

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 August 1980

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: EDUCATION FUNDING

Petitions signed by 78 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cut-back in funding for the Education Department were presented by Mr. Bannon and Mr. Whitten.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location were presented by the Hon. D. O. Tonkin, the Hon. W. A. Rodda, and Mr. Bannon.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 19, 26, 41, 48, 49, 53, 74, 76, 101, 106, 176, 177, 180, 191, 200, 203, 211, 216, 218, 221 to 224, 226 to 228, 232 to 236, 242, 243, 247, 254 to 256, 277, 278, 284, 302, 323, 326 and 336 to 338.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA PRISON

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

The **SPEAKER**: Is leave granted?

Mr. Millhouse: No!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Minister to make such statement without leave.

The **SPEAKER**: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Several members having risen:

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker, I make the same protest about the suspension of Standing Orders as I

made last week on this matter. Since then I have discovered what I did not know before. I have sent you a copy of the letter, I think, that I have sent to the Leader of the Opposition (and I also sent a letter to the Premier), which shows that in the House of Commons, from which we take our procedures, these matters are ventilated beforehand if there is any possible chance of doing so. In other words, the House is not asked to give *carte blanche* to a Minister to say what he likes on any subject he likes, which makes an absolute farce of the requirement to get leave at all for a Ministerial statement.

We do not know; and, once leave is given, the Ministerial statement, whether it takes 30 minutes or 30 seconds, can be given, and no-one can stop it. I do not know what the subject matter of the Minister's statement may be on this occasion. If it is about Yatala or Tognolini's escape, or something like that, I would welcome it. I do not know whether it is that or some piffling thing that does not matter at all; or maybe another attack on members of the Opposition such as we had the week before last from the Minister of Agriculture. Unless I know what the subject matter of the Ministerial statement may be, I will always deny leave, and that is the least courtesy which the Government can give not only to me but to every member. Therefore, I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders to give leave to the Minister over and above my objection to his being granted leave.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the Chair is that the suspension be agreed to. Those in favour of the motion say, "Aye"; against, "No".

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The **SPEAKER**: There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

While the division was being held:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I thank the House for giving me leave to make this Ministerial statement. The member for Elizabeth made some astounding accusations about the Yatala Labour Prison in his Address in Reply speech last Thursday, when he claimed that at least six prisoners had died in Yatala over the past 12 months, that the prison was responsible for these deaths—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: —and that, furthermore, the department must bear some responsibility for these deaths. In the past 12 months, there have been four deaths at Yatala, not six, as the honourable member alleged. One was the death of a psychiatric patient at Northfield, who apparently fell to his death in the psychiatric hospital at the gaol.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It's not a psychiatric hospital.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member can no doubt put us right on that.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I will have to—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Interjections are out of order at any time, and especially in the course of a Ministerial statement.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: No other person was involved in that incident. The other was the death of an inmate on 13 February 1980. This death is currently the subject of a coronial inquiry. Two other inmates have died in hospital during that period: one from terminal cancer, and the other from a brain haemorrhage after having been transferred from Cadell.

Statements were made about injuries to certain people in the prison population at Yatala, and the prisoner

concerned, who had a mark on his stomach. This prisoner did not report his injury to a medical officer, and though the inmate says he reported to an officer, that officer cannot recall the report. The prisoner is well known to the prison administration for suffering injuries while on his own, either at night or in his cell or in the shower.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's outrageous.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: He once bashed his head on his cell wall, and another time suffered a mysterious foot injury whilst in the shower. Another prisoner allegedly had a knife thrown at him. This matter has been investigated by the Department of Correctional Services. First, the prisoner said the knife missed him by inches, but later he told the inquiry that the knife hit him on the top of the left arm. At the time of the alleged incident, there was a backhoe working in the yard where this prisoner says he was standing. The backhoe was between the inmate and another building, which is the only place from which this knife could have come. The knife thrown would, in all probability, have hit the earthmoving equipment, rather than the inmate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You will live to regret this statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Chief Secretary will resume his seat. I have already issued a general warning, and I do not want to have to speak on this matter again. I have made it quite clear that, during Ministerial statements, interjections of any type are out of order. The honourable Chief Secretary.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The windows of the building opposite are locked, and the knife could not have been thrown from the roof because there was no-one on the roof at that time. The alleged throwing has been thoroughly investigated and there are circumstances which suggest that the knife was never thrown at all, but was acquired by the prisoner in some other way, and he wished to profit by giving it to the prison staff.

Coincidental with this incident was correspondence to an Assistant Director from this inmate seeking a transfer to another institution so that he could be with a friend. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the inmate who alleged the knife was thrown was in possession of a knife. The museum at the institution contains a varied assortment of weapons of this type manufactured by prisoners over the years. Most have been discovered by staff in searches. Others, and this is pertinent to the current allegation, have been handed over by prisoners seeking favours.

The member for Elizabeth had something to say about the segregation in the exercise yards and in the showers. Showering is done in three separate areas, and starts only when a full complement of officers is present. Inmates under protection shower in a special area separately and under the supervision of custodial officers. All prisoners are assessed before being assigned to institutions. This assessment includes the likelihood of threats to themselves or other prisoners, and takes into consideration the age of inmates, as well as the crime committed. Prisoners are counted and checked six times a day as part of the normal internal security.

Special procedures have been set down for the protection of prisoners who seek protection, and there are currently 10 persons in this category at Yatala. Some prisoners have been transferred to other institutions at their request, as in the case of the inmate who the honourable member says was cut on the stomach. This particular inmate is not only known for mysterious injuries but also has a reputation for plaguing administrations with unfounded stories of threats and assaults.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that during the term

of the previous Government there were two serious incidents at Yatala. Two prisoners were seriously attacked and injured by other inmates. These attacks resulted in conviction of the assailants and compensation for the injured, but I do not recall the member for Elizabeth calling for an inquiry on either occasion.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to a very grave matter in connection with these allegations, and here I might remind the honourable member of the Prisons Act, which his Party administered for a decade, particularly section 43, which says that judges of the Supreme Court may visit prisons at their wish, but all others must seek approval of the Director or Superintendent before visiting inmates. Moreover, it is accepted protocol for members wishing to arrange visits to any Government department or facility to arrange such a visit through the responsible Minister.

Because of the situation which has arisen, I have drawn the attention of the Director of Correctional Services to requirements of the Prisons Act in respect of visits, and to the protocol regarding visits by members of this House, so that all staff of the Department of Correctional Services will have these requirements brought to their notice.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Savings Bank of South Australia—Balance Sheet as at 30 June 1980.

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Education Act, 1972-1980—Regulations—

- i. Committee Fees.
- ii. Boarding Allowance.

By the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia—Report for year ended 30 April 1980.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Corporation of Port Adelaide—By-law No. 35—Cemetery.
- ii. District Council of Lincoln—By-law No. 27—Bathing and Control of Foreshore.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1980—"Cancellation of Probationary Licence Appeal Rules".

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978—Regulations—Qualifications.

By the Minister of Water Resources (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Sewerage Act, 1929-1977—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Waterworks Act, 1932-1978—Regulations—fees.

QUESTION TIME

GAS COMPANY

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say whether the Government, as part of its review of the South Australian Gas Company Act, will investigate, as a matter of urgency, whether individuals, companies or nominee companies acting on behalf of others have breached section 5 of the Act, which limits shareholdings to a maximum of 5 per cent, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I indicated to the House that the Government is considering introducing legislation in relation to the Gas Company. I am aware of some of the difficulties to which the Leader of the Opposition alludes, and the Government is actively considering those matters at present.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy give the House details of current mineral exploration activity in South Australia, and how the situation compares with that of 12 months ago?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pleased to supply the House with these figures because it is obvious that there is some misunderstanding in relation to the current position, certainly on the part of the executive member of the Labor Party who, I understand, is spokesman on mines and energy.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is the honourable member for Mitchell, if the honourable member wants me to name him. The facts speak for themselves. They are that the latest figures from the Department of Mines and Energy indicate unprecedented interest in mineral exploration in South Australia. There are 251 licences current, covering an area of 296 420 square kilometres. At the end of August 1979, there were 136 licences current, covering 139 961 square kilometres. Thus, the number of current licences has increased by more than 84 per cent, and the area they cover has more than doubled.

In addition, the Department of Mines and Energy is now considering 103 applications for licences covering an area of 160 521 square kilometres. At the end of August last year, 73 licences were under application, covering 91 642 square kilometres, so in total the number of licences current or applied for is 354, compared with 209 at the end of last August, an increase of 69 per cent. The area covered is now 456 941 square kilometres, compared with 231 603 square kilometres at the end of last August, an increase of 97 per cent.

The member for Mitchell has stated that claims of a resurgence in exploration activity are a myth. What I have just stated to the House are facts which indicate that the member for Mitchell was in error when he made that statement.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I quoted the figures from Mines Department records.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have been trying to track down the list to which the honourable member alluded. I can tell him that what I am giving to the House now is factual information received from the department. It appears that this could be another attempt by the Opposition to misrepresent the facts, but the fact is that there is a resurgence of interest in mineral exploration and in exploration for hydrocarbons. I have announced that more than \$50 000 000 is to be spent soon on oil exploration, something which the Labor Party in Canberra

and in this State managed to kill off. Those are the facts, and I have given them to the House so that the member for Mitchell will be better informed.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier confirm or deny reports that the Government intends to introduce legislation either to increase or decrease the number of members in this House, thereby forcing an electoral redistribution before the next State election?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

FREE TRAVEL

Mr. GLAZBROOK: My question is supplementary to one raised by the member for Mallee on 7 August. Will the Minister of Transport consider taking up with the Commonwealth Government and private transport operators the possibility of extending free or concessional travel for unemployed and disadvantaged people located outside the areas serviced by the State Transport Authority, by suggesting the use of stand-by fares to utilise seats unsold at the time of departure? It has been stated to me that, whilst those unemployed and disadvantaged people in the city applaud the Government's initiative in implementing free transport on the S.T.A. system, many hundreds more people are disadvantaged in country areas which, of course, the S.T.A. does not cover. I am told that, to many of these unemployed and disadvantaged country people, this restriction creates difficulties when they attempt to find work or to make urgent and necessary visits to medical centres or to see relatives, particularly when that involves travel to the city regularly. Indeed, I am told that some of my constituents who are pensioners regularly send money to their families in the country to subsidise travel to Adelaide by those relatives. It has been put to me that those unemployed in Murray Bridge, for instance, and similar country centres cannot avail themselves of the current Government programme of free transportation and, of course, this creates an atmosphere of discrimination and hardship. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will examine this suggestion, and whether he is prepared to talk to the Commonwealth Government and to the private transport operators on this important issue.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the member for Brighton is right in stating that the State Government's initiative in extending free public transport to pensioners, the disadvantaged and the unemployed has proved very popular with the public. Reports I have already received from the State Transport Authority indicate that the system is beginning to work quite well. Obviously, we shall have to wait a little while until everyone gets used to it, but initial reports are very favourable. The question that the honourable member has raised, in particular, concerns the extension of that free service to country areas to which the State Transport Authority does not supply a service. The honourable member is right in that we would have to negotiate with the Federal Government on that matter, and, certainly, I should be very happy to do that for him. I think his suggestion is an extremely worthy one, and follows a suggestion made a week or two ago by the member for Mallee.

There is also the question that the State Government could extend a subsidy scheme to private bus operators in the country. There is already a subsidy scheme for pensioners and disadvantaged people, but I would certainly be prepared to have a look at that suggestion to see how much further we can go. I might say that the

public transport concessions provided in South Australia, especially now that we have instituted our latest programme, are the most generous in the Commonwealth.

