insurance cover, but has said that where they cannot afford both, they should consider hospital insurance. Hospital insurance does cover a patient for any charge raised for services provided in a recognised hospital.

Provision of general practitioner services through the out-patient and casualty departments of the major metropolitan hospitals is not appropriate. Therefore, where a patient's condition requires continued medical care and supervision, but not specialist care, such care is not normally provided by hospitals and patients will be referred to a general prac-

itioner for long-term management. A patient with a condition requiring continued medical supervision by a general practitioner would be wise to have medical insurance, as the vast majority of them undoubtedly have.

COMMUNITY WELFARE STAFF

In reply to the **Hon. BARBARA WIESE** (27 June).
The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:

Separations by classification and location for the 12-month period ending 1 June 1982

Class	CER	CWR	CSR	CNR	SCR	NCR	M/Home	SAYTC	SAYRAC	Comm. Planning and Sers.	RSD	Other Locations	Total
SWO-1	14	17	21	16	10	14	—	8	8	1	5	15	129
SWO-2	1	—	—	4	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	4	12
SWO-3	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	1	1	5
SWO-4	1	—	2	—	1	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	7
CO-1	9	6	4	7	18	8	—	—	—	—	23	4	79
CO-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CO-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	4
CO-5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3	1	6
AO-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
AO-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
AO-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
EO-1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2
EO-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
PS-3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
MGN-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	3
NU-7	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Occupational													
Therapist	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Librarian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2
Property Inspector	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Graduate Officer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Weekly Paid	4	11	1	7	1	6	60	4	4	—	—	11	109
Total	30	36	28	34	31	32	62	14	15	5	42	39	368

CER = Central Eastern Region
CSR = Central Southern Region
SCR = Southern Country Region
M/Home = Magill Home
SAYRAC = S.A. Youth Remand and Assessment Centre

CWR = Central Western Region
CNR = Central Northern Region
NCR = Northern Country Region
SAYTC = S.A. Youth Training Centre
RSD = Resource Services Division
Comm. Planning and Sers. = Community Planning Services

Resignations (Separations) 1 June 1981 to 1 June 1982

Class	Resigned	Retired	LWOP	Trans.	W/C	Contract Expired	Decrease in Hours	Other	Total
SWO-1	33	4	39	14	4	9	24	2	129
SWO-2	5	—	3	1	—	—	—	3	12
SWO-3	1	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	5
SWO-4	3	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	7
CO-1	19	2	20	11	1	15	10	1	79
CO-3	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	4
CO-5	1	1	—	4	—	—	—	—	6
AO-1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
AO-2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
AO-4	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
EO-1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
EO-3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
MGN-1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Graduate Officer	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
NU-7	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Property Inspector	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
PS-3	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	2
Occupational Therapist	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Librarian	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
W/P	37	3	6	14	15	18	5	11	109
Total	106	15	75	50	21	42	40	19	368

LWOP = Leave Without Pay
Trans. = Transferred
W/C = Workers Compensation

QUARRY PRODUCTS

In reply to the **Hon. G. L. BRUCE** (2 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:

1. 20 mm screening price in South Australia and interstate compare as follows:

	Price \$ Per Tonne		
	August 1979	June 1982	Increase
Adelaide	4.02	7.68	3.66
Melbourne	7.20	11.30	4.10
Sydney	7.95	14.42	6.47

Further increases are pending interstate, Melbourne by \$1.30 per tonne on 1 July 1982 and Sydney \$2 during July.

2. In the most recent notification of price increases, Quarry Industries submitted costings that my department deemed questionable—the wages component represented some 80 per cent of cost increases. Upon request from the department the company resubmitted details of cost increases incurred and imminent (labour represented some 44 per cent of total increases) and on the information supplied the reduced selling price sought by the company was deemed justified.

The substantial price increase on specified products, e.g. 20 mm screenings, in this submission, is offset by the reduced increase to middle grade products and a price reduction in filling material. The company claims that the changed approach to the pricing structure is necessary to more realistically reflect the market situation of the range of product supplied and the cost of production of these products. The historical application of flat per tonne increases to all products over the past years has caused the differential between products to become distorted with specified products becoming artificially low.

3. The \$3.66 per tonne increase during the period under review includes 24 per cent in respect to wages. The balance is allocated over other production costs, the upgrading of obsolete and depreciated plant and equipment and an improvement of return on capital investment to reflect the effect of inflation.

The company's profit margin for the period since the restructuring of product prices is not available. However, the return of shareholders equity has reduced for the trading periods 1979-1981 by approximately 2 per cent (13.7 to 11.8 per cent).

N.H.S.A.

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (3 March).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I refer to your question asked in the Legislative Council on 3 March 1982 concerning your constituent and advertising by N.H.S.A. I apologise for the delay in replying to your question. However, the matter has involved extensive discussions between my department and N.H.S.A. as well as the obtaining of legal opinions by both parties.

I understand that the person to whom you referred also lodged a complaint about the matter with my department in which he advised that he intended to contact you. N.H.S.A. maintained that expressions such as 'professional service fee' and 'recognised hospital' used in their brochure did not contravene the Unfair Advertising Act as they were terms ascribed particular meanings under the National Health Act.

Nevertheless, the opinion obtained by my department was that these expressions were misleading in the brochure because there was no indication of the context in which they were used. Although N.H.S.A. also obtained a legal opinion which expressed a different view, the association has advised that it will amend the brochures at the earliest opportunity to qualify specifically the terms 'professional service fee' and 'recognised hospital'.

In relation to the particular complaint, N.H.S.A. has offered to meet the costs of his specialist's services provided the consumer agrees to a retrospective adjustment of membership back to 23 October 1981 to include basic medical cover, pays the contributions back to that date, and acknowledges that he now realises that hospital tables only cover medical services in a public or recognised hospital where the services are rendered by salaried staff employed by the hospital. The consumer has not indicated whether he will accept the offer. I point out that the Unfair Advertising Act does not provide any remedy whereby a consumer can obtain a benefit as a result of a breach of the Act by an advertiser.

MR AND MRS HASS

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (23 February).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The matter has been thoroughly investigated by officers of my department and substantial facts have come to light in addition to those mentioned in your question. I am not prepared to reveal the full details of the investigation as the facts could be prejudicial to Mr and Mrs Hass. The complainants are not consumers as defined under the Prices Act and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is not able to take action on their behalf in regard to consumer redress. Both parties have now engaged solicitors in the matter.

BUILDERS LICENSING BOARD

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (17 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:

1. As I have already stated, policing of the Builders Licensing Act has not ceased. From time to time officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs undertake concentrated visits of building sites with the sole purpose of checking for compliance with the provisions of the Builders Licensing Act. The most recent visit was in May; others are planned for the near future.

In addition to organised visits by groups of officers, individual officers investigating complaints about building work are required to check as a matter of course as to whether the builder was appropriately licensed at the time the work was undertaken. When breaches of the Builders Licensing Act are detected a report is submitted to the Builders Licensing Board.

2. It is current departmental policy to attempt to resolve consumer complaints about building work first by conciliation with the builder concerned. Most complaints are satisfactorily resolved in this manner. Only in those instances where conciliation has proved to be unsuccessful has it been necessary to forward complaints to the Builders Licensing Board with a recommendation that a remedial order be issued. Twenty-nine such complaints have been submitted to the board in the last six months.

Some complaints are clearly inappropriate for referral to the board, such as those of a contractual or legal nature, matters already under litigation, statute barred, trivial, or vexatious complaints.

3. Some delay is inevitable in the procedures required for compliance with the Builders Licensing Act.

Where the board proposes to order a builder to carry out remedial work it must allow him the opportunity of making representations to the board. A period of at least 21 days is normally allowed. A further delay can occur in having the matter listed for hearing if the board is heavily committed. Serving of an order can take one to two weeks.

In the last two months the board has been under considerable pressure in attempting to reduce a back-log of matters which occurred following the resignation of two of its members.

4. Results of checks of building sites undertaken by departmental officers do not support the view that there has been a large increase in the number of unlicensed builders.

As I have already stated appropriate action is taken in those instances where breaches of the licensing provisions are found to have occurred.

5. Some policing of the Builders Licensing Act is undertaken in country areas by the Regional Officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. Port Augusta office employs two building investigation officers who are authorised for the purposes of section 22 (1) of the Builders Licensing Act.

Both this office and the other regional offices at Berri and Mount Gambier advise the Builders Licensing Board of breaches of the Act detected by officers in the course of investigation of consumer complaints about building work.

When board inspectors travel to the country to interview applicants for builders licences they undertake checks of building sites to assess compliance with the Act as and when time permits.

6. Initially following the transfer of the complaints investigation function and the inspectors from the Builders Licensing Board to the Consumer Services Branch, a number of procedural difficulties were encountered. I can report that these problems have been very largely overcome.

MOTOR VEHICLE SPARE PARTS

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Motor vehicle and tractor parts have not been subject to price control since they were decontrolled in 1950. However, a number of limited inquiries into retail prices of these parts have been conducted since then. In each instance it was decided evidence was insufficient to reimpose price control because, while mark up margins appeared excessive, the overall profit made by the resellers was not great. Storage, handling and other general overhead costs are high and, on other than fast moving parts, substantial margins are required to cover these costs.

With fast moving parts competition tends to limit margins and also provides alternative sources of supply usually at lower prices than those recommended by the original manufacturer for genuine replacements. Prices of parts for imported vehicles in particular tend to be extremely high. Another factor of concern is the trend to supplying replacement assemblies rather than individual parts thereof. Obviously, some saving in the number of parts stocked follows, but the resulting cost to the consumer can be 20 or 30 times higher than the price of the part required.

The inquiries conducted by the Prices Justification Tribunal and the N.S.W. Prices Commission into spare parts did consider some margins were excessive. This problem is obviously a national one and needs to be approached in that way. I intend to raise the matter at the next meeting of Consumer Affairs Ministers. In the meantime I have arranged for a limited survey of prices and margins to be undertaken.

COMBLAS CASE

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (16 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Privy Council's decision in the Comblas case was not concerned with refunds of credit charges but with whether the credit provider could enforce a mortgage over Mr and Mrs Comblas' house to

recover amounts outstanding after the subject of the original credit contract—a prime mover—had already been repossessed and sold. The Privy Council held, on the facts of that case, that it could not. Under the Consumer Credit Act, a consumer is entitled to a refund of credit charges under a credit contract only where the credit contract does not comply with the requirements of the Act. The Privy Council discussed this credit provider's credit contract in detail and concluded that the defect in the contract was not one which prevented the credit provider from enforcing payment of credit charges but, rather, prevented the credit provider from enforcing its security over Mr and Mrs Comblas's house.

This defect arose because, on the facts, the Consumer Credit Act, but not the Consumer Transactions Act, applied to the transaction in question. Recent amendments to these two Acts have ensured that there can no longer be any situation where only one Act applies. The Privy Council's decision applies only to transactions where, because of the sum advanced and the existence of a concurrent mortgage over land, only one of the Acts applied. Such transactions would be few, but the recent amendments would now apply to them so that, in answer to Mr Sumner's first question, the problem considered by the Privy Council could not arise in a case brought before the courts after the amendments came into operation on 22 April 1982. That is, in any such case both Acts would now apply. In answer to the second question, the question of refund of credit charges made was not an issue, so neither the Privy Council's decision nor the recent amendments affect that position.

AMOCO

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (15 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: An investigation of the alleged ownership of 'U-Save' by Amoco has revealed that neither Amoco Australia Limited or any of its associated companies has an interest in the U-Save organisation. The arrangement for supply of petroleum products to U-Save by Amoco is not considered an avoidance by Amoco of the provisions of the Petroleum Retail Marketing Sites Act 1980 (Commonwealth) and no further action is proposed.

COMPANION ANIMALS

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (9 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The value of allowing companion animals in nursing homes is recognised by the S.A. Health Commission and the Central Board of Health. In revising regulations relating to nursing homes comparisons were made with the existing legislation and regulations in the six Australian States, New Zealand and Ontario, Canada. New South Wales and Western Australia have specific regulations excluding animals and birds from nursing homes. It is not intended to introduce such a regulation in South Australia.

Draft revisions of nursing home regulations are currently being circulated to interested parties seeking comment. Responses are to be considered by the Central Board of Health and if a case is presented to regulate against the presence of animals and birds in nursing homes the matter will be reconsidered. The decision whether or not a particular animal can be permitted to be present in a nursing home will necessarily remain the decision of the management of

that nursing home. Similar principles apply in relation to rest homes and voluntary hostels.

AGED DRIVERS

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (16 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: As the Minister of Health stated in her response to a similar question asked in another place on 10 June 1982, she has already taken action to rectify the situation. The Minister of Health has written to her Commonwealth counterpart pointing out the existing anomaly and stressing that the State Government regards these compulsory tests not as scanning but as a preventative health measure which is taken in the interests of total community health and safety and which, therefore, should be considered in the light of eligibility for free checks.

The Commonwealth Minister has not yet replied to the Minister's representations but the honourable member can be assured that the State Government's opinion on this matter has been put forward as forcefully as possible. It is considered that the Commonwealth should take action to ensure that these tests can be taken without cost to the person undergoing them.

AIDS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

In reply to the **Hon. BARBARA WIESE** (3 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Programme of Aids for Disabled People (PADP) is a Commonwealth scheme which is administered by the South Australian Health Commission. The Commonwealth allocated \$200 000 to South Australia for 1981-82 and the scheme commenced from 4 January 1982. Whilst it is not yet known what funds will be available for the scheme in 1982-83, it is expected that the Commonwealth will continue to fund the programme.

NURSING HOMES

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (10 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:

1. In South Australia, the responsibility for licensing and compliance with the Health Act and Regulations relating to nursing homes rests with local boards of health. The Central Board of Health and the S.A. Health Commission have a monitoring role, including investigation of complaints.

In the course of inspections, aspects of patient care are noted in addition to the physical facilities provided. The trend has been for greater emphasis on standards of care and this has been recognised in Codes of Practice issued by the Central Board of Health requiring, for example, provision of diversionary therapy. These Codes are followed, in the main, by local boards of health.

The Regulations under the Health Act relating to nursing homes are currently under review. The Central Board of Health has circulated for comment proposed amendments to the Regulations which place a greater emphasis than the existing Regulations on standards of care, as well as physical facilities. The Central Board of Health has also established a working party, with local, State and Commonwealth Government representation as well as industry and union representation, to consider the staffing requirements of the Regulations.

2. The problem of duplication by various levels of government in the nursing home area has been documented. For example the Commonwealth Auditor-General in the

Report 'Efficiency Audit on the Commonwealth Administration of Nursing Home Programmes' (1981) noted overlap by Commonwealth and State officials in relation to inspections. In a recent submission to the Senate Select Committee on Private Hospital and Nursing Homes, the S.A. Health Commission recommended that Commonwealth responsibilities in the area be handed over to the States.

There is co-operation between local boards of health and S.A. Health Commission staff where inspections are undertaken. For example, in investigating the complaint referred to in the honourable member's statement, the inspection of the nursing home was undertaken jointly by an S.A. Health Commission officer and an officer of the local board of health. Where investigations are undertaken by S.A. Health Commission staff they are generally done in conjunction with the local board of health which has the responsibility for ensuring compliance with the provisions of the legislation.

The administrative arrangements under the Health Act have been the subject of prolonged discussions with the Local Government Association. It is proposed to amend the Health Act to clarify the roles of the S.A. Health Commission and the Central Board of Health.

HYSTERECTOMIES

In reply to the **Hon. BARBARA WIESE** (8 June).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister of Health agrees that the information referred to by the honourable member from the newspaper article by Mrs Alex Kennedy of data relating to hysterectomies in Western Australia and New South Wales raises questions about the performance of hysterectomies in these States. Negotiations are taking place between the private hospitals and the South Australian Health Commission about including all private hospitals in arrangements to provide figures on the performance of these operations.

There is an important national study on hysterectomies being undertaken by the Royal Australian College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists which will provide information relative to the incidence and reasons for this operation in Australia. The Maternal Health and Reproduction (Standing) Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council is also considering the incidence and type of hysterectomy undertaken in the various Australian States, including South Australia. One of the difficulties has been that much of the data which has been available relates to an aggregate of South Australian and Northern Territory women.

The Minister of Health will await the outcome of these studies before considering a research project to determine whether the frequency of, and reason for, hysterectomies being performed in this State's hospitals are similar to those reported in New South Wales and Western Australia.

ORGANOCHLORINES

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (21 July).

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answers to the five specific questions asked by the honourable member are as follows:

1. Organochlorines may be defined in broad terms as any organic substance that contains carbon, hydrogen and chlorine in its molecular structure. If this broad definition is accepted then the use of organochlorines is very widespread and includes pesticides, plastics, paint removers, medicines,

solvents, anaesthetics, type correction fluids and many more of undetermined number.

2. See answer to 1. above. Although 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D are organic and contain chlorine they are not usually referred to as organochlorines but rather as chlorophenoxy acetic acid derivatives.

3. Neither the South Australian Health Commission nor the Central Board of Health maintains data on the use of organochlorines in this State. Information that comes to hand on specific substances is reviewed and assessed.

4. See answer to 3. above.

5. No.

QUESTIONS

SPLATT CASE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: First, has the Attorney-General seen a report on the Splatt case prepared by Mr F. B. Moran, Q.C., for the Legal Services Commission? Secondly, if not, is the Attorney aware of the contents of the report? Thirdly, does the report recommend that Splatt should be released or that an inquiry should be held into his case? Finally, what action does the Government intend to take in this matter?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: In reply to the honourable member's first question, I have not seen the report, and, in reply to his second question, I am not aware of its contents. In reply to the Leader's third question, I am not aware of the recommendations contained therein, and the answer to the fourth question depends on what is put to me by the Legal Services Commission after it has considered the report.

F.S. AND U. FRIENDLY SOCIETY

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the registration of the F.S. and U. Friendly Society.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Since the honourable member is not interested in the welfare of workers—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I'll let it go for the moment. I know more about it than you do.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Your Party is not relying on very good authority if it lets a clown like you run—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: Members on the other side—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You shut up, too. Has he ever been in a trade union in his life?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Of course he hasn't.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Is it a fact that for some months now the F.S. and U. Industrial Benefits Society has been seeking to register the F.S. and U. Friendly Society in this State and that approaches were made to the Government over five months ago, yet no final decision has been made? Secondly, is it a fact that the objectives of the F.S. and U. Friendly Society are to provide a range of mutual benefits to members of trade unions and industrial associations, including retirement benefits, small life insurance and term insurance, sickness benefits, mortality benefits, medical and hospital benefits, financial counselling, budget planning and industrial

injury clinics? Also, is it a fact that the society would provide housing loans at a competitive rate?

Thirdly, has the Government been provided with information estimating that registration of the society would provide employment for over 40 people, funds for first mortgage home loans up to \$1 000 000, spending in the South Australian economy, the leasing of office space in this State, and other benefits including free counselling in relation to financial matters? Fourthly, why has no decision been made on this application by the F.S. and U. Friendly Society and when is it expected that a decision will be made?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The F. S. and U. Industrial Benefits Society Pty Ltd has been registered in South Australia as a foreign company under the provisions of the new Companies Code. I understand that that company, registered in this State as a foreign company, has applied for a friendly society to be registered in South Australia. That friendly society would be registered under the Friendly Societies Act. I am not aware that the application has been decided yet by the Government.