Mitcham.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In that case, certainly not balanced submissions.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

Mr. McRAE: My question to the Premier is supplementary to other questions I have asked on the same topic. When the Premier was interviewed on the A.B.C. news on Thursday evening, 14 August, why did he claim that the guidelines for public servants appearing before committees provided that public servants may choose to be accompanied by an adviser when, in fact, the guidelines as tabled on 6 August state in part, "An adviser arranged through the Public Service Board must accompany an official appearing before Parliamentary committees"? I stress that the part I have quoted accurately reflects the whole tenor of that document. While obviously I do not want to recanvass the whole of the guidelines, there are a number of occasions on which it is made quite clear that a public servant wishing to give evidence before a committee must be accompanied by an adviser arranged through the Public Service Board.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I made quite clear in a statement to this House a fortnight ago that the Government was prepared to accept reasonable and balanced suggestions from any interested party. Indeed, I have notified some of those interested parties by letter, having received no such submissions from them.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: All you've got to do is abandon them altogether; that's my suggestion to you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was about to say that I received a similar suggestion from the Hon. Mr. Sumner in another place, but there was no other suggestion or notification. As a result of the suggestion that I made that the Government would be prepared to hear reasonable and balanced submissions, I have also made clear (and I cannot recall exactly the day in this House) that the Government has already received one such suggestion. That came from the members of the Public Service Board. It involved changing the word "must" to "may", because this was, as I have explained—

Mr. Bannon: That's news.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition went through this performance last time I said this in the House. That was the Government's intention at all times.

Mr. Bannon: You said nothing about it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This was the Government's intention. As a result of a discussion it was said that surely the Government did not expect that the Director-General of a department would need an adviser. The answer to that was "Of course not." An adviser was there if the public servant desired to have someone there in appropriate circumstances. That has been made clear time and time again, and I am amazed it has taken about a fortnight for that particular request for balanced and reasoned submissions to come to the Government to appear in the daily press. There have been a number of inaccuracies in articles also, but the fact remains that the Government has sought balanced and reasoned submissions. That invitation was made a fortnight ago, and as yet we have still not had any positive—

Mr. Millhouse: You've got mine, anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for

MORPHETT VALE EAST KINDERGARTEN

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Education advise me as to the outcome of last Tuesday's meeting between the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union with respect to the location and future viability of the Morphett Vale East II Kindergarten? Steps were taken about two years ago to establish another much needed kindergarten in the Morphett Vale area. In February 1979, the then Minister gave approval for the funding of the kindergarten. At the same time, however, refusal was given for the kindergarten to be located on the grounds of the Morphett Vale East Primary School. Two lots of land were subsequently sought in Archer Court, Morphett Vale, and settlement took effect on 20 April 1979. Objections from local residents to the establishment of a kindergarten has led to protracted legal and planning proceedings that have not yet been finalised.

At the beginning of this year, the Kindergarten Union made approaches to the Education Department to have the Kindergarten temporarily housed on the site of Yetto East Primary School. Confusion has now arisen owing to the fact that certain people are endeavouring to have a child-parent centre erected at Yetto East Primary School in lieu of a kindergarten. I am led to believe that this confusion was given impetus by the former member for the area, Mr. Les Drury, who circulated a flier stating that a child-parent centre would be established at Yetto East. This opinion seems to differ from what was the official Education Department opinion at the time, that there may be a possibility for such a facility later. Parents whose children attend the kindergarten are worried that they will lose this facility, and hence my question.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I know how extremely interested the honourable member is in the affairs of his electorate. As he has said, the matter is relatively complex, when one considers the issue. In fact, the kindergarten, which is presently referred to as the Morphett Vale East II second kindergarten, will continue to operate from the Yetto East Primary School. The essence of the problem is really that there is some dispute between local residents and the Noarlunga City Council as to whether in fact the suggested site for a kindergarten is the most appropriate one. That problem is as yet unresolved.

As the honourable member has also said, there is some dispute whether the Education Department or the Kindergarten Union should ultimately provide this second kindergarten, and a third kindergarten may even be needed in the long term in the area. The latter issue is currently still under discussion between the Kindergarten Union, which prefers the non-acceptable site, and the Education Department, which currently has land available within the existing school premises.

The problem of the siting is as yet unresolved, and I will be awaiting with great interest the deliberations of a public meeting of local residents and, I believe, the Noarlunga council that will be held soon to determine the acceptability or otherwise of at least one of the sites. Meanwhile, the kindergarten services will continue at the Yetto East Primary School.

NUGAN HAND

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Will the Premier direct, if he has not already done so, the South Australian Police Force and the Corporate Affairs Commission to assist and co-operate with the Federal police in their inquiries into the South Australian connections of the collapsed Nugan Hand merchant banking group? The Premier will be aware that the New South Wales Drugs Royal Commission has called for an inquiry into the affairs of the Nugan Hand group because of its involvement with criminals. The Premier will also be aware that last Wednesday the Federal police seized a large number of documents from premises formerly used by Mr. Karl Fritz Schuller, a director of Nugan Hand, who was the South Australian agent for investment in the Sydney-based merchant bank and the companies connected with it. Mr. Schuller, like Mr. Hand, has disappeared. So have the funds of South Australian investors.

I understand that the Federal police are investigating Mr. Schuller's disappearance, the loss of large amounts of investment funds and silver bullion, and the financial involvement of prominent South Australians. I have been told that the names of several past and present members of Parliament have been found on documents seized by the Federal police, some of which are in the possession of an Adelaide newspaper. In order that the Federal police can get to the bottom of Nugan Hand dealings in South Australia, will the Premier do as I have requested?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was given some notice that a question on this subject might be asked during this Question Time. I must say that I am distressed to hear that it has come from the former Premier (the member for Hartley), because I was told by a member of the media that the Labor Party and the staff of the Leader of the Opposition were engaged in a witchhunt about Nugan Hand's activities and were seeking to involve Liberal members of Parliament in the scandal which they could see coming out of the Nugan Hand affair. I repeat, that I am entirely surprised that this question should have come from the member for Hartley. I can well believe that he was not aware of the deeper meanings behind the question that he was asked to ask.

I will ensure that co-operation is given and, indeed, as far as I know, officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission and officers of the South Australian Police Force have already offered to co-operate with the Federal police and with the authorities generally.

It may just help members opposite if we can perhaps clear the air a little further, because it may save them a little more wasting of Question Time. When I was warned that such an action might be contemplated in another attempt at muck-raking, I asked members of my Cabinet whether or not they had in any way been involved with the Nugan Hand organisation or with Mr. Schuller. There is no question at all of any members of Cabinet being involved with the activities of Nugan Hand. However, I am unable to give any guarantee that Mr. Schuller was not at any time examined by me and had spectacles prescribed by me, or that the Attorney-General may not have given some legal advice in relation to an estate that was the business of Mr. Schuller's, or that the Minister of Transport may not at some time perhaps have dispensed some medication for Mr. Schuller.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I'm not interested in that.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not interested, and I am pleased to hear that the former Premier is not interested, either. I hope that what I have said may save one or two other questions that might be expected, on the past record of the Opposition.

CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM

Mr. LEWIS: Will the Minister of Environment, representing the Minister of Arts, investigate the possibility of opening the Constitutional Museum for touring parties from country centres in the evenings in instances where prior bookings are made with the management?

Currently, the Constitutional Museum is open on Monday through Friday and on Saturday from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and guided tours, I point out for the information of honourable members, leave every half an hour, the first leaving at 10 a.m. and the last, because it takes about 100 minutes, about 3.20 p.m. It is open on Sundays from 1.30 to 5 p.m., but at this stage there is no provision for people with no opportunity to come other than in the evening to visit at that time. The present prices are 90c for pensioners, children, students, and others entitled to a concession, and \$2 for adults.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has sought leave to give information relevant to the question, and I respectfully make the point that prices are not part of the question.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My concern was to ensure that members and the Minister understood that I would not necessarily see those fees applying on the basis of individuals, but rather a fee for a party which has been paid for a prior booking overall, to meet the cost of opening in such circumstances.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the points raised by the member for Mallee, and I shall be very pleased to take up the matter with the Minister of Arts in another place. I would be anxious that as many people as possible in South Australia should look at what the Constitutional Museum provides. This applies especially to country people, who do not often get to the city. I think the suggestion of the member for Mallee is a good one, and I would be pleased to discuss it with my colleague.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs recommend to the Premier that the two country areas near Adelaide which currently receive a 50 per cent pay-roll tax rebate under the Government's decentralisation scheme should, following the Budget, be eligible for the full 100 per cent rebate available to other country areas of South Australia? Last week, the Minister of Industrial Affairs seemed somewhat confused in his reply to my question in that he said that the full rebate was available to all country areas outside of Adelaide. The Minister should be aware that there are two country areas which receive only a 50 per cent pay-roll tax rebate, and not the full 100 per cent. These areas extend north of Adelaide almost to Port Wakefield and Riverton, and south of Adelaide, including McLaren Vale, Strathalbyn, Victor Harbor, Goolwa and as far as Milang. These areas are hardly part of the Adelaide metropolitan area. Will the Minister now answer my question properly?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I see the member for Florey is on the same band waggon as was the Leader of the Opposition in the speech he gave last night. It would appear that the Leader, in his speech last night, did not know the facts of the scheme, or did not bother to get the details, or, if he did, he did not bother to quote them accurately. I have some details which I wish to relate to the House, but let me deal first with the specific points raised by the honourable member, which related to whether the Government would extend the rebate to the area which currently receives a 50 per cent rebate, and would we extend it to 100 per cent. The answer is "No", for a

number of reasons.

Mr. O'Neill: You said the whole State.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I ask the honourable member to listen to the answer. First, the scheme is designed as an incentive to manufacturing and processing industry in decentralised areas, and it is directly related to the disadvantages that those industries face because of their distance from the Adelaide metropolitan area. Of course, some sort of manufacturing or processing industry at Port Augusta or out of Pinnaroo faces a significantly greater disadvantage than does the decentralised industry just out of Gawler or just south of Adelaide, say at Victor Harbor. For one thing, two of the substantial costs that any decentralised industry has to pay are the cost of freight to Adelaide, and telephone charges. The greater the distance from Adelaide, the greater the trunk call charge for calls to Adelaide. Therefore, quite obviously, the farther the distance from Adelaide, the greater the rebates should be.

Secondly, all other schemes introduced by other Governments throughout Australia have always involved a marginal area in between the metropolitan or city area and the more distant country areas. It is quite appropriate that only a 50 per cent rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax should apply in those areas. The Leader's claim that Port Wakefield is in the 50 per cent zone is quite incorrect. That zone includes the district council area of Mallala, which does not extend to Port Wakefield, as claimed by the Leader. He also claimed that McLaren Vale is in the 50 per cent zone, but most of that area is not in that zone.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Half of it is.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Deputy Leader should listen for a minute. Let us look at the record of the previous Government in this regard.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What has that got to do with it?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A great deal. Less than 12 months ago, when the Labor Party was in Government in this State, its pay-roll tax incentive schemes gave only a fraction of what has been given by this Government. The Leader of the Opposition was a Minister at that time, and he sat there and accepted those policies. Now, 12 months later, he is coming out with the most naive statements. It is safe for him in Opposition to make such statements, but he knows that his Government has a terrible, if not a disgraceful, record in this regard.

In 1978-79, the last full year in which the Labor Party was in Government (and thank goodness it is over), the total assistance by rebate for pay-roll tax and land tax for decentralised industry was \$353 000. Under the present Liberal Government policy, it is estimated that, for the full year of those rebates of pay-roll tax and land tax, the total cost will be approximately \$5 000 000—more than ten times the amount granted by the previous Government. How can the Leader of the Opposition stand up with any honesty and say what he is saying, and also ask the present Government to extend that system further, especially, as I have pointed out, as he does not even know the districts to which the different rebates apply?

I would have thought that the honourable member would praise this Government for achieving what it has and for the more than ten-fold increases in rebates handed out by this Government compared to what his Party's Government handed out in 1978-79. That Government had no plan to extend the rebates to 100 per cent in the areas referred to as the 50 per cent zone.

POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Chief Secretary assure the House that police officers will not be withdrawn from the northern parts of South Australia, particularly from my

district? The Minister would be aware that I have been approached, and I believe that telegrams have been sent to him, by my constituents, who have expressed concern that the police station at Mannahill has been closed on a temporary basis. I seek an assurance from the Chief Secretary that a police officer will again be stationed in that area in the near future. There is a strong body of opinion in the northern parts of my district that there is an urgent need to increase, not decrease, the number of police officers in the northern Flinders Range.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is true that I have received a telegram from the residents of Mannahill. The police officer at Mannahill was transferred from that place at his own request, for personal reasons. I have discussed this matter with the Commissioner and, whilst no officer is currently at the station, the policing of the North and several other parts of the State is being looked at.

The honourable member has raised this matter in relation to the Flinders Range. I know how he feels, and I know how some of his constituents feel about this matter. The honourable member's district covers about three-quarters of the area of South Australia, and some areas of his district may require additional police staff. The Police Department is currently confronted with rationalising its needs in terms of the requirements of these areas. I will raise this matter with the Commissioner and have further discussions with him and the honourable member for Eyre.

PAY-ROLL TAX SCHEME

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Premier answer the widely understood rumour that there is to be a 50 per cent cut in the Budget allocation for the Government's much trumpeted pay-roll tax scheme for youth unemployment? This is a clear admission that the scheme has failed. What alternative job creation schemes for youth employment does the Government intend to implement?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am afraid that the honourable member will have to contain himself with great patience until Thursday.

DRY LAND FARMING

Mr. RANDALL: Following a statement this morning on the A.B.C. news, can the Minister of Agriculture say how many countries are using dry land farming techniques developed in South Australia, how many countries have shown interest, and whether the Federal Government has shown interest in exporting our technology to Third World countries as a form of foreign aid?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Apparently the honourable member wants me to expand on the wide coverage that I gave this important subject last week. Indeed, I believe it shall forever deserve attention. I would like, first, to confirm that I had discussions with an A.B.C. reporter in an interview last night at the opening of the dry land farming congress. In saying that, I would like to reflect that Chris Rann, the journalist who interviewed me, was one of the few South Australian journalists who saw fit to be in attendance at a gathering at which 40 countries of the world were represented. That was rather a disappointment to the organisers, and indeed, to me.

An honourable member: They were the losers.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I think that they were the losers and, indeed, the public of South Australia has lost something because it does not have access to a report of the occasion. However, delegates will be present for

another 10 days or so, and I hope that our media representatives generally will pick up its theme and objectives and convey relevant information to the public in due course.

Turning to the question asked by the honourable member for Henley Beach: it is true that elements of the dry land farming systems developed in South Australia are widely used in the Middle East and countries adjacent to the Mediterranean region. The Department of Agriculture has assisted, or is in the process of assisting, in the transfer of dry land farming technology to Libya and Iraq. It has also conducted a feasibility study in Jordan and is involved in range land management consultancy in the steppe country of Algeria. In total, at least nine countries have shown interest in obtaining South Australian dry land farming technology. In addition, I believe that we can expect considerable further interest in our technology by countries represented at the present congress.

The other part of the honourable member's question, relating to the Federal Government's involvement and/or commitment to Third World countries, is of interest to us. I understand that there have been approaches from some countries which fall into that category and to which the Federal Government may have made some commitment, but as a State of the Commonwealth we are not in the act for benevolence or aid as such, and it will be only on the basis of Federal Government commitment, both to Third World countries and to this State financially, that we as a State will be involved.

Our involvement in marketing dry land farming technology in the Middle East countries or anywhere else in the world will be strictly on a commercial basis. We have something to offer; we have something to sell, and it is on that premise that we are honouring a commitment inherited from our predecessors. It is on that basis that we are honouring commitments to the countries that I have mentioned in this House several times. I repeat that we aim to honour those commitments in a proper way; we aim to provide the expertise that we in this State possess, at a cost that will cover our costs. The object is not initially to make a profit out of transferring that technology but, indeed, to cover our State's investment, or our State's cost in the projects. I think that we have an expertise in this State that is unique, not only to Australia but to the world. It is relevant, it is available, and it is for sale. In setting out to uphold the commitments that we have made so far, we will in turn enjoy the benefit of consolidating our position, and thereafter we will be in a better position to explore other countries of interest after proposals that they may make to us can be fully considered.

WATER CHARGES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Does the statement in respect of metropolitan water rates made by the Minister of Water Resources last Tuesday, that the Government's objective was to ensure that "slightly better than the break-even point is achieved" (compared with the cost of providing water), mean that the Government is now using water charges in the metropolitan area as a taxation measure? In other words, did the Government increase water charge per kilolitre (which is now 27c) beyond the level estimated by the Labor Government, in an attempt to raise extra revenue for the Budget?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: No, that is not correct. If the honourable member analysed precisely what I said, he would realise that water rates are not a taxation revenue raiser. In fact, the total water distribution cost in South Australia in such that there is an annual loss of

\$20 000 000 per annum, so it is certainly not a revenue raising matter. The reason for having to raise the rate to 27c per kilolitre is virtually an inheritance from the former Government. Had the fourth report and the tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee been adopted and followed by the former Government, there would not have been the need to increase water rates at this stage. In fact, the costs which were incurred by the former Government and which we have inherited have amounted to many millions of dollars, as was spelled out in the report of the Public Accounts Committee, namely, that in the day labour force in the Engineering and Water Supply Department there are in excess of 900 Engineering and Water Supply employees above those actually required by the department. The recommendation was made in the fourth and again in the tenth reports of the Public Accounts Committee that the numbers should be reduced.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And they were reduced.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: No action was taken by the previous Minister until 1978, and the recommendation was clearly made in 1975. Had the previous Government and the Minister adhered to the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee in 1975, there would have been a natural attrition rate occurring from 1975 which would have kept perfectly in step with the requirements of the department.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: That is perfectly true and it can be quite clearly seen. The policy of the Government of the day was to ignore that advice offered at that time by the Public Accounts Committee and the department, and the Minister did not put it into effect until three years later. That meant three valuable years in which the policy of the Government continued to put on persons in its attempt to present favourable unemployment figures. The Government of the day continued with that philosophy and policy at the expense of the department, the State and the taxpayer. The member for Hartley well knows that he should have taken action, but the Government and the unions would not agree to that action not to engage any further employees within the department. The freeze was applied in 1978. It should have been applied in 1975, as stated by Public Accounts Committee. Had that been done then we would not be facing the problems we are having today. However, the Government is honouring its undertaking that there will be no retrenchments, and as such it is continuing to do work ahead of time because of the irresponsible attitude adopted by the member for Hartley in 1975.

WALLAROO PORT FACILITIES

Mr. OLSEN: Further to my question of 31 July, can the Minister of Marine give me specific information regarding the work to be done at Wallaroo relating to the lengthening of the berth alongside the wharf swinging basin in the Wallaroo port, and the deepening of the channel to the approaches to the berth to upgrade the port to the status of a deep sea port?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The dredging that is planned for Wallaroo at present consists of some minor work to widen a small section of the outer channel which would result in the width of the channel being increased by 30.5 metres to 107 metres. It will be convenient to undertake that work while the dredge is en route to Port Pirie to carry out work at that port for which a scheme is currently being prepared. In addition, a proposal to lengthen and deepen the outer berth on the southern side of the jetty is currently before the Department of Marine and Harbors,

but a recommendation has not yet been made.

The department, in order to establish its future dredging programme, has examined Port Pirie (for which, as stated, a scheme is now being prepared), and recently has undertaken some preparatory investigations at Thevenard prior to a more detailed examination of that port. Subsequently, it is intended to examine Wallaroo in detail to determine future dredging requirements that would be necessary and justified economically as being commensurate with future shipping requirements. Accordingly, it would be premature at this time to speculate on other likely dredging at Wallaroo.

The department is not aware of any high spots in the channel, which has a declared depth of 8.46 metres at low water over its full length. It is known that some sections of the channel bottom consist of hard rock, but here again a detailed examination would be necessary to determine the nature and extent of the various materials over the full length of the channel.

FREE TRANSPORT

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Minister of Transport consider providing free travel passes to students undertaking transitional education courses? Students who undergo these courses are forced to give up their unemployment benefit and go on to the TEAS scheme. I am told that this allowance is always substantially lower than the unemployment benefit.

The students undertaking the courses are severely financially disadvantaged while awaiting transition from unemployment benefit to the TEAS allowance, while on the course awaiting the solution of other delays and problems, and also during the six weeks at the end of the course when they go back on to unemployment benefits. Because of financial aspects, there is a great difference between those who make initial inquiries for these courses and those who finally do them. I believe that, if people are willing to take these courses in an effort to prepare themselves for the work force, they deserve special consideration, and the heavy drag imposed on them by paying fares out of their restricted incomes should be removed.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will certainly have the proposal costed and looked at. As I pointed out in answer to a question by the member for Brighton a few minutes ago, this State provides the most generous public transport concessions in the whole of Australia. I appreciate the honourable member's concern for the people he mentions, and certainly the Government will continually review the situation regarding special sections of the community that are affected as the honourable member has mentioned.

ROADWORKS

Mr. BLACKER: In view of the recent announcement of the Government's commitment to the O'Bahn system of public transport for the North-East suburbs, can the Minister of Transport give an assurance to country dwellers that funds for this project will not prejudice any development of highways and/or country roads serving non-urban areas?

When the Eyre Highway was sealed, funds for country roads were cut, and moneys previously allocated were redirected to the Eyre Highway. Similar examples can be found where other major projects have been undertaken. The fear of country people is that country road programmes will be further delayed as a direct

consequence of the recently announced system.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The North-East busway will be financed through public transport moneys, urban transport grants from the Commonwealth Government, and Loan funds from this State. The member for Flinders will be aware that money for highways and road construction in this State is provided from the Commonwealth under the States Roads Grants Act, and indeed by matching quota provided from this State collected under the Highways Act from motor registration fees and fuel tax receipts. That money all goes to roads and is usually not subsidised from Loan funds at all. I can give the member for Flinders an assurance that no money will be allocated for roads under the normal provisions of those Acts that I have mentioned that will be put towards the construction of the North-East busway.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, too, is to the Minister of Transport and it is on the same subject as that of the member for Flinders. In view of the hostile reception given to the NEAPTR proposals for this O'Bahn bus made by the Minister yesterday, will he say whether he will reconsider them? It is extraordinary that it is left to the Country Party and to the Australian Democrats to raise this matter in this House. Not one Liberal has spoken about it, nor has one member of the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has sought leave to explain the question, not to make attacks on other members of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the Minister (and no doubt he has read this morning's paper) of the criticisms that have been made, particularly about the desecration of the Torrens Valley by the proposal to have these jolly bridges and buses running along them. It is summed up as well as it can be by Mr. Paech who, I think, is the Town Clerk of St. Peters—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Walkerville.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Walkerville, then. You see, the Minister knows what is in his own district. Mr. Paech sums it up pretty well, as does Mr. Tedder, of the Conservation Society (and I need not say anything more about that). The statement was:

There is no doubt once this is done, the Torrens Valley is ruined for all time.

That is the first point. The second point I make to the Minister is that this O'Bahn system is absolutely untried, and I remind him of what was said in the document that he put out as late as April of this year titled "Director-General of Transport: Public Transport in North-East Area of Adelaide. A summary of Options". If I may, I will quote a couple of sentences from it and make my explanation; it is as follows:

Additional work on the design and likely cost of a track appropriate for Adelaide conditions is required, and there has been no practical experience of regular public transport service or of high speed (80 km/h) operation with the system.