The F.S. and U. Industrial Benefits Society Pty Ltd was to provide the Government with further information on the objects and schemes which it proposes to run. That information has been provided. One must remember that the Friendly Societies Act is administered by the Chief Secretary, who is the Minister directly responsible for considering this application. I believe that, in the context of considering an application for any proposed friendly society that has been registered in South Australia, the Public Actuary would be involved in advising about the appropriateness of registration of a friendly society or a body under the Friendly Societies Act. I do not know why a decision has not yet been made. I am aware that the matter has been under consideration by the Chief Secretary. I will have some inquiries made and I will bring down a reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members would be well aware that the Local Government Grants Commission has been deliberating over the distribution of grants to local government for this financial year. I understand that about \$36 000 000 is to be distributed, and that that amount is over 20 per cent greater than the amount distributed last year. Can the Minister tell the Council whether that is correct and when councils will be advised of these grants? Will he also confirm earlier information distributed to councils that these grants are untied and that councils will be free to use them as they see fit?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: True, the Treasurer has advised that the amount coming to South Australia under Grants Commission arrangements for the current financial year is \$36 510 067. That represents a 21 per cent increase over the amount provided to local government in South Australia last year. Officers from the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission are processing the arrangements now and councils in this State will be advised by letter next week of the individual sums they will be receiving. In regard to the honourable member's second question, it is true (and it is an arrangement which the State Government honours in every way) that these grants are completely untied and that local councils can spend these grants exactly as they wish.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 22 July about the Riverland cannery?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is not the responsibility of the receiver/managers to lodge at the Corporate Affairs office, or to distribute, the statutory accounts of the cannery. This is the responsibility of the directors, all of whom resigned following the appointment of the receivers. Consequently, to my knowledge, accounts have not been lodged or distributed. However, the receivers have prepared accounts in the normal course of their duties.

Accounts for the 15-month period to 31 December 1980 (which have been audited) show a net loss of \$10 900 000. That figure includes interest of over \$2 000 000 and depreciation of approximately \$1 000 000. The picture at that date is however not yet clear. Due to current doubts as to the saleability of some of the fruit stock produced prior to the receiver's appointment, this loss could be up to \$2 000 000 greater. The receivers have not yet finalised accounts for the 12 months to 31 December 1981, but at this stage it would appear that the loss for that period will be of the order of \$6 600 000, including interest of about \$3 500 000, and depreciation of \$700 000. Most recent information available (that is, for the four months to 30 April 1982) shows that, before interest and depreciation, 1981-82 fruit processing alone was more than \$2 000 000.

The receivers believe that results for the full 12 months to December 1982 will reflect some improvement in the general products area, partly as a result of a renegotiation of contracts with Henry Jones and a reduction in cannery overheads. However, there has been a further deterioration in the canning fruit area because of disastrous world and local markets, which have in turn led to the very low levels of cannery throughput of which the honourable member would be aware.

OIL EXPLORATION

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about the present situation regarding the Pitjantjatjara people and the Hematite Oil Exploration consortium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Negotiations between the Pitjantjatjara people and the Hematite consortium commenced in November 1981. Six negotiating sessions each over a number of days took place between November 1981 and April 1982 in relation to the consortium's proposed six-year petroleum and gas exploration programme in the Officer Basin. Agreement between the parties was reached on the protection of sacred sites, environmental safeguards and all other issues except as regards compensation payable by the consortium for disturbance to the Pitjantjatjara lands, the Pitjantjatjara people and their way of life.

On advice from senior counsel and mining industry consultants, the Pitjantjatjara proposed various formulae for calculating compensation based on a monetary figure for each kind of disturbance activity contemplated in the consortium's programme. The consortium merely offered a fixed annual lump sum by way of compensation. Neither side considered the other's proposals in relation to compensation were reasonable. The Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act provides that, in the event of a disagreement between the parties as to conditions for entry on to the Pitjantjatjara lands for mining purposes, the proposed explorer may request

the Minister of Mines and Energy to appoint a senior judge to act as arbitrator and fix the conditions.

After two months without further negotiations and with no request for arbitration being made to the Minister during that period, the Pitjantjatjara's lawyer wrote in late June 1982 to the Minister inviting him to approve the commencement of negotiations with Comalco Exploration as to terms for entry on the Pitjantjatjara lands for the purposes of mineral (as opposed to petroleum) exploration, leaving open the possibility of further negotiations with the Hematite consortium or of an arbitration.

On 31 July the Minister refused to approve the commencement of negotiations with Comalco Exploration and publicly accused the Pitjantjatjara people of seeking compensation for disturbance resulting from exploration activities when (he said) they were only entitled under the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act to be compensated for disturbance from production activities. The Minister further accused the Pitjantjatjara people of seeking excessive compensation.

First, will the Minister please explain why he has involved himself with the negotiations between the Pitjantjatjara people and the Hematite Oil Exploration consortium at this stage, when the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act makes it quite clear that the consortium should have asked him to appoint an arbitrator under section 20 (8)? Secondly, will the Minister state that he is prepared to appoint an arbitrator as envisaged by the Act? Thirdly, would the Minister agree that neither he nor the Government should be involved with such negotiations without a request from the applicants for the appointment of an arbitrator?

Fourthly, how does the Minister justify preventing the Pitjantjatjara people from entering into negotiations with Comalco Exploration for a mining exploration licence merely because negotiations between the Pitjantjatjara people and Hematite in relation to a petroleum exploration licence have lapsed? And, finally, would the Minister confirm that compensation is payable pursuant to section 24 of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act in relation to disturbance caused by exploration activities whether for minerals, petroleum or gas and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Minister has, to a large extent, already answered those questions publicly. For the sake of having those answers on record, I will refer those questions to him and bring back a reply. The Minister is in something of a difficult position because, on the one hand, he is criticised for being involved and, on the other hand, he is criticised for not being involved. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. I think it should be recognised that there is that particular difficulty with these sorts of negotiations. I will bring back a more comprehensive reply, which will accord with what the Minister has already said publicly about the matter.

COLIN CREED

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Chief Secretary, a question about a former policeman, Mr Colin Creed.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: The current activities of former policeman, Mr Creed, are well documented in the newspapers, but research has revealed earlier activities of this particular gentleman. In an incident many years ago Mr Creed assaulted a woman whilst investigating a domestic dispute and, as a result of the assault, Mr Creed bent orthopaedic pins in the woman's bones, and substantial damages were awarded. Other matters have also occurred

which indicate that Mr Creed has, for a long time, had a severe personality defect, giving rise to violent behaviour.

My questions relate to the provision of psychiatric services to the Police Force for the purpose of screening members who may give indications that they are prone to violent behaviour. Would the Chief Secretary indicate the nature and extent of psychological and psychiatric testing available to the Police Force in 1974 and say whether there has been any change in the screening and testing procedures since that time? Have any decisions been taken since 1974 to screen police officers involved in incidents of violent behaviour? Given the high stress factors involved in police work and the great demands made upon members of the Police Force, can the Chief Secretary say whether there is any provision of social worker support or psychological support to assist police officers with personal troubles? In common with other members of the community, police officers are subject to the usual anxieties and stresses. Will the Minister indicate the present level of such support to members of the Police Force?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Chief Secretary and bring back a reply.

NURSING HOMES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about nursing home contracts.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will the Minister, as a matter of urgency, investigate the validity of a contract signed between Mrs E. D. Crichton of 26 Constable Street, Ferryden Park, and the Glendale Nursing Home? This contract is alleged to be for \$240, in the event that Mrs Crichton did not give one week's notice of her intention to remove her 88-year-old mother, Mrs Mary Murray, from the Glendale Nursing Home. Is the Minister aware that Mrs Murray was a patient at the Glendale Nursing Home from 11 September 1981 to 1 February 1982, when she was taken to the Allora Nursing Home, which was closer to her daughter's home? Is the Minister aware of the allegation that the Glendale Nursing Home then presented Mrs Crichton with a bill for \$242.40 demanding payment because she had not given seven days notice of her intention to transfer her mother?

If the contract is valid, what is the position in connection with patients who die? The contract is signed under great duress at the same time that the person involved is being asked about the name of the family undertaker. This contract states that this person must pay \$242.40 or one week's full bed cost in lieu of notice. I ask the Minister what is the position if patients are thoughtless enough to die without giving a week's notice. Also, is the Minister aware that the owners of Glendale Nursing Home are F. J. Rowett Nominees, and that this is one of many companies listed amongst those involved in taxation minimisation and/or avoidance schemes referred to in recent sittings of the Senate select committee on private hospitals and nursing homes when it was in Adelaide?

Is the Minister also aware that on 21 June 1982 I wrote to the Manager of the Glendale Nursing Home outlining these facts and asking him or her to advise me whether, in view of the circumstances that I had outlined, they intended to waive the amount and stop harassing Mrs Crichton immediately? Is the Minister also aware that Mrs Crichton is a pensioner of extremely limited means who lives in a rented trust home and who told me in a recent conversation that she had no means whatsoever? Indeed, on the day that

I spoke to her Mrs Crichton had only \$1.38 in her purse to last her for 48 hours until her next pension day.

Is the Minister also aware that on 2 August 1982 the proprietor of Glendale Nursing Home, one F. J. Rowett (presumably also the F. J. Rowett of F. J. Rowett Nominees), wrote to Mrs Crichton and drew her attention to the fact that she had made no payment of the amount due to Glendale Nursing Home? When Mrs Crichton complained about the \$242.40, F. J. Rowett, the signatory to this letter, said that he was prepared to take 50 per cent of the amount owing, in other words, \$121.20. However, Mr Rowett subsequently wrote on 2 August 1982 informing Mrs Crichton that, as she had not settled the full amount in dispute (namely \$242.40), he would reinstate that amount and charge her the full sum.