The summary continues:

It is possible that the unresolved problems and elements of uncertainty involved in applying the guideway concept may outweigh its advantages.

It continues:

A failed bus on a guideway system would, until its removal, bring the system to a halt.

We are buying a pig in a poke with this system. While it is not as expensive as some of the other systems (when I made my first comment last night, I was under a misapprehension as to how much it would cost), it has

grave disadvantages, first, that the system is untried and, secondly, that it will ruin one of the few natural assets in the north-east of the city.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Mitcham refers to violent public reaction to the Government's proposals, but I must say that the only violent public reaction I have noticed is his. I take it that the Australian Democrats have had a Party meeting on transport this morning, and the member for Mitcham has convinced himself that he ought to have a violent public reaction. Where is the Australian Democrat's policy on public transport to the north-east? At least the official Opposition has a policy, however costly it may be, but we do not have a policy from the Australian Democrats. I will take up one or two of the points that the member for Mitcham has raised. On *Talk Back*, this morning, there was no violent reaction to the proposals: in fact, most of the people who rang were in favour of the scheme. The member for Mitcham referred to the impact on the Torrens Valley. The Government realises that the Torrens Valley is important, and that is why it will spend at least \$4 000 000, if not more, on implementing the Hassell Report on the redevelopment and restoration of the Torrens Valley. I quote from a report of the River Torrens Committee, set up by, I think, the member for Hartley, when Minister, when commenting on this matter, as follows:

It [the transport corridor] did not prejudice the River Torrens co-ordinated development scheme proposals. That is why this Government will implement this most imaginative and exciting Torrens River development scheme. The member for Mitcham mentioned the problem of an untried O'Bahn system. He ought to be aware that this is going into actual commercial service in Essen next month.

Mr. Millhouse: What if it doesn't work in Essen?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Obviously, the member for Mitcham, unlike most members of the community, has little regard for the technical expertise of Daimler Benz. It will go into service in Essen next month and elsewhere in Germany within the next 12 months, and other cities wish to implement the scheme. The member for Mitcham says that we would have a problem with a failed bus on the guideway. The member for Salisbury has ridden on it, and he said in the House last week that there is no problem with breakdowns on the guideway. If the member for Mitcham can get a trip from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to go to Germany, I will arrange for a ride on the bus for him. There is no problem with breakdowns on the guideway.

There is no violent public reaction at this stage. Apart from adverse comments from a few people, the Government's proposals have been accepted remarkably well. In conclusion, the Government, by implementing a \$39 000 000 scheme, compared to the former Government's \$115 000 000 scheme, is thereby saving money, which will be able to provide for those people who need better public transport in other areas of the metropolitan area.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINING EXPLORATION

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Earlier today, the Minister of Mines and Energy, in responding to what we all understand to be a Dorothy Dixier from a member on his

side, suggested that figures I had given in a speech earlier in the House were to be queried. I believe that I could paraphrase his words by saying that he also said that he had not been able to get hold of the documents from which the figures came. My sole purpose in making this explanation is to indicate to the Minister, who apparently did not hear my speech, that the figures came from a document headed "Department of Mines and Energy South Australia, 191 Greenhill Road, Parkside". The document lists the telephone numbers, and the second page is headed "Department of Mines and Energy South Australia, Current as at 1 July 1980 exploration licences (Mining Act, 1971-1978)". The figures contained therein are those exploration licences current at the dates concerned, and those are the dates that I gave to the House. If the Minister is unable to get that document from his own department, I offer to make this copy available to him.

At 3.17 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

RAILWAY AGREEMENT (ADELAIDE TO CRYSTAL BROOK RAILWAY) BILL, 1980

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve an agreement between the State and the Commonwealth of Australia relating to the construction of a railway from Adelaide to Crystal Brook; to provide for the vesting in the Australian National Railways Commission of certain land and the property of the State or of State authorities; to refer to the Parliament of the Commonwealth certain matters relating to the agreement; to repeal the Adelaide to Crystal Brook Standard Gauge Railway Agreement Act, 1974; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to ratify the agreement between South Australia and the Commonwealth for standardising the Adelaide to Crystal Brook rail line, a project which is a major step forward for the transport system of our State. Members will recall that for many years South Australian Governments have sought the connection of Adelaide to the standard gauge railway system serving the other mainland capital cities. In 1974, the then Commonwealth and State Governments agreed to construct such a connection. Under the terms of that agreement, the State was required to contribute one-third of the cost of the line's construction. A subsequent review of that proposal indicated that it was of such a magnitude that its construction costs appeared to be much greater than those which could be justified by the benefits gained from it. Accordingly, the project lapsed, and after that the non-urban railways of the State were transferred to the ownership of the Australian National Railways Commission. In 1978, that commission re-examined the Adelaide standard gauge connection with a view to devising a less costly means of achieving it.

In doing so, a new proposal was designed which, from an operating point of view, provided all the significant benefits of the earlier proposal, but at a much lower cost—so much lower that the entire investment appeared to be financially justified by the operating savings which

would result from using the new standard gauge link.

The Liberal Government, in its election policy on transport, stressed the importance of this matter and promised to press ahead with all necessary negotiations with the Commonwealth. We have been most successful in reaching such a complex agreement in such a short time since we took office. This is yet another of the promises that we have fulfilled. The negotiations now come to fruition in this agreement.

From South Australia's point of view, to provide this link greatly improves the Adelaide area's rail accessibility to the major markets in the eastern States, particularly New South Wales and Queensland, as well as improving the access for areas in the north of the State and the Northern Territory to Adelaide and the port. It is expected that the provision of the standard gauge link will reduce the transit time for Adelaide goods movement through Port Pirie by more than one day because there will be no need to exchange the bogies from one gauge to the other at Port Pirie or Peterborough.

Such improvements—long overdue—will greatly improve South Australia's commercial and industrial relationship to the rest of Australia, bringing greater opportunities of growth for both primary and secondary industry, with improved job opportunities for South Australians. Our State's central geographic location should be a real advantage in stimulating our trade and commerce. The standardised line will be a practical way of reinforcing that advantage.

The new proposal does not require the State to contribute toward the construction or operating cost of the standard gauge link. All such costs will be borne by the Australian National Railways Commission, and the State will be absolved of any debts arising out of the 1974 agreement. However, the State will grant certain metropolitan land presently owned by State agencies to the Australian National Railways Commission. Most of that land is presently held as railway reservation by the State Transport Authority. Such land is described in the agreement which is the schedule to the Bill.

The new standard gauge railway will comprise: a new line between Merriton and the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line in the vicinity of Crystal Brook; a new line generally alongside and to the west of the S.T.A. lines from Salisbury North to Mile End; a new interstate and country passenger terminal at Keswick; a standard gauge link from Dry Creek to Gillman and Port Adelaide sidings; a standard gauge link to the Pooraka livestock sidings; provision of standard gauge links to selected broad gauge sidings near Mile End, Gillman, Pooraka, Dry Creek, Port Adelaide and Islington; a major supplementary freight terminal at Islington; provision to extend the line to Outer Harbor; and conversion of the line between Salisbury North and Merriton from broad gauge to standard gauge.

Following the construction of the standard gauge link it is expected that traffic flows to and from Adelaide will undergo radical change and that, arising from this change, staffing requirements will not follow the present pattern.

During the period over which the traffic flows are changing, the Australian National Railways Commission intends to relocate staff between Peterborough, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and the Adelaide metropolitan area. There will ultimately be an overall reduction of staff, and I have already conferred with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport seeking his assurance that due consideration will be given to the continued well-being of both Peterborough and Port Pirie while staff from those towns are being relocated elsewhere on the Australian National Railways system.

As honourable members are aware from recent

announcements, the Government's initiatives for the northern regions of the State are bearing fruit, and renewed growth of industrial activity will greatly enhance employment opportunities, more than offsetting any reduced activity that may result from the transfer of railway staff to other locations.

The standard gauge railway is an important component of the infra-structure which will support not only the future growth of industry in the North, but also the future growth of the whole of the State. Therefore, I commend to the House this Bill to ratify the agreement between the State and the Commonwealth of Australia for the construction of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge railway.

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

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 repeals the Adelaide to Crystal Brook Standard Gauge Railway Agreement Act, 1974. Clause 4 provides the definitions necessary for the operation of the measure, mainly by reference to definitions contained in the agreement. At this stage it is necessary to note that the phrase "operative date" means the date at which the agreement comes into force. Clause 5 contains the approval of the agreement, the consent of the State to the construction of the railway and a direction to the Government of the State and the State authorities to observe the terms of the agreement.

Clause 6 refers to the Parliament of the Commonwealth the matter of the construction and operation of the railway. A similar reference was made in the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, with regard to the non-metropolitan railways, but the Commonwealth has no power to legislate with reference to the urban sector. Provision for the reference is contained in section 51 (xxxvii) of the Commonwealth Constitution. Clause 7 provides that the State, the Transport Authority and any other State authority involved is from the operative date discharged from any liability incurred in carrying out work on the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway project under the 1974 agreement. The Commission will become subject to those liabilities. Clause 8 provides for the vesting of relevant land in the Commission upon the signing of a certificate relating to that land by the appropriate Ministers.

Clause 9 provides for the continuance against the Commission of proceedings against the State or a State authority in respect of matters for which the Commission will assume liability. In respect of land, that liability is assumed at the date of vesting; in respect of other matters, it is assumed at the operative date. Clause 10 provides that a joint certificate signed by the appropriate Ministers is conclusive evidence as to the vesting of land in the Commission and that a joint certificate of those Ministers relating to other matters arising under the proposed Act or the agreement is *prima facie* evidence of the matters stated therein.

Clause 11 provides that, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the parties may submit a dispute to arbitration. Without this provision it is possible that section 24a of the Arbitration Act would make void the provisions in the agreement relating to arbitration. Clause 12 provides for the making of regulations by the Governor.

The Agreement

The recitals set out the history of the agreement of 1974, relating to the construction of a standard gauge railway for Adelaide to Crystal Brook, and the Railway Transfer Agreement of 1975, and the intention of the parties to terminate the 1974 agreement and make new arrangements.

Clause 1 sets out the arrangement of the agreement. Clause 2 provides for the interpretation of certain expressions used in the agreement. Clause 3 provides specifically for the interpretation of the phrases "the Commonwealth Minister" and "the State Minister". Clause 4 provides for the interpretation of cross-references, and other ancillary matters. Clause 5 provides that the agreement shall have no effect until the relevant legislation of the Commonwealth and the State has come into operation. Clause 6 sets out the matters that are to be covered by the relevant legislation.

Clause 7 provides for the termination of the 1974 agreement, and the discharge of all liabilities of the parties under that agreement. In particular, the State is relieved of the obligation to pay interest in respect of financial assistance received from the Commonwealth thereunder. Clause 8 provides that the Commonwealth shall refund to the State an amount equal to the sum of all the repayments of capital and payments of interest made by the State under the 1974 agreement. Clause 9 provides for an audit of accounts and records relating to railway works under the 1974 agreement. Clause 10 provides for the construction of the Commission of the proposed railway as soon as is reasonably practicable. Clause 11 provides for necessary deviations in the non-urban sector of the railway, with the consent of the State Minister. Clause 12 refers to the railway work, which is set out in detail in the second schedule to the agreement.

Clause 13 provides that the Outer Harbor connection may be added to the railway, if at any time the Commonwealth and State Ministers so agree. Clause 14 requires the Commission to carry out its work in the urban sector with the minimum of disruption to the operations of the Transport Authority. The Commission and the authority are to make arrangements to minimise interference with the day to day operations of the authority, and recourse to arbitration is provided for in case agreement is not reached. Clause 15 provides that the Commission shall not be liable for disruption unavoidably caused to the operations of the authority. Clause 16 requires the State and the authority to take steps to ensure that the railway work is not impeded. Clause 17 provides for variations of the railway work with the consent of the appropriate Minister. Clause 18 provides for the use of land and equipment thereon by the Commission before the vesting of that land in the Commission, and for an indemnity by the Commission in respect of any damage or loss to the State or any State agency or servant arising from the operations of the Commission on the land before it vests in the Commission.

Clause 19 provides that the Commission shall bear the reasonable costs of relocating equipment or other facilities during the construction of the railway. There is provision for arbitration. Clause 20 provides for the vesting in the Commission of the land described in Part 1 of the third schedule, and, if effect is given to clause 13 (the Outer Harbor connection), the land in Part 2 of that schedule. Nothing in the agreement is to require the State to acquire compulsorily any land for the purposes of the railway. Clause 21 provides for a survey of the relevant land and for arbitration in case of disagreement as to the survey.

Clause 22 provides for the giving of a joint certificate by the Commonwealth and State Ministers, upon which the

relevant land shall vest in the Commission. Clause 23 provides for the conveyance by the State to the Commission of an estate in fee simple of any land in the non-urban sector that is required for the construction of the railway. There is provision for arbitration in the case of a disagreement as to whether or not the land is reasonably required. Subclause (2) provides for the taking by the Commission of stone, soil and gravel from Crown land for railway construction purposes. Subclause (3) requires the Commission to comply with the State's requirements as to the method of extracting construction materials and as to the reinstatement of the affected land. Clause 24 provides for the surveying of land by the Commission at its expense. Clause 25 provides that the Commission will use land transferred to it under the agreement only for railway purposes and will return to the State any such land that is no longer required for railway purposes.

Clause 26 provides for mutual rights of way and other easements over the lands of the Commission and lands of the State or State authorities. Clause 27 provides that the Commission shall be, from the operative date, the beneficial owner of all the assets collected for the purposes of carrying out the 1974 agreement. Clause 28 preserves rights and claims of any person, other than the State or a State Authority, in respect of the property referred to in clause 27. Clause 29 provides for the Commission and the Transport authority to make necessary arrangements for the co-ordination of their operations, and to go to arbitration in case of disagreements. Clause 30 provides for the Commission and the Transport Authority to make arrangements about the use by each of them of the railways of the other. A recourse to arbitration is provided.

Clause 31 provides for the appointment of an arbitrator and excludes the operation of section 24a of the Arbitration Act of the State. It is also necessary for this exclusion to be included in the legislation, and it appears in clause 11 of the Bill. Clause 32 provides that the agreement does not, in general, affect the operation of the Railway Transfer Agreement.

The first schedule sets out the railway route. The second schedule sets out the railway work. The third schedule indicates the land that is to be transferred, by reference to a plan which is to be exhibited with, and identified for, the purposes of the agreement. The fourth schedule lists assets collected under the 1974 agreement.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMES (OFFENCES AT SEA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Crimes (Offences at Sea) Act and the Crimes at Sea Act, 1979, of the Commonwealth together form a comprehensive scheme for applying criminal law to areas off the coast of the State. When the first drafts of the State Act were prepared, it was assumed that the Commonwealth Act would be passed in 1978. In fact it did not pass until 1979. The State Act contains two references to the Commonwealth Act drafted on the assumption that it would pass in 1978. Unfortunately, these references were overlooked when the Crimes (Offences at Sea) Bill was before the House earlier this year. The purpose of the present Bill is to correct references to the Commonwealth

Act in the State Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 substitute references to "1979" for existing references to "1978" in the principal Act.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BANK OF ADELAIDE (MERGER) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the merger of the Bank of Adelaide and its subsidiary the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited with Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and its subsidiary Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited.

Following substantial losses by its wholly owned subsidiary, Finance Corporation of Australia Limited, it was necessary for the Bank of Adelaide in May 1979 to obtain the support of the other Australian Trading Banks and the Reserve Bank of Australia. Flowing from this situation, the Bank of Adelaide was directed by the Reserve Bank of Australia to merge with another Australian bank. Arrangements were then made by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited to acquire the share capital of the Bank of Adelaide by a scheme of arrangement under section 181 of the Companies Act, 1962-1980, of South Australia. The scheme was subsequently agreed to by the necessary majority of members of the Bank of Adelaide, approved by the Supreme Court of South Australia, and became effective from 30 November 1979. The Bank of Adelaide is now a wholly owned subsidiary of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited.

The merger has the approval of the Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia, who has given his consent pursuant to section 63 of the Banking Act, 1959, on the understanding that steps will be taken as soon as practicable to bring the operations of the two banks into a single entity and for the Bank of Adelaide then to cease carrying on banking business. This understanding with the Federal Treasurer is one of the principal reasons for introducing this legislation.

To complete the merger, it is necessary to amalgamate the business and undertaking of the Bank of Adelaide and its Savings Bank with the business and undertaking of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and its Savings Bank, respectively. It is hoped that the necessary arrangements be made to enable completion by 30 September 1980, so that the merger will become effective from 1 October 1980.

In practical terms, the merger of these banks will involve the transfer of over 260 000 accounts and the transfer of borrowing arrangements of more than 46 000 customers. By far the majority of this business is in South Australia. The time and effort involved in carrying out the merger by means of separate transactions with each customer would be unduly onerous and would involve not only the staffs of the banks but also the customers themselves and officers of Government departments, such as those in the Stamp Duties Office and the Lands Titles Office. It would be necessary to obtain an authority from each customer to transfer accounts from one bank to the other, new mandates for the operation of a variety of types of account, new authorities for periodical payments, and new indemnities for various purposes connected with the

accounts.

New securities (guarantees, mortgages, liens, etc.) would be required from borrowing customers and their sureties, or else authorities would need to be taken for transfer of existing securities, where practicable. The work involved in preparation of documents, obtaining signatures, stamping and registration would be totally unproductive, at the expense of, and with delays to, new transactions. The legislation will minimise the volume of paper work to be handled by customers and others, bank staff and Government officers, and will preserve the rights of the more than 1 100 staff involved and give them continuity of employment. While it is possible to do this by renewal of contracts, a more effective and expeditious way to do it is through the form of this legislation.

The saving in documentation which would be achieved by the proposed legislation is not intended to deprive the State of any revenue which might have been derived from the stamping of such documentation. The Government is negotiating with Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited as to the payment in lieu of stamp duty that will properly compensate the State for loss of revenue which would otherwise have occurred. This follows the precedent set by the merger by legislation of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group limited with the English Scottish and Australian Bank Limited in 1970. Because the Bank of Adelaide has branches in each State, legislation similar to this Bill is being sought by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited in each State.

The Bill before honourable members is similar in principle to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Act, 1970, which was enacted for the purpose of implementing the 1970 merger referred to in the preceding sentence. However, on this occasion the Act in South Australia will be the principal Act in the legislative scheme throughout Australia, because the Bank of Adelaide is incorporated in this State. In the 1970 merger, an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom was the principal Act and the South Australian Act of 1970 was supplementary to it.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

The preamble recites the present situation regarding the relationship between the banks and the savings banks, the proposals for the merger and the aims of the legislation, and is generally self-explanatory.

Clause 1 formally provides for the short title and citation of the proposed Act. Clause 2 is the interpretation clause and provides definition of a number of terms used in the Bill. Notes on the principally defined terms are as follows:

"appointed day". For the purposes of the Act the Governor of the State will appoint a day termed the appointed day upon which the transfer of the undertakings of the Bank of Adelaide and the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited will take place.

"excluded assets". Lands constituting bank premises or bank residences are to remain in the ownership of the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited. The purpose of this definition is to exclude from the transfer of asset land held by the banks otherwise than by way of security, and also to exclude from the transfer any records required to be kept by the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited under the Companies Act, 1962-1980. Also included in this definition are certain investments in

companies which are not now, and after the appointed day, will not be involved in the business of banking.

"liabilities" is defined as including duties and obligations.

"property" is widely defined to include real and personal property. When excluded assets are not intended to be covered by the use of the general term "property" it is so provided in the operative clauses of the Bill.

"undertaking" in relation to the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited in each case covers all of the property rights and liabilities of those banks on the appointed day with the exception of excluded assets and rights and liabilities relating to excluded assets.

The remaining definitions are self-explanatory.

Clause 3 declares that the Act binds the Crown. This clause covers the need to ensure that the benefits of Government guarantees given in respect of certain securities held by the Bank of Adelaide will continue with Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited. It would also ensure that any accounts which a Government department might have with the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited would be transferred in the same fashion as accounts of private customers.

Clause 4 is a key provision of the Bill. Under subclause (1), on the "appointed day", the undertakings of the Bank of Adelaide and the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited are to be vested in Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited respectively. By this simple enactment, Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited succeeds to the whole of the property assets and liabilities of the Bank of Adelaide (except the excluded assets and liabilities relating to those assets) and the position with the savings banks is the same. It is desired that the appointed day be 1 October 1980. Subclause (2) provides that on and after that day reference to the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited in documents executed on or prior to that day are to be read as references to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or (as the case may be) Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited unless the document relates to an excluded asset or unless the context otherwise requires.

Subclause (3) enables the Registrar-General to register Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited as the proprietor of land under the Real Property Act, 1886-1980, which becomes vested in them under the Act. This will relate to securities on land.

Subclause (4) provides that an instrument relating to land under the Real Property Act, 1886-1980, which has vested in Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited under the clause shall, if the instrument is duly executed and is otherwise in registrable form, be registered by the Registrar-General, notwithstanding Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited has not been first registered as proprietor of the land. This will avoid the necessity for multitudinous formal applications in connection with releases of mortgage securities.

Subclause (5) provides that, where part of the undertaking of the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited is situated outside South Australia and the Act does not operate of its own force to give Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited

or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited a perfect title to that property, then the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited is to take all necessary steps as soon as practicable to ensure that title to the property is transferred to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited.

Clause 5 amplifies clause 4 and provides in some detail for the continuation between Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and the customers of, and other persons dealing with the Bank of Adelaide, exactly the same relationship as already exists with the latter bank. By paragraph (a) all existing instructions or authorities given by a customer will be deemed to have been given to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited. By paragraph (b) existing securities will be available to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited as security for the debts or liabilities thereby secured at the appointed day which are transferred under the Act.

Where the security extends to secure future debts and liabilities, it will be available in the hands of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited for debts and liabilities which the customer may incur after appointed day with that bank; and Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited is given the same rights and priorities and is made subject to the same obligations and incidents as applied to the Bank of Adelaide. Under paragraph (c) the rights and obligations of the Bank of Adelaide as bailee (e.g. for safe custodies) are transferred to and assumed by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited.

Paragraph (d) provides in effect that any negotiable instruments drawn on, given to, accepted or endorsed by the Bank of Adelaide will have the same effect on and after the appointed day as if they had been drawn on, given to, accepted or endorsed by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited. Paragraph (e) preserves all legal proceedings commenced by or against the Bank of Adelaide before the appointed day.

Clause 6 applies between the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank and Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited exactly the same provisions as clause 5 enacts between the two trading banks. Clause 7. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that where the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited was occupying premises under a lease, licence or other agreement which is not transferred (because it would be classed as "excluded assets") nevertheless Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited may exercise the rights of the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited thereunder.

Further, the exercise of those rights by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited does not constitute parting with possession of the land by the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited for purposes of the lease, licence or agreement. The purpose of the latter provision is to avoid any problem which otherwise might arise under a provision of a lease prohibiting transfer of the lease or parting with possession of the land without the landlord's consent in writing.

Clause 8. The purpose of clause 8 (1) is to facilitate service of documents (which include summonses and other legal processes), continuation of legal proceedings and enforcement of judgments against either of the merging trading banks. Clause 8 (2) achieves the same result as regards the merging savings banks.