This contract was obviously signed under duress. The Minister should be aware that it was signed at a time when discussions had taken place regarding who the family undertaker might be, and regarding the person that should be called in the event of sudden death, and so on. The Minister would also know that patients who die do not usually give notice of it. It seems to me that we have here a classic case of an aged pensioner of extremely limited means trying to do her best for her 88-year-old mother and being harassed by the proprietor of a private nursing home for an exorbitant amount of money which, it is claimed, is due under—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I do not want necessarily to reflect on the competency of the person who is asking this question. However, he is badly abusing the Standing Orders of this Council in endeavouring to ask the question.

The PRESIDENT: I take the honourable member's point of order and ask the Hon. Dr Cornwall to ask his question.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will the Minister, as a matter of urgency, investigate the validity of the contract that was signed by Mrs Crichton with Glendale Nursing Home?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member directed the question to me as Minister of Consumer Affairs. I take it that he meant it to be addressed to me in that capacity, his constituent being a consumer of services. I am not aware of the various matters that the honourable member has raised, as no complaint has been made to me. If a complaint has been made to my department (and the honourable member has not suggested that), it has not come to my notice. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs acts on complaints made by or on behalf of consumers and, if such a complaint has been made, it will be investigated.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I have just made a complaint.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Certainly, and it will be investigated. The usual procedure is for the consumer, if possible (and it may well not have been possible in this case), or persons acting on his or her behalf, to make a complaint to the department. If the person concerned goes to a member of Parliament, I suggest that the usual first course is for that member to assist his constituent to make a complaint to the department. That usually results in the case being investigated more expeditiously and efficiently.

However, I will certainly investigate this matter and bring it to the notice of my colleague, the Minister of Health, as it obviously is also a health matter. I certainly accept that, on the face of it, it would appear that the person concerned is a consumer of services and that the matter does fall within the jurisdiction of my department. When asking this question, the honourable member set out sufficiently the terms of the contract but, if he has the actual contract, I would ask him to make it available to me.

HUNGRY CHILDREN

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question regarding a report which appeared in yesterday's newspaper and the subject of which is South Australian children eating pet food.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: The Minister, when speaking on radio 5DN this morning, was asked what the Department for Community Welfare can offer to people who find themselves in such disastrous circumstances. I should like to commend the Minister for his ready reply, when he told listeners that the department could provide relief to such unfortunate children. However, I consider it necessary to widen the amount of information made available to the public regarding such services being provided by the department. Will the Minister therefore tell the Council whether his department will pass on such information over ethnic radio and in the press?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The question is well asked, because it often seems to be difficult to notify people in need about the availability of welfare services. It is often those very people who are in need of welfare services who do not read pamphlets, advertisements, and so on. Certainly, I am quite prepared to consider the feasibility of making this information known on ethnic radio and in the ethnic press.

STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking you, Sir, a short question regarding the abuse of Standing Orders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: A few minutes ago, I was refused permission to complete a statement on a matter of considerable public importance concerning an aged pensioner, a Mrs E. D. Crichton, who was being harassed by F. J. Rowett Nominees, the owners of Glendale Nursing Home about an amount that was in dispute. It is a matter of very considerable public importance, because the validity of the contract may well be in doubt. This is a situation in which a woman in her sixties was harassed into signing a contract by what I believe to be the unscrupulous proprietors of a nursing home.

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member sure that I can help him with this matter?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am sure you can, Sir. Knowing your ability and your knowledge of Standing Orders, Sir, I will be most disappointed and surprised if you cannot help me. Ever since this session of Parliament resumed, I have been consistently prevented from carrying out my legitimate duties as a front bench member of Her Majesty's Opposition by the consistent refusal of the Hon. Norm Foster to grant leave on the great majority of occasions on which I have sought to explain my questions.

Mr President, you would be aware that, under the Standing Orders of this Council, the leave to make an explanation is very valuable indeed. We have no grievance debate, and we have very few other means by which we can bring these matters of importance before Parliament, and before the people, on behalf of our constituents.

It is my contention that I am persistently being refused my legitimate right to take up matters in the South Australian Parliament on behalf of my constituents. Therefore, I ask you, Sir, to examine the appropriate Standing Order, which, I suggest, is being grossly and flagrantly abused by the Hon. Mr Foster, to see whether in fact it should be reviewed.

The PRESIDENT: I will most certainly again look at Standing Orders. Personally, I have no brief in the argument whatsoever. Of course, the honourable member would understand that, if there is a dissenting voice, I have no option but to deny leave. The manner in which the honourable member seems to be coping is some credit to him. However, in no way can I waive the instruction contained in the Standing Order.

STIRLING EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about the building of a hall for the Stirling East Primary School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Recently, I received a letter from the Stirling East Primary School Council setting out the council's concern at the difficulties which it is having in obtaining a school hall. The reason why this school needs a hall particularly badly is that for many months of the year the school oval is unusable owing to water problems. The reason for this is partly because the oval is built in a gully and, from what I can understand, has been built almost level. As a result, there are large parts of the year when inclement weather means that the oval is not usable and the pupils have to play, either in the vicinity of the buildings, or actually in them, because there is no school hall.

Back in April 1979 extensions and improvements to the existing facilities at Stirling East Primary School came under discussion with the Education Department, and the development was planned to commence around May 1980, with completion in May 1982. Since then delays have occurred for this school, while improvements and additions have been made for other schools which, I would have thought, did not have the same essential need that this school has. Plans were actually signed by the Principal and the Chairman of the school council on 23 April 1980. Now the school has been informed that, if it requires a school hall, it will need to make a substantial contribution to the cost of it. Furthermore, I understand that the calling of tenders has been deferred until December 1982, from September 1982.

It really seems to me that the Education Department, the Public Works Standing Committee, and perhaps the Minister, have not realised that the climatic conditions for this school make it impossible for children to undertake recreational and educational work outside the building for a very substantial and important period of the year. I understand that other primary schools in the area have been provided with halls at no charge to those schools, or the parents, but have been totally funded by the Government. This appears to me, and to those with whom I have discussed the matter, to be discrimination of the worst kind and is equivalent to an indirect tax on the parents of this school. The estimated cost of the hall is now \$136 000 and, as there is not a very large number of pupils at the school, it would be an impossible burden on those relatively few parents.

What is more, I understand that school councils are now required to raise 10 per cent of the cost of such a hall themselves and, in addition, to pay a proportion of the interest on the balance of that cost; in the case in question the council would be required to raise \$13 600 and to pay a proportion of the interest on \$122 400, but apparently they do not know what this proportion will be until they have made a commitment and the circumstances of the parents, and the area, have been assessed by a committee known as SLAC, whatever that is. It seems to me extraordinary that a group of people such as the parents of these young children should be asked to agree to a commitment

in advance, to be assessed by another group of people totally divorced from the problem. Of course, that is a matter of principle, and not only for the Stirling East Primary School.

Does the Minister consider that the erection of a school hall at the Stirling East Primary School is essential and urgent? If not, will he give a reason? Does he consider that a request for the Stirling East Primary School to contribute 10 per cent plus a proportion of the interest on the \$122 400 to the cost of a school hall is consistent with the treatment given to other schools in the area, or in similar circumstances? Has there been a change of policy since the plans were approved in April 1980?

Would the school hall have been built totally from Government funds at that date? What is the latest estimate of the cost of the school hall? What contribution would the Government expect from the parents of the 393 students? Is the decision to require a contribution from the parents, and the school council, final? If not, will the Minister be prepared to meet a deputation to discuss the matter?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I assure the honourable member that the Minister of Education has a very intimate and detailed knowledge of all aspects affecting school halls, school grounds, school buildings, and all other aspects of education in this State. I shall be very pleased to forward to him the comprehensive list of questions asked by the honourable member. I believe that when the replies come back they will go a long way towards satisfying him.

SOCIAL INDICATORS

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about social indicators.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The Department for Community Welfare is known to use social indicators in the course of providing services to the public. Will the Minister explain what items are taken into account by the department when developing these social indicators? In what areas are social indicators used?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answers are statistical in regard to explaining the use of the process of social indicators. I shall be pleased to refer the question to my department to obtain the necessary information and bring down a reply.

CIGARETTES

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about cigarette promotion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Some weeks ago, probably like all other honourable members, I received a packet through the post of what looked like cigarettes. A short explanation was attached to the package, which was from an organisation calling itself ACOSH, the Australian Council on Smoking and Health, South Australia Incorporated. The organisation is concerned about the subtle promotion of cigarettes, in this case through the sale of chocolate cigarettes. One has to look closely to see that they are chocolate, and these chocolate cigarettes are readily available to children from supermarkets and shops.

First, what is the Minister's view about the subtle promotion of such cigarettes to children? Does she intend to take any action to curtail such activity? Secondly, are cigarette companies actively involved in any way with lolly cigarettes

sold to children? Thirdly, are posters readily available from the Health Commission to any shopkeeper with a social conscience who wishes to advise that he or she does not wish to sell cigarettes to minors?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The views of the Minister of Health on the subject of cigarette promotion are well known. I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to her and bring down a reply.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of 17 June concerning the incidence of blue tongue disease in north Australia and the consequent banning of the export of stock?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The responsibility for negotiating with other countries on the health certification requirements for the export of livestock rests with the Commonwealth. Officers from the Australian Bureau of Animal Health are continuously pursuing negotiations with countries which have banned or restricted the importation of Australian livestock. Originally more than 15 countries banned Australian livestock but this number has been reduced to the point where the only countries of significance which still apply a total ban are the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China.