Clause 9 relates to evidence and has the effect that any document which before the appointed day could have

been used as evidence for or against the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited may after the appointed day be similarly used for or against Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited.

Clause 10 deals with the position of the Bank of Adelaide staff. They become employees of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited on the same terms and conditions as applied to them as Bank of Adelaide employees. The section preserves any right which at the appointed day had accrued in respect of the employment. The Bank of Adelaide Provident Fund will continue in existence for the benefit of those employees and their dependants until it is terminated under applicable rules governing that fund. The Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited intends to assume responsibility for the fund under a provision of the rules dealing with amalgamation of the Bank of Adelaide.

Since the Bank of Adelaide Fund is preserved, the Bank of Adelaide staff transferred to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited do not acquire a right to enter an existing Australia and New Zealand Bank Provident Fund. A person who held office as a Director, Secretary or Auditor of the Bank of Adelaide or the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited does not become a Director, Secretary or Auditor of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited by virtue of the Bill. Neither the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited nor Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited employs any staff but the work of both is carried out by the staff of the trading banks.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 21 August. Page 575.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I will take only a few minutes of the remainder of my time, and I will address myself only to one matter, which I consider to be of grave importance. That matter concerns the security of prisoners at Yatala Labour Prison. I have been in this Parliament since 10 March 1973, and in that time I have never heard a statement like that made by the Chief Secretary this afternoon.

Last Thursday, because of what I considered, on very good information, to be a grave threat to the life and bodily well-being of a prisoner or prisoners at Yatala Labour Prison, I made a statement in this Parliament about the situation that I know exists in that place at present. I did that solely because I was concerned that the only way I could do something to ensure that the life and bodily well-being of those prisoners could be to some extent protected was to make the matter public. I had received information that very day about the danger in which a particular prisoner found himself as the result of certain matters to which, because of Standing Orders, I am not permitted to refer.

I placed that matter on record because I believed that it was the only way at my disposal to endeavour to ensure the future security of the life and well-being of that prisoner. However, this afternoon the Chief Secretary delivered a statement that I can only describe as fantastic, because it was completely and utterly a production of a department that is trying to protect itself—the Depart-

ment of Correctional Services, which was formerly called the Prisons Department. When one considers the way in which the Minister appears to be a prisoner of his department, one can possibly understand why the department was formerly called the Prisons Department.

The statement that the Minister delivered this afternoon is wrong, as I will prove in due course, in so many ways as to be a ringing condemnation of his ability (or his inability) to continue to hold the position of Chief Secretary in this State. I frankly believe that the Minister has no conception whatsoever of the serious situation that exists within the gaols and prisons of this State.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It existed there a year ago.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Deputy Premier interjects. I do not disagree with that interjection. If only I could have some reassurance from the Deputy Premier that he takes the life and bodily well-being of some prisoners in this State at present with some seriousness, I would be very relieved this afternoon.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We do. We are doing things down there that you didn't even contemplate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The evidence does not support the Deputy Premier's statement. I am not able, in full, this afternoon to reply to the statement that has been made by the Chief Secretary. Why? Because he chose, in contravention of the previous practice of this House, at least during the time that I was a Minister, not to supply the Opposition, nor *Hansard*, with a copy of the statement that he made in the Parliament this afternoon. I have received that statement only in the past few minutes, about five minutes before I rose to speak.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He didn't stick to a written statement.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: He supplied me with a statement about five minutes ago, which has been very slightly doctored, I might say. We will have to check it against *Hansard* to see to what extent it is a correct representation of what he said in the Parliament this afternoon. This statement, as presented to me, is so full of holes that I will have to wait for a copy of *Hansard* before being able to deal with the matter. For example, page 1 of the document concludes:

Two other inmates have died in hospital during that period, one from terminal cancer and the other from a brain haemorrhage after having been transferred from Cadell Training Centre.

On page 2 it is stated:

This prisoner did not report his injury to the medical officer at Yatala . . .

The document that has been supplied is obviously nonsensical and, therefore, I am not able to deal with it point by point. However, I will make one or two protestations about the way in which the Chief Secretary dealt with this matter. The Minister has been completely duped by his department into delivering the Ministerial statement this afternoon.

Undoubtedly, he must take the final responsibility for the content of his statement this afternoon, as undoubtedly he will. But, nonetheless, I make the point that he has been (deliberately, in my view) misled by his department. I have no doubt that that will come out in due course. I also have no doubt that this Minister will live to rue this day on which he delivered this statement in the Parliament, because by so doing I believe he has thrown in his lot entirely with the senior officials of that department. Also, in so doing, it seems to me that he cannot escape accepting the responsibility that will finally and inevitably fall on his shoulders for the situation that exists in the gaols of this State. At that time, he will finally be forced to resign his commission (as a result, as I said, in part at least,

of the comments he has made this day).

I believe that many matters need investigation at Yatala Labour Prison. I am not able to comment further on many of those matters, because they are before the Public Accounts Committee, but there are many other matters that need to be investigated at Yatala Labour Prison. Once a full investigation has been undertaken into these matters they will, inevitably, come before the public. I will not, for my part, be goaded this afternoon into rushing into a premature discussion about such matters. Indeed, the matters, as I have said, will wait their due and proper course.

There is only one matter with which this Government should particularly concern itself at this time: that is, the danger that exists day to day in that prison to the lives and bodily security of prisoners. Let me make it perfectly clear that if any prisoner in Yatala Labour Prison, or throughout the Department of Correctional Services, suffers injury as a result of his co-operation with any of the instrumentalities, committees or members of this Parliament, that death or injury will be on the head of this Government. That is how serious the situation is.

I beg the Government to take this matter seriously, because I do not want to see any situation arise where any person's life or bodily well-being is placed in jeopardy. I earnestly plead with the Government, and I plead with the Premier: if the Chief Secretary is too ignorant or too stupid to be able to take the necessary actions in this matter to ensure that the prison population of this State is well protected and thoroughly secure from attacks or other attempts upon life or limb, for goodness sake let the Premier take the matter into his own hands to ensure such protection.

I believe that the situation is of such seriousness that it has got to the stage where only if the Premier takes the matter into his own hands will we avoid further attacks on prisoners and the possible loss of prisoners' lives. I believe that it is as serious as that. I have put matters as fully as I am able to put them before the House this afternoon. I know that the Premier is a compassionate man in many ways, so I hope that he will take this matter as a serious one and will give the people of South Australia his personal reassurance that prisoners held in custody in this State are well protected from the threat of loss of life or bodily injury.

I do not wish to proceed with other matters this afternoon. In due course, I will make further statements about these matters; I believe that, at the moment, these matters are being dealt with by other organs of this Parliament. Accordingly, I leave the House with the plea I have just made—that the Government, having been put on notice about these matters, will take urgent steps to ensure that the lives of prisoners are protected, and that they are protected from threats or bodily injury. I hope that my comments in the House this afternoon will spur this Government into taking the action necessary to ensure that these people who are residents and citizens of this State are given the protection they deserve.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I support the motion. I extend my sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Maurice William Parish, who served as the member for Murray from 1915 to 1918. From the dates of service of that gentleman it can be taken that he must have lived a long and useful life.

I congratulate the Government on its record since it came to office 11 months ago. We have heard much about promises, so I would like to note the promises made by this Government at the time of the election and indicate that, if the promises made have not already been honored,

they are far advanced towards being honored.

There were five major promises made. Of course, members on the other side would consider that not a great number of people in this State have been advantaged by the abolition of succession and gift duties. If members researched this matter, they would be surprised at the number of people who have been advantaged by these moves.

I turn now to pay-roll tax concessions. Until 30 June, 1 818 additional youth workers had been employed under this scheme by 535 firms. Approximately 270 firms have employed an additional youth employee. Fewer firms have employed two employees, fewer still three, and so on. I am concerned about the situation of the unemployed people in this State. I am particularly concerned about the young people who are unemployed. I am convinced, however, that the moves made and the promises kept by this Government have seen almost 2 000 additional young people employed. If it were not for those moves, the situation in the State would have been much worse than it is now.

I refer members to the following passage from His Excellency's Speech:

It is pleasing to observe that there has been a 22 per cent increase in apprenticeship intake for the first six months of this year in comparison with the same period last year.

I suggest that the policy of this Government has encouraged, and resulted in, that very satisfactory increase in the intake of apprentices in this State over the first six months of this year.

The Government promised to abandon stamp duty on a first home up to the value of \$30 000. This scheme was also enacted by legislation, and 5 558 first-home purchasers have taken advantage of it. It has meant a loss of revenue to the State in the time that it has been operating of \$2 706 000. In other words, the average saving for each home buyer has been \$486.80. Subsequently, the abolition of establishment fees on loans of up to \$30 000 was announced by three building societies. I would suggest that the Government's initiative encouraged those building societies to announce this policy. On a loan of \$30 000, the saving is \$300. Therefore, a first-home buyer who seeks a loan from one of these three building societies of \$30 000 makes a straight-out saving of \$880. I can say without fear of contradiction that this has provided a fillip to the building industry, in addition to other significant amounts that have been provided by this Government in relation to housing loans through other financial channels.

Then there was the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence. I realise that not everyone paid land tax, but as values increased so more and more people were brought into the net of having to pay land tax on their main place of residence. The abolition of land tax has been of great benefit to many people in this State.

Besides these promises, which were made by the Government in a broad sense across the board, many promises were made in relation to departments, and I would say that all Ministers, within the ambit of their portfolios, are seeking to have those promises honoured. I refer specifically to the Minister of Transport, and to some of the promises he has honoured or attempted to honour. The first concerns the bringing forward of negotiations and the signing of the standard gauge agreement, as provided for in a Bill that was introduced this afternoon. I do not wish to say any more than that the negotiations were continued from previously, and that undertaking has been met. Secondly, through negotiations with the Federal Government, increased funding is available for sealing of the Stuart Highway. This year, \$9 100 000 is to be made available for the sealing of a section of the Stuart

Highway. This is an increase from last year when \$3 800 000 was appropriated for that purpose. Over the years it has been up to the Government of this State to appropriate moneys made available by the Commonwealth Government for national highways (and my understanding is that there are only three in this State—one from the Victorian border to the toll gate on Glen Osmond Road; another from Cavan to Port Augusta, which then branches into the Eyre Highway; and the Stuart Highway). The State has to decide priorities in relation to the spending of this money on national highways, and for years the Stuart Highway did not get one cent.

To the south of Adelaide we have an excellent highway down to the Swanport Bridge, and everyone appreciates that. I surmise that that highway was established because a place called Monarto was to be established, and that fact had at least some bearing on the decision in relation to that highway. If it had not been for the fact that that road is an interstate highway, I think that the faces of some of the former Government Ministers would be red. About \$60 000 000 to \$70 000 000 was spent on that highway. I suggest that much of that sum was spent because of Monarto and not just because that was an interstate highway. It was intended that it be a fast highway to Monarto.

Mr. Keneally: There has not been one additional dollar provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. RUSSACK: It was my privilege in June of this year to visit Darwin, and I think the member for Stuart also visited Darwin in June. I was concerned to see the close association of the Northern Territory with Queensland. It is obvious that a lot of trade and commercial enterprise has been lost to South Australia because we have not had a railway or satisfactory highway to the Northern Territory. A quantity of whitegoods, which this State is renowned for manufacturing, did not find its way to centres in the Northern Territory, because of the fact that there is a bitumen road from Mount Isa to Darwin providing a link to the Eastern States.

If one looks at a map it can be seen that Brisbane is farther from Darwin than is Adelaide. I went into a shop in Darwin and asked for a particular ice-cream that was advertised, and I was told that it had not arrived from Brisbane that morning. I also found that, until recently (the A.B.C. is now providing a local news service), the only television news service provided in Darwin came from Brisbane. This State has lost millions of dollars in this way, yet we have the sympathy of the people of the Northern Territory. We have the sympathy of the Chief Minister, who has now announced that, with the co-operation of the South Australian Government, he will fight for a rail link between South Australia and the Northern Territory.

I commend this Government for keeping its promise and for the efforts that have been made by the Minister of Transport in providing \$9 100 000 this year for the continuation of the sealing of the Eyre Highway. Another promise kept by the Minister of Transport was that of introducing compulsory seat restraints for children. The next was to introduce probationary licences in this State.

There was also an effort to keep the promise in relation to the introduction of breathalyser tests, and we all know the fate of that legislation. Then, possibly one of the major matters was the north-east transport system, as promised. In this House the week before last the member for Florey ridiculed the Minister about not introducing a transport scheme for the north-eastern area. He belittled the Minister concerning the O'Bahn scheme. Personally, I am delighted that this Government has honoured its promise; yesterday, what I consider to be a most imaginative and

successful scheme was announced for the transportation of people who live in the north-eastern suburbs. I wish to read a statement by the Minister concerning this proposal, as follows:

The State Government is to build an exclusive busway from Gilberton to Tea Tree Plaza to improve public transport services to the north-eastern suburbs. The two-lane busway will include an O'Bahn guideway from Park Terrace along the Torrens River Valley to a point east of Lower Portrush Road. Announcing the decision today, the Minister of Transport, Mr. Michael Wilson, said the Government would incorporate the O'Bahn system in a full restoration of the river valley section as detailed in the River Torrens Co-ordinated Development Scheme report released last month.

The busway project would cost \$20 000 000 in construction, and \$18 500 000 for 90 new articulated buses for use on the busway and other improved services in the north-east. (These figures are based on 1979 values). The new buses would be the most modern available—comfortable seating, air-conditioned and low floor heights. \$4 000 000 will be spent on the river valley development to complement the transport scheme. The total project cost of \$42 500 000 compares with the former Government's proposed Light Rail Transit scheme which was costed at \$115 000 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. RUSSACK: I am glad that the Deputy Leader realises that this is such an important matter that he wished more members to hear what I was saying about the north-east transport system. The Minister's statement continues:

The new system, cutting travel times by 10 minutes or more, is expected to be completed by 1986. "The decision to use O'Bahn in the river valley is to reduce the impact of the busway to a minimum in this sensitive natural environment," Mr. Wilson said. "The implementation of the River Torrens Development Scheme will begin immediately and will be co-ordinated with the design work on the busway. The extent of the guideway will be determined in the detailed design stage. However, it will not be necessary to use the guideway along the entire route."

"The building and integration of the busway will be co-ordinated by a project team including officers from the S.T.A., Highways Department, Department of Transport, Engineering and Water Supply, and the River Torrens Committee. Buses using the new facility will enter Park Terrace north of the Hackney Bridge and proceed into the city via Hackney Road and Grenfell Street. This avoids the impact on the north park lands and disruption to King William Street which would have been caused by the light rail transit proposals. The buses will follow Grenfell Street and use Light Square as the terminus. Complementary schemes giving priority to buses will be used in the city. In the north-eastern suburbs the articulated buses will act as feeder services in the area before driving on to the busway for the unhindered journey to the city. From Tea Tree Plaza the estimated journey time is 23 minutes."

Mr. Wilson said the busway was the cheapest effective rapid transit scheme of all the options considered by the Government. "Diesel buses will remain the most cost efficient form of transport for the next decade and, by the end of the new vehicles' life (10-15 years) other technology, now in an advanced stage of development, will be ready for introduction," Mr. Wilson said. "We need to take into account future energy shortages. The Government wishes to retain the option to electrify the system. The flexibility of bus technology will allow the introduction of either electric trolley buses, battery, methanol or l.p.g. powered buses or

combinations of these."

The cost of articulated buses is estimated at \$150 000 each, capable of seating 70 passengers. This compares with the previous Government's rolling stock estimated to cost \$800 000 for an l.r.t. car capable of seating 90 passengers. "Even allowing that the life of the bus is half that of the tram, the buses can be replaced after 15 years and still be \$500 000 cheaper per vehicle. One of the reasons the Government has chosen the busway is to allow the long-term savings to be used for new transport systems in other parts of the metropolitan area, such as the south."

Mr. Wilson said another major consideration apart from cost was the flexibility of buses. "The use of O'Bahn technology does not restrict the buses from operating on normal roads, and if a breakdown occurs the bus can be pushed out of the guideway and if necessary towed on normal roads—this cannot happen with trams. Routes can be varied in the 'catchment' area where the buses will serve as feeders before entering the busway to the city. Variable numbers of buses can join the busway at the different entry points, depending on changing demands," Mr. Wilson said.

"Commuters will also have no need to change from bus to tram, as would have been necessary in the former Government's l.r.t. scheme." Mr. Wilson said the option to use Walkerville Terrace had been rejected because it lowered the standard of the service excessively. "In choosing the river route the Government has also committed an extra \$4 000 000 to restore and develop the valley for the benefit of the public. Noise impact studies show that encased engines and suitable acoustic screening can reduce the noise of buses to the same level as light rail vehicles. This is very important to those people living near the busway. The guideway has the narrowest track and is the least visually intrusive of all options and is capable of being integrated into an extremely attractive scheme for the River Torrens Valley."

The revolutionary O'Bahn bus system has been designed to save space. Buses which normally require a lane and shoulder between five and six metres wide can be driven in the guideway 2.6 metres wide. The advantage of the system is low cost—ordinary buses can use the guideway with a relatively cheap modification to the wheels.

The modified buses may enter and leave the guided section at normal operating speeds. An O'Bahn system is presently under construction in Essen, Germany. Adelaide is one of the first cities to adopt the technology which is also being considered for Thailand's Bangkok, and the German cities of Heidelberg and Regensburg. The buses which will use the guideway can be fitted with "guide" wheels for about \$5 000 a bus, not a great deal considering the \$150 000 price of the articulated buses. The advantage of O'Bahn—less encroachment on existing environment—makes it extremely attractive for the River Torrens Valley.

I thought it most appropriate to relate to the House the Minister's comments concerning the new proposal, which has been deeply researched, which is most imaginative and which, above all, will be of great advantage to those people in the north-eastern area. It will not be necessary to change the mode of travel. The feeder buses will come into the busway and the passengers will not have to change, thus effecting a considerable saving of time. On a homeward journey, it will be of great convenience to people with parcels. I commend the Minister and those responsible for this report on the scheme that is to be adopted.

Another promise that has been kept by the Minister of Transport was the 1977 election promise to introduce a no-fault insurance scheme to replace the present third party scheme. The new scheme, which has already been announced, will be implemented as soon as possible. So, this Government has kept its major promises, and is

implementing other promises as quickly as circumstances will allow. I am sure that this Government will create in this State an atmosphere of positive progress.

The Budget will be brought down next Thursday. I have no details of it and, even if I had, I would not be prepared to divulge anything. I believe that the Budget may not be fully acceptable in relation to hand-outs to people. I would liken it to the Federal Budget, which has budgeted for long-range stability rather than for immediate benefits or hand-outs to Australians. However, in the long run, the Budget will be of benefit to all as regards future economic benefits. It will create positive attitudes, together with the confidence in the economic sphere that is needed.

Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Since you were last called together, my Government has devoted a great deal of time and energy to the task of creating a favourable industrial climate in this State.

Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech states—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Whose speech?

Mr. RUSSACK: His Excellency's Speech, which is prepared by the Government.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You know who prepares his Speech.

Mr. RUSSACK: Of course I do, and so does the Deputy Leader. I do not apologise for that. I am proud to think that the Government prepared this Speech to show South Australians what it is proposing to do for the benefit of the people of this State. Paragraph 6 states:

South Australia is now on the threshold of mineral developments which will undoubtedly have a major impact on the economy, employment and development of this State.

Time does not permit me to detail the projects that have already been put in train, both in the expansion of industrial enterprises and mining, except to say that the Government has set about confirming to the people that we can look forward to the future with confidence. I realise that the Opposition tears down every constructive proposal that this Government puts forward. It paints a gloomy picture and talks of the depressed situation, but I am sure that, psychologically, this State can get going as a result of the practical measures this Government has initiated and, secondly, by the atmosphere that can be yet brought about in the community.

I read recently of a certain man who lived by the side of the road and who sold hot dogs. He was hard of hearing so he had no radio. He had trouble with his eyes, so he read no newspapers. He sold good hot dogs. He erected signs on the highway stating how good they were. He stood on the side of the road and cried, "Buy a hot dog, Mister," and people bought. He increased his meat and bun orders, and bought a bigger stove in order to take care of his trade. He finally got his son home from the city to help him, but something happened. His son said, "Father, haven't you been listening to the radio or reading the newspapers? There's a big depression. The European situation is terrible, and the domestic situation is worse." The father thought, "My son has had a higher education than I have. He reads newspapers and listens to the radio. He ought to know." So, the father reduced the number of advertising signs and no longer bothered to stand on the highway to sell his hot dogs. His sales fell almost overnight. "You were right, my son," the father said to the boy, "we're certainly in the middle of a great depression."

I suggest that this State is progressing. It is introducing economic measures that will set the State rolling but, if we have the depressed attitude that the Opposition infuses into the community by its propaganda, we will have the people accepting false circumstances, and living in a false

atmosphere.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You never used to do it when you were in Opposition, did you? I'll give you some quotes one day.

Mr. RUSSACK: The difference in the situation is that this Government has the right policies for moving forward, whereas the Opposition was different in years gone by.

I will now say a few words about the Address in Reply. The member for Elizabeth, who preceded me, commenced his speech by saying that he symbolically opposed the motion before the Chair, because he considered, as he said last year, that it was an utter waste of time. However, he then proceeded to speak for 53 minutes of the hour at his disposal. This afternoon, I suggest that he was most grateful that he had the call and was able to use his Address in Reply time for a matter of deep concern to him.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Everyone agrees the Address in Reply is no good.

Mr. RUSSACK: They may now, because it has deteriorated to such a degree that it is not being used for the purpose for which it was intended. The matter was commented on in the release of a news sheet from another place, which states:

Professor Gordon Reid, in his celebrated address to the summer school of the Australian Institute of Political Science, entitled "The Changing Political Framework", referred to the proceedings of Parliament degenerating into a continuous and elementary election campaign. If one reads all the contributions made in both Houses during this Address in Reply debate the truth of the Reid observation becomes apparent. The Address in Reply debate, in the past an important debate in the session's calendar, is now of little value and the time applied to it needs to be reassessed.

This situation prevails because the time is being used in a way different from that intended when the Address in Reply was placed in the Standing Orders.

This afternoon, I wish to say some things about the electorate I represent, and I think the time should be spent commenting on the Speech prepared by the Government and read at the opening of Parliament, and the legislation that is intended. If we read through the speeches delivered in this House, many of them could conform to the statement to which I have referred; it is a forum for political campaigning.

In this State, we have a very virile primary industry, and I refer again to the Speech, as follows:

Opening rains in the latter half of April following an extremely dry period have provided the best commencement to the season for many years. Consolidating rains in June and July have contributed to the estimated record sowings of 2 700 000 hectares of cereal crops in South Australia. The early rains have resulted in good pasture growth with a high legume content thus ensuring favourable conditions for livestock production. The general prospect for agricultural production in the present financial year appears to be very good.

We still have for this State the lion's share of exports from primary industry. The *Yearbook* of 1979 states:

Although exports of manufactured goods have generally been increasing, the bulk of exports is still of goods usually classified as primary products. In 1977-78 the crude materials in the edible group accounted for \$203 600 000, or 30.8 per cent of exports, including wool, \$114 600 000, or 17.3 per cent, and the food and live animals group accounted for \$211 400 000, or approximately 31.9 per cent.