Most countries require that a serological test be performed and some such as Canada require the state of origin to be free from serological evidence of blue tongue viruses. New Zealand will accept cattle, but not sheep, from the Australian mainland. It is expected that further reductions in restrictions will occur but it is unlikely that the requirement for testing will ever be eliminated. The honourable member can be assured that every effort is being made to eliminate the remaining bans, but it should be pointed out that the action by a country such as the United Kingdom is no different from the action that would be taken by Australia in the event of a similar blue tongue situation existing in that country.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I desire to ask a supplementary question. The Minister said in reply that action by a country such as the United Kingdom is no different from action taken by Australia in similar circumstances. Does the Minister agree that the circumstances are vastly different? The United Kingdom is a compact country in which disease can spread quickly. In Australia, hundreds of miles separate the north of Australia, where this disease has existed, from southern Australia. The equivalent in some respects could be considered as the banning of exports to the United Kingdom because of an outbreak in East Germany, because the distances are comparable with the distance to the Top End of Australia from southern Australia.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. As I understand Standing Orders, no explanation can be given of a supplementary question. I think the honourable member is giving an explanation and is not asking a supplementary question.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member may well be right.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I thank the honourable member for pointing out that fact. Does the Minister agree with what I have said, and will he point this out to the relevant Commonwealth authorities?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture in another place and bring down a reply.

FAMILY RESEARCH UNIT

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my questions of 21 and 22 July about the family research unit? As I believe the reply is rather lengthy, perhaps the Minister would be willing to seek leave to have the replies inserted in *Hansard* without his reading them.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek that leave.
Leave granted.

Staffing for the Family Research Unit:

Major responsibility for family research is shared between officers from the Community and Planning Services Division in which the Family Research Unit is located. Other departmental officers undertake specific family research projects as they arise. For example, two of the current research projects are being carried out at a number of district offices and involve staff at those district offices.

Details of the officers from Community and Planning Services are as follows:

Director, Community and Planning Services:

B.A., Dip.Soc. Studies. 20 years experience covering family social work, research, policy analysis, children's services both in Australia and overseas; nine years in the Department for Community Welfare, 18 months senior project officer in Family Research Unit. Presently responsible for the supervision of all the Community and Planning Services projects; directly supervises work of Family Research Unit—10 per cent of time.

Senior Project Officer, Community and Planning Services:

B.Econ, M.U.R.P. Seven years experience with the department in a variety of positions including community development, research, social planning, working with non-government agencies. Involved on an issue bases, estimated 20 per cent of time.

Senior Project Officer, Community and Planning Services:

B.A. Nine years experience with the department, working with families, young offenders, children in substitute care, child protection and aged care. Involved in family research projects 10 per cent of time.

Project Officer, Community and Planning Services:

B.A.(Hon.). Training in psychology and research methods. Three years experience in conducting family research as Evaluator of the Family Support Services Scheme. Involved in family research activities 80 per cent of time.

Project Officer, Community and Planning Services:

LLB, D. Social Admin. Two years field experience working with young offenders and their families. Expertise in legal aspects/implications of family policy. Twenty-five per cent of time working on family research issues.

Other departmental officers currently involved with family research studies:

Adoptions Officer, Adoptions Branch:

Dip. Social Work. Eleven years experience with the department as a Community Welfare Worker working with families and as Branch Head. Participating in study on the Adoptions Contact Register, accounting for ten per cent of time.

Foster Care Consultant, Residential and Foster Care Unit:

B.A. Soc. Wk. Five and a half years field experience with the department, foster care consultant for last two years. Participating in study on children in foster care: Their School Experience. Fifteen per cent of time.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese also requested information on the current status of the survey on community attitudes to families.

Survey on community attitudes to families:

The survey was conducted by the Family Research Unit in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Family Stud-

ies. There were two parts to the survey—a questionnaire administered Australia-wide to a random sample of families, and conducting public forums which the Family Research Unit undertook within South Australia as an extension to the questionnaire component of the survey.

Questionnaires were completed twelve months ago and the Australian Institute of Family Studies is preparing a national report on the results of the survey. Public forums were held throughout the State. It was hoped that a broad section of the community would attend these forums and give their views on what is important to family life and what are the special needs of families. Despite extensive publicity attendance at the forums was poor. The views presented could only be attributed to small sections of the community, for example, various religious groups. After analysis of the results and the preparation of a draft report, a decision was made not to proceed with the forum component of the survey as the results could not be seen to represent the views of the general community. The public forum component of the survey was not successful and the aims were not met.

UNSWEETENED ORANGE JUICE

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of 21 July about unsweetened orange juice?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The particular orange juice referred to by the honourable member is claimed by the packer not to contain added sugar. The statements on the package comply with the food and drugs regulations. However, the statement in the advertising pamphlet is not consistent with the carton labelling, although in fact the product is unsweetened. The word 'unsweetened' should not have been used on the pamphlet, without an energy statement immediately following. As the incident is the result of a misunderstanding between the merchandiser and the packer, rather than flagrant misrepresentation, the merchandiser has been advised that future advertising claims should be in accordance with the food and drugs regulations. In the honourable member's explanation, he made reference to the drinking of orange juice by diabetics. The current medical advice to diabetics is to avoid consumption of fruit juices. If juice is consumed, it should be limited to one to two small glasses per day. Within these intake constraints, the juice in question should not present a problem for diabetics.

TRAFFIC LANES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 16 June about traffic lanes?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: A proposal to enact legislation to require motorists on multi-laned roads to travel in the left hand lane unless overtaking, has been referred to the National Advisory Committee on Road User Performance and Traffic Codes for consideration. In the event that the National Road Traffic Code is amended to include the proposed requirement it is envisaged that all States would amend their legislation accordingly.

LOCAL PRODUCTS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 27 July about the use of local products?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The architectural design of a new law courts building requires close attention to the design

of the interior elements and finishes, to provide a dignified appearance throughout. The design of the various interior elements, such as furniture, floor coverings, wall finishes, and ceilings, must be co-ordinated so that they complement each other. To achieve this, the architect must carefully select from the products available from manufacturers. If the local industry is not producing a product which will meet these criteria on the particular project, the architect will then consider whether an imported product is available which will meet the design criteria. This is the process which led to the selection of imported mineral fibre ceiling tiles for this project. A ceiling was required which was not 'commercial' nor 'institutional' in appearance, and blended with the interior design requirements of the building.

Research into locally manufactured tiles by the architect was unable to find a ceiling tile which met the aesthetic requirements of this building. The production of a special tile by local manufacturers to achieve the aesthetic requirements was investigated by the cost was found to be excessive. The area of ceiling tiles in the building represents approximately fifty per cent of the total ceiling area. The remaining fifty per cent is of locally manufactured plasterboard. The supply cost for the imported ceiling tiles is \$63 000. The ceiling tile selected for this project does not have a local equivalent, and so a direct cost comparison is not possible. In comparison to the locally manufactured 'chocolate block' type of plaster ceiling tile, the imported mineral fibre tile is slightly more expensive, but its cost was within the budget allocation for ceilings. In terms of acoustic and fire-resistance ratings, the selected imported ceiling tile complies with those requirements, as would the local tiles. I am not aware of any comparative test information on the acoustic and fire resistance values between local and imported ceilings. I believe that the project team gave adequate consideration to the use of local ceiling tiles but found that the local product range was limited, and there was not a tile available which met the important aesthetic requirements of this significant building.

HALLEY'S COMET

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 15 June about Halley's Comet?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Jubilee 150 Board is aware that Halley's Comet will be visible from South Australia in 1986. The board will be looking at ways in which the return of the comet can be incorporated in the State's Jubilee 150 celebrations. I am uncertain who can fill out a Jubilee 150 registration form on behalf of the comet, but certainly its return will require no Government funding or organisation.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 15 June about equal opportunities?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The South Australian Public Service Board is responsible for the development and implementation of equal opportunities management plans which will address the needs of disadvantaged groups within the Public Service. It is intended that the equal opportunities management plans will be initially introduced into Government departments with a view to later extension into the whole of the public sector.

Prior to the establishment of operational plans within departments, liaison and discussion will need to take place with departmental heads, senior administrative officers, management services officers and relevant union represen-

tatives to determine the most effective and efficient approach. Using the development and implementation of the permanent part-time work arrangements as a model, it is considered that preparatory work prior to the implementation of the equal opportunity management plans would take at least nine months. A senior officer of the Public Service Board has been appointed as project officer to consider appropriate and feasible measures to be adopted prior to implementation of the plans.

POLICE SPECIAL BRANCH

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 6 April about the Police Special Branch?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. D. S. Hogarth has submitted one report to the Government pursuant to paragraph 3 of the Order-in-Council dated 20 November 1980. Paragraph 3 of the Order-in-Council requires Mr Hogarth to inspect the files, information and records maintained and gathered by the Special Branch as often as is necessary to ensure that the Order-in-Council is being complied with, and in any event no less frequently than once each financial year.

To the best of my knowledge, Mr Hogarth has inspected all the files before preparing his report to the Government. Mr Hogarth has not made any requests or recommendations to the Government that his powers be clarified or broadened. I can assure members of the Council and the public of South Australia that independent audits of Special Branch files by someone who is not a member of the Police Force have taken place since November 1980 and will take place in the future.

REPLY TO QUESTION

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a reply to a question without notice without my reading it. A reply to this question has been sent to the member by letter.

Leave granted.

STATE TIES

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (8 June):

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The present Government has carried on the policy of previous Governments in that there are no guidelines set out for the distribution of small gifts such as State cufflinks, brooches, State ties or State flag pins. They are not distributed willy-nilly but as each case merits. Sometimes a small supply of some of these articles is given to Ministers and members of Parliament who are proceeding overseas for distribution at their discretion.

State ties are issued on a more restricted basis than the other articles mentioned but they have certainly been allocated to members of Parliament, important visitors to the State, senior public servants travelling to conferences and to public servants who have retired after very long service. They were also issued to some passengers on the first standard gauge train from Adelaide to Alice Springs as a celebratory publicity gesture.

Some recipients of various ties have, of course, been known to exchange them when in a convivial mood or to donate their own to visitors and then to seek a replacement after explaining the circumstances. The important thing is that, since introductory issue, their allocation has been quite

restricted. The situation in relation to brooches is somewhat similar.

HOUSING COSTS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of 28 July about housing costs?

1.

SCHEDULE OF COSTS

Capital City	Medium Price of Land (1) May 1982	Conveying (2) Charge	Total Cost	% Variation Compared with Adelaide
	\$	\$	\$	%
Adelaide	11 200	192	11 392	—
Sydney	36 800-74 600	416-590	37 216-75 190	+ 227-560
Melbourne	18 200	305	18 505	+ 62
Brisbane	24 400	275	24 675	+ 117
Perth	16 400	140	16 540	+ 45

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies continue:

2. Cost of Transporting Building Materials:

The vast majority of component materials for house building are available in South Australia and thus do not have to be transported from other States. One exception is certain timbers used in house construction, such as Kauri and Oregon. The cost of transporting these to South Australia represents about 25 and 33 per cent of the total product cost, respectively. The only other notable exception is ceramic tiles which are either imported, or transported from interstate. Their transport costs represent about 20 per cent of the value of the product.

3. Cost of New Completed Home:

It is estimated that the average cost of a new home in South Australia was approximately \$44 300 in December 1981 (that is the latest available figure). Including the cost of white goods this would raise the total cost to approximately \$45 500.

4. Interest Paid on First and Second Mortgages:

Assuming a 10 per cent deposit paid by a home purchaser, finance would have to be found for approximately \$40 000 for a house costing \$45 000. Finance is likely to be provided as a \$35 000 first mortgage and a \$5 000 second mortgage. The second mortgage is likely to be over five years. At a 13.5 per cent interest rate charged on the first mortgage, and a 10.2 per cent (flat) charged on the second mortgage, the total interest paid would be as follows: 25 years \$90 155; and, 30 years \$112 016. These represent 200 per cent and 249 per cent, respectively, of the \$45 000 price of the house. Commercial loans are not normally available for 35 and 40 year terms.

CHILD CARE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: For each college in the State under the Technical and Further Education Department:

1. What facilities for child care are available, in terms of space and equipment?

2. Is the child care undertaken by volunteer or paid workers?

3. What recurrent expenditure is budgeted for child care?

4. For how many hours per week is the child care available?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Special facilities have been built at the Technical and Further Education Colleges at Croydon Park (Thebarton Annexe), Elizabeth, Kensington Park and Gilles Plains. Non-special facilities exist at Whyalla College. The indoor floor

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The following information is provided in answer to the honourable member's question. The first question related to the percentage difference of land costs in South Australia compared with other States. I have a schedule showing the percentage difference of land costs in South Australia compared with other States that I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

space available at each of the abovementioned colleges is approximately:

Croydon Park College, main campus—200 m²

Croydon Park College, Thebarton Annexe—150 m²

Elizabeth College—160 m²

Kensington Park College—135 m²

Gilles Plains College—170 m²

Whyalla College—40 m²

At each of these colleges, except Whyalla College, there is an outdoor play area in addition to the indoor area. Each college, except Whyalla, has toilet suites adapted for children's use, and each, except Kensington Park College and Whyalla College has a kitchen equipped for the preparation of food.

The two colleges which are currently operating occasional child care are Elizabeth Community College (TAFE) and Croydon Park College of TAFE. They are equipped with children's furniture and educational toys.

2. At Croydon Park College of TAFE, occasional child care is provided by weekly paid employees; at Elizabeth Community College (TAFE) it is provided by volunteer workers.

3. Occasional child care is not considered to be a separate budget cost centre and does not appear as a budget item. The actual costs involved would include cleaning, power, public risk insurance, water, light, materials, maintenance or replacement of furniture, toys and equipment, and salaries of weekly paid employees.

4. Occasional child care is available at Croydon Park College of TAFE for up to 30 hours per week and at Elizabeth Community College (TAFE) for approximately 15 hours per week.

TOURIST PROMOTION

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. What funds have been allocated to be spent in New Zealand for the recently announced tourist promotion programme to attract New Zealanders to visit South Australia?

2. How much has been spent so far?

3. How much was allocated to be spent within South Australia in connection with this promotion, and for what purpose?

4. How much has been spent in South Australia so far?

5. What has been the result to date of this promotion?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. Approximately \$100 000 has been allocated to be spent on the New Zealand tourism promotion. This amount will

be supplemented by a further sum of approximately \$80 000 being contributed by other sectors of the tourism industry. This is a unique example of the pooling of resources of various industry sectors to achieve maximum input.

2. Approximately \$40 000 has been spent so far by the Department of Tourism.

3. The majority of funds will be spent on New Zealand media and on local promotional aids. The total allocation has not been divided specifically into expenditure in South Australia as opposed to expenditure in New Zealand. However, it is likely that approximately half of the amount will be spent in South Australia. Expenditure in South Australia will include transport and accommodation requirements for groups of travel agents being brought to South Australia, production of literature and other promotional material to be sent to New Zealand for distribution.

4. Approximately \$12 000 has been spent in South Australia so far.

5. Already the Department of Tourism has detected increased interest on the part of New Zealand travel wholesalers and work is advanced on the development of a number of new tour programmes, including South Australia for the first time. Several group bookings have been made on direct air services to Adelaide, although fares and schedules have not yet been formally approved. It is important to recall that this campaign aims to correct the low awareness of our State in the New Zealand market and to draw attention to the direct services commencing in November this year. Full effects of the campaign will not be felt for some months.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: What is the number and percentage of Housing Trust tenants who are on reduced rentals in—

1. The State;
2. The metropolitan area;
3. Whyalla;
4. Port Pirie;
5. Port Augusta;
6. Mount Gambier;
7. The Riverland;
8. Port Lincoln?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies are as follows: The following information is provided on the numbers and percentages of Housing Trust tenants on reduced rentals. Data is not currently available for some individual cities as requested by the honourable member and regional data is provided as indicated. The data was current as at 30 June 1982.

	Number of Rent Reductions	Percentage of Trust Tenants
1. The State	23 133	54.84
2. The metropolitan area (Darlington to Gepps Cross)	12 183	71.68
3. Whyalla (includes Eyre Peninsula and far west but excludes Port Lincoln)	1 852	32.04
4. Port Pirie	383	41.50
5. Port Augusta	427	25.45
6. Mount Gambier (includes South-Eastern region)	794	35.46

	Number of Rent Reductions	Percentage of Trust Tenants
7. The Riverland (includes Noarlunga area and south coast)	1 794	55.68
8. Port Lincoln	248	41.68

TOXIC MATERIALS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: Concerning the introduction and possible introduction into South Australia of industries dealing with highly toxic materials and substances, e.g. fractionation plant, petro-chemical plant, uranium hexafluoride plant—

1. Does the Minister have a schedule of fines to be imposed in the event of spillage of toxic substances into gulf and coastal waters, and emissions of toxic gases into the atmosphere?

2. If the answer is 'yes'—

(a) What are the figures?

(b) How do these compare with fines imposed in U.S.A., Germany and Japan?

3. If the answer is 'no'—

(a) Does the Government intend introducing a schedule of fines to cover such industry before further development of this nature is allowed to continue in this State?

(b) Will the Government insist on high standards of safety and introduce harsh and heavy penalties to be imposed in the event of the slightest breach of any regulations laid down in such a schedule?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Clean Air Regulations 1972 under the Health Act, 1935-1971, impose fines for emissions in excess of the limits contained in the third schedule of those regulations. The Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961-1979, provides penalties for the discharge of oil from both land and marine-based sources into South Australian waters. The Dangerous Substances Act, 1979-1980, provides for the regulation of the keeping, handling, conveying, use and disposal of any hazardous substances.

The Radiation Protection and Control Act, 1982, provides regulation-making powers to regulate, restrict or prohibit any act relating to mining or milling of radio-active ore, or producing, manufacturing, supplying, keeping, conveying, using or disposing of radio-active substances or radiation apparatus. Further, it makes provision for any necessary action to control dangerous situations which may expose any person to excessive radiation.

2. (a) The penalties for non-compliance with the Clean Air Regulations are \$2 000 maximum and where the offence is of a continuing nature \$200 for each day the offence continues. Under the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961-1979, the maximum fine is \$50 000. Under the Dangerous Substances Act, 1979-1980, penalties not exceeding \$1 000 may be applied as a result of a breach or non-compliance with any regulation.

Under the Radiation Protection and Control Act, 1982, provision is made for penalties up to \$50 000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both, for a minor indictable offence, or for a maximum penalty not exceeding \$10 000 for a summary offence. Penalties are provided in both cases for continuing offences.

(b) These figures are not readily available.

3. (a) Vide 1. and 2.

(b) Vide 1. and 2.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: THE HON. R. C. DeGARIS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I move:

That three week's leave of absence be granted to the Hon. R. C. DeGaris on account of ill-health.

I am pleased to inform the Chamber that the honourable gentleman is improving and is home. He may well be able to appear in this Chamber sooner than is indicated in the motion. However, on balance it was felt wise to move the motion in its original form.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 29 July. Page 276.)

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I take this opportunity once again to affirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. During this session I have already spoken about the death of Sir John McLeay and have extended my sympathy to his family. I want to take this opportunity also to express my sympathy to the family of the late Ted Dawes, who recently suddenly died. Mr Dawes was a well liked and well respected messenger serving the Parliament of South Australia, particularly this Council.

During the course of my contribution to the Address in Reply, I want once again to put on public record in the context of this debate some of the many positive achievements of the present Liberal Government in what are accepted and recognised to be difficult economic times. On previous occasions I have put this on record, for the obvious reason that one needs to see criticisms in a proper context.

One of the achievements of this Government is that it has a broad policy of encouraging and committing industry and commerce to establish and expand in South Australia. There are many good reasons why industry and commerce should locate in South Australia and why South Australia should be regarded as the proper place in the centre of Australia for the establishment of industry and commerce, to service not only the rest of Australia, but also international markets. In addition to the obvious business benefits of establishing in this State, there is the undoubted advantage of the unique South Australian environment.

As the Government has been successful in attracting and co-operating with resource development projects, it has been suggested that the Government is putting all of its eggs in the one basket, but if one looks at the record of the Government it is easy to see that the resource development basket is only one of the many areas of development which are important to South Australia's economic future, on which the Government has placed some emphasis. Obviously, this Government recognises and promotes the importance of the State's existing strong agricultural, industrial and commercial base.

The recognition of that factor can be gained from some of the statistics available with respect to investment in major manufacturing and mining projects. The growth in mining activity is being reflected in increased committed investment in major manufacturing and mining projects. In October 1979 there was only \$300 000 000 committed to major manufacturing and mining investment for the following three years. That figure has taken a dramatic leap, to \$3 480 000 000 as at December 1981. This is an increase of 1 060 per cent.

Recently a survey by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce of the total cost of projects listed by developers at the committed and final feasibility stages indicated that investment in South Australian projects increased by

\$570 000 000 in the second half of 1981 to the total to which I previously referred, \$3 480 000 000. That contrasts with a drop in the total figure for all States and the Northern Territory of \$2 700 000 000. Incidentally, Victoria was the only other State in that period to record an increase in investment.

It is important to recognise that South Australia now has 10.6 per cent of the total investment in Australian manufacturing and mining projects committed and at the final feasibility stages. That is greater than the State's share of the national population, and it should be recognised that it does not include the Roxby Downs project, which for the purposes of that Federal departmental study was put into a category of being at the preliminary study stage.

In the manufacturing, retailing and service industries, there is the same picture of confidence and growth. The special study to which I have already referred has been updated for development projects in terms of capital expenditure that has been announced by these industries in the past 2½ years. The list is impressive, and I do not intend to repeat the details contained therein. Suffice to say that it now accounts for \$1 100 000 000 of new capital investment. The study ought to be recognised also as one that was not exhaustive, as many development projects cannot, for commercial reasons, be made public at this stage. The commitment of \$1 100 000 000 has an impact of nearly 4 000 jobs for the South Australian community. The investments to which I have referred in the retail, service and manufacturing industries involve more than 100 organisations that have either established in South Australia in the past 2½ or three years or have expanded their activities in this State.

The staggering growth in the areas of exploration, mining, manufacturing, retail, and service industries represents the greatest period of expansion since the 1960s, and this is being reflected in increasing employment opportunities.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You must be living in another world.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If one compares the August 1979 figures with those at the end of June 1982, one sees that there has been an increase of 8 800 new jobs in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What happens if you take it from September 1979?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That was not the last full month of the former Government. August 1979 was the last full month of the former Government's life.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's dishonest.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: It is not.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will deal with the Opposition's proposals when we get to that stage.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why don't you take it from September 1979?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will deal to some extent with some of the Opposition's proposals. It is quite obvious that the Opposition is pessimistic and that it keeps knocking South Australia and developments such as Roxby Downs. Only one person opposite recognised the good sense of supporting the Roxby Downs indenture legislation, because of the base that it would provide for the future of South Australia.

A number of other areas such as the Cooper Basin and Stony Point development add to the base for South Australian job opportunities, and I will deal with those in a moment. The fact is that any new investment in South Australia (and it has been quite substantial since August 1979) will undoubtedly improve the base in South Australia and provide opportunities for new jobs. That is what this Government is about in providing a strong and diversified

base that will mean new jobs in what for Australia is a difficult economic climate. No-one can dispute that in the past 2½ to three years there has been a massive upturn in investment in South Australia. We have not seen anything like it since the early 1960s.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Would you say that we're in the middle of a boom?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not suggesting that. The Hon. Dr Cornwall does not seem to accept the realities of life. If we want job opportunities created, industry must be attracted here and resources must be developed. We must provide a diversified base from which job opportunities will spring. That is the emphasis that this Government has been placing on the diversification of South Australia's base. If we turn to exploration activity, we must recognise that it has a medium-term as well as a short-term impact and that many projects do not come to fruition overnight. Perhaps that is one of the Opposition's problems: it is not realistic and does not plan for the future. In the mining area, mineral expenditure in 1981 was \$51 100 000, \$20 000 000 more than in 1980 and more than five times the expenditure in 1979. The number of exploration licences at the end of 1981 was 466, which is 393 more than at the end of June 1979. These licences were held by 92 companies—more than double the number involved in mineral exploration in South Australia at the end of June 1979.

It is also important to recognise that off-shore petroleum expenditure commitments stand at more than \$200 000 000 in South Australia over the next six years, and that on-shore, in the Cooper Basin, exploration development commitments now total about \$200 000 000.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: The biggest natural resource project in Australia today.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Yes, there is no doubt at all that Roxby Downs and the Cooper Basin between them represent the biggest resource development in Australia today.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Your Government is responsible for the Cooper Basin, is it?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It has encouraged that development; there is no doubt about that.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: The Labor Government sold our gas to New South Wales.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is correct that the former Government sold our gas to Sydney. However, I do not want to be diverted into that matter, although it was an appropriate interjection.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He should have more brains than to make a stupid interjection like that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He didn't know that you would be stupid enough to sell our gas to New South Wales.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Cooper Basin project is costing \$1 200 000 000 and it has a pipeline about 700 kilometres long coming down. Recent public indications from the company were that some 3 000 people would be directly employed during the peak construction period, that crude oil and condensate would come on stream early in 1983, and that that flow would make significant contributions to the revenue flowing to South Australia. Something over \$20 000 000 annually is due to come in in royalties from that development. That is more than double the State's present return from all mineral and development projects, and this is a significant contribution to South Australia's economy, as is Roxby Downs.

I have spoken at length and a great deal of information has been provided publicly on that development. On present-day prices, it is worth about \$140 000 000 000 and, when it

is in full production, it will provide many thousands of jobs, directly and indirectly, as well as a township facility that will accommodate well over 9 000 people.

Whilst there has been some criticism of that project by the Opposition, no-one can deny that it is important for South Australians to develop that resource to take advantage of the minerals which are there and to provide jobs for many South Australians directly and indirectly. It is yet another area of endeavour by this Government to broaden its economic base to ensure that in difficult times there is a breadth of investment and development which will more than adequately support the population of South Australia. There are many other areas of positive progress to which I have already referred and which reflect the emphasis of this Government, that is, the development of a strong and diversified base for South Australia.

It is also important to recognise that this State Government has injected record sums into housing. No State Government has done more to provide reasonable cost housing for its people. In the 1981-82 financial year the South Australian Housing Trust capital works programme was a record \$110 000 000. In addition, the State Bank lending programme for concessional loans was a record \$85 000 000.

The State Government, in conjunction with the Housing Trust, has ensured that the Housing Trust has greater flexibility in raising record sums to finance housing development. It has encouraged the Housing Trust's innovative approaches to marshal capital. It obtained additional funds from the Superannuation Investment Trust (some \$10 000 000) and from S.G.I.C. (some \$5 000 000). We have encouraged the issue of short-term promissory notes, the first by any similar organisation, to the extent of \$5 000 000. Capital has also been achieved from the transfer of certain shopping centre leases.

The Government, with the Housing Trust, has taken initiatives to further increase the availability of housing in projects such as joint venture unit projects and leasing from the private sector, in an arrangement which is the first of its kind in Australia. The result of these Government initiatives is record investment, record building and a huge increase in the provision of low-cost and low-rental housing.

It should be noted that in 1981-82 the Housing Trust commenced building 1 815 new homes. That is about 800 more homes than for 1980-81, when the Housing Trust commenced 1 017 new homes. The State Bank is lending record sums to assist 55 families per week. The Government has increased the loan limit from \$27 000 to \$33 000 in permitted loans for new and existing homes. That is another area on which the State Government is placing a great deal of emphasis.

There are many other areas to which I could refer, but time does not permit. I could mention transport, education and initiatives taken by the Minister of Marine in the development of ports and harbours and in relation to container shipping, the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge railway line, and so on. They are all positive achievements to strengthen South Australia.

For a few moments I will reflect upon the Opposition's position in relation to economic activity and development in this State. The Leader of the Opposition interjected in relation to employment opportunities and unemployment. All we have from the Opposition is a rather vague economic plan which is only presented in parts. I will spend a few moments looking at that economic plan and the Leader of the Opposition's reference to the Enterprise Fund.

It is very difficult to gain any real idea from the economic plan that has been presented so far about what the Opposition would do in dealing with the State's economy. In fact, that document states:

Labor recognises that a State Government presiding over a small regional economy has limited economic powers.

That particular economic plan acknowledges that it represents the first stage of policy formulation. It does not represent the final plan in detail. Maybe we will see the second stage of that plan which I believe will deal with how the economic plan will be funded. If one examines the 85-page economic plan one can see that no definite proposals are put forward. Many of the broad suggestions have already been investigated by the Liberal Government and, in some cases, implemented when found appropriate.

There is no costing in the Opposition's economic plan and there is no hint as to where the additional capital required will come from or from where it will be taken. There is no hint of where the additional revenue required will be raised. It is no wonder that there has been some significant criticism of the package presented by the Leader of the Opposition in another place. On the basis of the statements made in the economic document and with past experience of the previous Labor Government's job creation schemes, it seems that the package of proposals would conservatively require an annual increase in State Government expenditure of about \$200 000 000 at 1982 values (based on advice received by the Government).

I think one can only conclude that, as a result of an examination of that economic document and on past speeches by the Opposition, a Labor Government would implement significant increases in State taxes and charges. There is no alternative available to a State Government to raise the funds necessary to pay for job creation schemes. It should be recognised that an extra \$200 000 000 a year would require the imposition of additional taxation of \$154 a year for every man, woman and child in this State. For a family with two children that would mean, on average, an extra \$616 a year or nearly \$12 a week.

In addition, the recently announced Labor health policy could add \$50 000 000 per year to the \$200 000 000 already mentioned. Therefore, we are really looking at an estimated cost of \$250 000 000 a year to implement Labor election promises already announced. One expects that other promises will be forthcoming in relation to education, welfare, and so on. Where does the Labor Party propose to raise the extra revenue required to pay for these promises?

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: What a boring old line that is.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is a factual line. There is a very interesting article in the *Business Review Weekly* of 25 July. That article is headed 'Who runs Wran?' and refers to some of the sleight of hand tricks resorted to by the Wran Government in meeting what is, in fact, a disguised \$300 000 000 Budget deficit in New South Wales. It is very interesting reading.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: That will be yours, too, if you get back into Government.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Our Budget will contain all the information to enable the honourable member to make her own assessment.

It will be a responsible Budget. In New South Wales there has been sleight of hand in transferring about \$350 000 000 of so-called reserves from various agencies back to Consolidated Revenue, which enabled the Wran Government to desist from increasing State taxes and charges despite continually rising costs, but now the chickens have come home to roost in New South Wales.

After the Loan Council meeting, Mr Wran returned to New South Wales and claimed that the Federal Government was cheating New South Wales of \$38 000 000. He immediately reconvened Parliament, introduced a mini-Budget and raised fuel taxes, public transport and hospital charges and other rates and charges in New South Wales to raise an estimated \$350 000 000 in a full year. That is a ten-fold

increase over the alleged underpayment by the Federal Government to New South Wales. I suspect that the Labor Party in South Australia would not hesitate to make expensive promises but would do much as Mr Cain in Victoria did when he came to office, that is, to back off from a number of election promises. One promise was to return probate and gift duty in that State. He quickly backed off when he realised how unpopular were such moves in Victoria. It ought to be recognised in this State that when we introduced legislation to abolish death duties, gift duties and land tax on the principal place of residence, the Leader of the Opposition in another place stated in regard to death duties:

Unfortunately, this unpopular tax is one that has a potential to be extremely fair and just, and it is a pity that at one stroke it is to be abolished.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Michelle Gratton said that in the *Age* the other day.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: What journalists write is really a matter for them; they exercise their own judgment. The Leader of the Opposition in this State is on record saying that it is a pity that it is to be abolished. In Victoria, Mr Cain sought to reintroduce probate and was quick to recognise the errors of his ways and backed away from that proposal.

One presumes that the reference by the Leader of the Opposition in this Council to the Enterprise Fund during his Address in Reply speech might be one way in which a Labor Government would seek to pay for the expensive promises to which I have referred and the promises which undoubtedly the Labor Party will make as we lead up to a State election. Let me just analyse the concept of the Enterprise Fund for a few moments, because the people of South Australia need to recognise that it is a specious proposal which is a gimmick and which has no substance to it. The Opposition proposal for an Enterprise Fund will not provide the basis for economic growth in South Australia. It really is pie-in-the-sky promoted for election purposes. If one looks across the border to Victoria, one will see that the new Victorian Premier promised to establish a Victorian Development Fund in terms similar to the Enterprise Fund advanced by the Opposition. In Victoria, the Government had been in office for barely one month when its major election promise and policy was abandoned. It is important that honourable members remember that, and remember it well. There was to be a new style of financial management in Victoria, with a much-vaunted Victorian Development Fund generating untold millions for State projects.

Victorians were told that there would be an extra \$475 000 000 generated for so-called 'job-creating capital works programmes'. What is more, an extra \$47 200 000 would be spent on housing in the Government's first year of office. What has happened as a result of that Government's coming into office? One understands now that the Victorian Development Fund may not be established for 12 months, if at all. Apparently it is a different matter for the Labor Party once it achieves office. It found out, on coming into office, that the existing financial structure was a perfectly good one, that one cannot fiddle with the system and use money that does not exist, or that it is in reserve, for future projects. I have already referred to the article in *Business Review Weekly* concerning the use of statutory agencies by New South Wales. The failure of the Victorian Development Fund to make the transition from ill-researched pipedream to reality has been followed by more excuses, and is another failure to come up with the goods.

Also, we have been told, a \$47 000 000 housing increase to which I have already referred is to be shelved in Victoria. The Housing Minister is now saying that, because the development fund has not materialised, the Government might

have to postpone its promise to spend that extra money on housing. The Victorians have a right to be confused and angry about this backing away from election promises after only a month.

I do not think that anyone can be in any doubt that the use of an Enterprise Fund in South Australia is really an election gimmick, just as the Victorian Development Fund was a gimmick in Victoria. It will not provide any of the magical solutions claimed for it, because it will not assist in reducing unemployment, it will not provide additional Government revenue or any money for housing, it will not provide more money for construction, for small business, it will not provide investment for export-based industries, and it will not be a generator of capital in its own right. It sounds good in theory, but there is no way that such an Enterprise Fund can be implemented, because there is no magical solution to the difficulties which confront Governments around Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about your magical solutions?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader has not bothered to listen to anything that I have said and, if he had, he would have seen the focus that I have been making on the development projects which have been undertaken in this State and which are all directed towards diversifying our base in this State and providing a sound base, creating jobs and security for the people of South Australia.

There is no doubt that, if a Labor Government had been in office, none of that would have occurred in South Australia. The State Labor Government was run down; it had lost its steam, if it ever had any; it was doing very much what Mr Cain is doing in Victoria and what Mr Wran is doing in New South Wales: that is, taking up ideas without those ideas having any substance at all, and engaging in what can only be regarded by any independent observer as economic sleight of hand.

This Liberal Government in South Australia is optimistic about the future. It has effected a number of optimistic achievements for South Australians and it will continue to place its emphasis on achievements to provide diversified bases for the development of South Australia. There is no doubt that there are many runs on the board, and the people of South Australia will be able to see those runs on the board during the next six months or so, just as they have been able to recognise them in the past. If the Opposition cannot come to terms with the fact that there are runs on the board, it demonstrates its shortsightedness and the fact that it is pessimistic about South Australia, that the Opposition is all 'gloom and doom' and really does not know which way to turn.

The recent building society interest rates question is one of those instances when the Opposition did not really know which way it was going. On the one hand, before the Treasurer exercised his responsibility under the Building Societies Act the Opposition was setting the scene to criticise the Government if the Treasurer allowed the building societies to increase their interest rates. However, when the Treasurer exercised his responsibility and declined to approve an increase in the interest rate the Leader of the Opposition in the other place then shifted to the other foot and decided that he would take up the cudgel for the building societies by protesting publicly (and I think a report of this appeared in an article in Saturday's *Advertiser*) that the building societies have to have an increase in their rates if they are going to get in more funds.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: That is why they call him the Flim-Flam Man.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is correct, the Flim-Flam Man or Mr Gloom and Doom—I do not mind which term is used to describe his attitude. The Leader of the Opposition

in the other place cannot shift from one foot to the other if he is going to put up a credible performance to South Australians in general.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: His approval rating is a good deal better than the Premier's.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader of the Opposition in the other place does not know which way to turn on the building societies interest rates issue. It is just one example of him trying to get the best political mileage out of a situation. He is a political opportunist. If one looks at the facts of that, and many other instances, one sees that he is an opportunist and plays the game for what he thinks he can get out of it in the short term rather than looking to the future of South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You cannot believe all this stuff, surely?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I believe it. One has only to look at the matter objectively, but the Leader in this place is not prepared to do that. He cannot come to terms with runs being on the board. He cannot recognise that this Government has honoured its election promises in so many areas.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I cannot think of one of them.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The cut in taxes. The Leader is not only blinkered, he is wearing a blindfold. He cannot recognise that concessions on stamp duty for the first, principal place of residence have cost the State \$10 000 000. Those reductions have benefited nearly 22 000 purchasers of homes in South Australia over the past 2½ years—that is nearly \$500 per household!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What did you take back in increases in rates and taxes, and the like?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: We have not increased taxes.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Public transport, water and sewerage rates, and other costs have increased at a lot more than the inflation rate.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The costs of services have increased at a reasonable rate to match increases in costs. Increases in costs are largely brought about by wage increases. Mr Wran acknowledges that one has to keep pace with increases in costs by the way in which he has increased his State charges.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You have gone well beyond increases in costs.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader of the Opposition in this State has acknowledged in public statements that charges for services have to be increased to meet increases in the costs of providing those services. In fact, he got himself into a spot of bother because he was reported on one day as saying that he would not increase State taxes or charges, and then, on the next day, had to back down quickly. I refer to the press report as follows:

A report in the *Advertiser* yesterday quoted Mr Bannon in part as saying an Australian Labor Party Government would not raise State charges during its first term in power. 'This was incorrect.' Mr Bannon said yesterday that, while an Australian Labor Party Government would not raise taxes or bring in new taxes during its first term in power, it would be 'irresponsible to say in a blanket way charges would not rise'. He said, 'Rises in charges should be related to the increase in the costs of the services provided or related to the Government's policies on how a service should be used'.

That was certainly an about face. Therefore, there cannot be any criticism from the Opposition benches about increases in costs and charges for services provided by the Government because that is a course of action supported by Wran, Cain and the Leader of the Opposition in this State. I and this Government have a most optimistic view of the future for all South Australians. I believe quite fervently that the record of progress achieved in the past 2½ years will demonstrate without any doubt that this Government has the

capacity to honour its commitments, is credible and is the Government for South Australians into the 1980s.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that His Excellency the Governor has appointed 4.30 p.m. today as the time for the presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I ask honourable members to accompany me to Government House for that purpose.

[Sitting suspended from 4.7 to 5.14 p.m.]

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable

members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech adopted by the Council today, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the fourth session of the Forty-fourth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 11 August at 2.15 p.m.