This State is still very reliant on export production from the rural industry. I am happy to be representing an electorate that produces very good cereal crops. I suggest that Yorke Peninsula is one of the best barley growing

areas in the world. It is to be hoped that this year's harvest will be as good as that of last year. I heard on the radio recently that it is expected that there will be record returns for cereal crops in Australia, yet primary producers will not be as well off as in previous years. We all know why, and I do not want to get into the argument of the cost of fuel, but this is the cause of a big increase in production costs. Some farmers have had increases of from \$1 000 to \$6 000 in the cost of their fuel for one year.

Apart from cereal growing, we have sheep and wool production, fat lamb production, poultry production, pigs, vineyards, the wine industry, and market gardening, and I wish to spend a little time talking about market gardening on the Northern Adelaide Plain. The people in that area have been moving along under some difficulties. For about 10 years there have been restrictions on the use of underground water. We all accept that the introduction of such a scheme was necessary, but inflation has severely affected growers' costs, while no increase has been allowed to enable them to increase production or to meet the rising costs. This has hit, in particular, the grower with the smaller water quota.

Growers have consistently used substantially less than their annual allocations, and I shall refer shortly to some of the consumption figures on the Northern Adelaide Plain. The heaviest annual withdrawal occurred in the drought year of 1978, when growers used 85 per cent of the total. I emphasise that: in 1978, in a drought year, a year of need, only 85 per cent of the total water quota in the area was used.

The low overhead family unit garden provides South Australia with high quality vegetables at low cost, and I must emphasise the matter of the family unit. On the Northern Adelaide Plain, if it were not for the fact that some of the units were operated by a family unit, in many cases today, when they have been reduced to a limited income, there would not be any production of these high quality, low-cost vegetables produced on the plain.

If a person has a small water quota, and if there should be a storm, as was experienced last November, and a crop is lost, that person has not the ability to use any more water to grow a second crop to get out of his financial difficulties; therefore the year is a total loss. I hope that some consideration can be given to this factor, bearing in mind that in the drought year of 1978 only 85 per cent of the quota was used. It is a problem to people who have a disaster and whose crop is destroyed in any year.

I understand that there is a 5 per cent tolerance in water consumption. If a person uses only 90 per cent of his water quota, then in the next year he will have an allowance of 105 per cent. However, if he uses more than 105 per cent, or 5 per cent above the quota, then he is obliged to pay the same going rate as is paid for water from a reticulated system; in other words, 27c a kilolitre. I hope that further consideration can be given to this matter. The growers are most concerned about what they consider to be an injustice. I am sure that some consideration will be given to the problem.

The structure of the soil of the Adelaide Plains and the conditions for market gardening are unique. The soil does not become waterlogged, and the area is close to the sea, so there are few frosts. Summer temperatures are reduced because of the close proximity to the sea and are, therefore, much lower than in many other areas. The area is most suitable for market gardening, and I am sure that the Government recognises this fact and will consider every available assistance to this industry on the northern Adelaide Plains. The area has another advantage in being close to the city market.

Regarding water consumption and its allocation, there

are 874 people on the northern Adelaide Plains who receive a water quota; 77, or 8 per cent of those eligible, receive a supply of water of nought to 1 000 000 gallons; 222, or 25 per cent, receive 1 000 000 to 2 000 000 gallons; 134, or 15 per cent, receive 2 000 000 to 3 000 000 gallons; 78, or 8 per cent, receive 3 000 000 to 4 000 000 gallons; 64, or 7 per cent receive 4 000 000 to 5 000 000 gallons; 41, or 4 per cent, receive 5 000 000 to 6 000 000 gallons; 34, or 3 per cent, receive 6 000 000 to 7 000 000 gallons; 14, or 1 per cent, receive 7 000 000 to 8 000 000 gallons; 20, or 2 per cent, receive 8 000 000 to 9 000 000 gallons; 25, or 2 per cent, receive 9 000 000 to 10 000 000 gallons; and 165 growers, or 18 per cent, receive 10 000 000 gallons upwards. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a schedule which is purely statistical and which shows the annual quotas in megalitres and the annual consumptions for the years 1971 to 1980.

Leave granted.

WATER CONSUMPTION ON N.A.P.

Definition—

N.A.P.—The area defined as the N.A.P. is the same as paragraph 2.2 of the Report of Kinnaird Hill deRohan and Young Proprietary Limited (Kinhill) dated February 1976.

Annual Consumption (Source Kinhill Report and E. & W.S. records)

	Annual Consumption ML	Annual Quotas ML
1971.....	18 395	37 792
1972.....	23 895	37 792
1973.....	18 954	37 792
1974.....	15 632	25 604
1975.....	18 248	25 604
1976.....	18 379	25 604
1977.....	21 456	25 604
1978.....	21 752	25 604
1979.....	20 145	25 604
1980.....	N.A.	25 604

Mr. RUSSACK: I also have a schedule of the types of vegetable grown (tomatoes, cucumbers, capsicums, egg fruit, rock melon, and beans) and flowers, and the production returns. The return in 1977-78 was \$9 243 000. Outside vegetables (beans, melons, pumpkins, celery, lettuce, carrots, etc.) netted a return of \$11 489 000, making a grand total for goods produced in that area of \$20 832 000. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took the liberty of showing this table to the Speaker, who said that it was purely statistical, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1977-78 FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PRODUCTION IN THE NORTHERN ADELAIDE PLAINS

Glasshouse	Houses	Production	Estimated Returns	Total
				\$
Tomatoes.....	9 200	120 ½-case per house	\$7.00 per ½-case	7 728 000
Cucumbers.....	800	150 ½-case per house	\$4.50 per ½-case	540 000
Capsicums.....	500	60 ½-case per house	\$7.00 per ½-case	210 000
Egg Fruit.....	120	60 ½-case per house	\$7.00 per ½-case	50 000
Rockmelon.....	80		\$500 per house	40 000
Beans.....	450		\$500 per house	225 000
Flowers.....	120			450 000
Total.....	11 270	houses		\$9 243 000

Outside Vegetables	Acres			
Beans.....	25	\$1 750 per acre		43 000
Melons.....	25	\$1 000 per acre		25 000
Pumpkins.....	100	18 ton per acre	\$90 per ton	162 000
Celery.....	85	900 crates per acre	\$900 per crate	720 000
Lettuce.....	250	600 crates per acre	\$1 800 per acre	450 000
Carrots.....	300	18 ton per acre	\$200 per ton	1 080 000
Other bunch lines.....	80		\$2 000 per acre	160 000
Cauliflower.....	500	5 000 plants per acre	40c per plant	1 000 000
Cabbage.....	283	6 000 plants per acre	40c per plant	679 000
Onions.....	803	18 tons per acre	\$140 per ton	2 023 000
Potatoes—winter.....	902	7 ton per acre	\$120 per ton	772 000
Potatoes—main crop.....	1 020	16 tons per acre	\$80 per ton	1 305 000
Other vegetables.....	30			225 000
Capsicums (outside).....	15		\$2 500 per acre	37 000
Stone fruit.....	50			120 000
Almonds.....	1 750			1 800 000
Grapes.....	1 400			700 000
Flowers.....	48		\$6 000 per acre	288 000
Total.....	7 666	acres		\$11 489 000

Grand Total \$20 832 000

Mr. RUSSACK: Within the District of Goyder, there is a lucrative industry in market gardening on the northern Adelaide Plains. Certain difficulties are involved, and I ask the responsible Minister and the Government to consider these difficulties so that the industry can progress and develop for the advantage not only of the growers in the northern Adelaide Plains area but also of the people of this State.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You will agree that those growers have been well looked after by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSACK: During the difficult period of November last, the Minister of Agriculture was most attentive; he went personally to that area and assisted those people to the best of his ability. His departmental officers, too, assisted, and were most attentive and made themselves available. As a matter of fact, numerous approaches were made to them and great tolerance was shown. The best assistance that could be made available to those people in distress was forthcoming.

I can tell honourable members how a family living in that area overcame a great difficulty. About two or three years ago, when there was a grape production glut, the father and two sons in the family about which I speak grappled personally with the difficulties involved. Of course, in the initial stages, they asked for some solution from the Government but, at their own initiative, they established a winery and processed the whole of their crop. They now have a well established winery on the Port Wakefield Road that is called Primo Estate. The father looks after the vineyard, one brother is a qualified wine-maker, and the other brother is a born salesman and has a terrific personality. These people overcame a problem through incentive, drive and hard work, and I commend them for that. I know that not everyone can do that, but I do say that there are many areas in which people who are confronted with disadvantage can overcome it by initiative, drive and hard work.

In the District of Goyder there are many other industries; Adelaide Cement Company has an extraction plant at Klein Point near Stansbury that employs 20 or 30 men. That enterprise is very well conducted. The Ocean Salt Company has provided employment for many people at Price and Lochiel. Dotted about the district are engineering enterprises—at Minlaton, Maitland, Balaklava, Tarlee and other places—that provide employment. Within the bounds of my district, a test mine is being sunk in the interests of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. In the annual report of the trust, the following was stated:

The primary fuel used in the power stations at Torrens Island and Dry Creek is natural gas. Oil is used as a standby fuel at Torrens Island. The trust has arrangements with the Pipelines Authority of South Australia for supply of gas up to 1987. There are no firm arrangements for supply beyond then because insufficient reserves have so far been proven in the Cooper Basin to provide for this as well as meeting obligations which the producers have to supply New South Wales.

I understand that that commitment extends until the year 2005 or 2006. Consideration must be given to other types of fuel for energy, and in the report headed "Future Fuel Supplies" appears the following:

Work has continued on evaluation of the St. Vincent basin. Recoverable reserves of coal in this basin, which lies mainly in the Inkerman-Balaklava-Port Wakefield area, are now estimated to be of the order of 2 000 million tonnes.

The coal is very low grade with bad fouling properties. However, investigations so far indicate that there is a good possibility that suitable boilers can be designed to burn it using conventional pulverised firing techniques.

Fluidised bed combustion has been investigated but developments in this field are not at the stage where it could yet be considered for large scale commercial application. Work is now proceeding on digging a large trial pit near Bowmans from which a bulk sample of about 300 tonnes of coal will be extracted for pilot scale combustion tests. These tests will be done in the United States and Germany as there are no suitable facilities in Australia. The excavation of the pit will also provide valuable geotechnical and hydrological information for use in planning any future mining operations.

I have visited this project twice and am glad to say that there has been satisfactory progress. We all look anxiously to the result of the tests. As honourable members are probably aware, the Premier announced not long ago that if those tests were successful it was hoped that a power station could be established somewhere in the vicinity. The advantages would be that it is close to the metropolitan and populated areas and that it would attract (because it is so close to populated areas) engineers of the calibre necessary for such a sophisticated power plant. For the sake of the area of Port Wakefield, Bowmans and Balaklava, it is to be hoped that the tests will be successful and that that will be a future means of energy production in this State.

I now mention the conduct of members in this House during this Address in Reply debate. I seriously commend to members of this House the appeal made by the Speaker during the last session. I say this because in one case a member spent the whole hour allowed for his Address in Reply speech in character assassination of members of the front bench. I had (and have) the pleasure at times of speaking to a former Minister who served in this House for many years. He was not of the same political persuasion as I, but he said to me one day:

I come into the House quite often—and I have seen him here recently—

and it worries me to see the personal abuse levelled by one member at another. In the 20 years that I spent in Parliament, I can honestly say I did not abuse any other member.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we can criticise the Government and we can criticise the Opposition so far as policy is concerned. We can, perhaps, criticise the way a Minister has carried out his duties, but I suggest that it is not Parliamentary to criticise people personally.

During last week, on a popular radio talk-back programme, the person responsible for that programme, when speaking about politicians, said:

I consider politicians to be a necessary evil.

When statements such as that are made, it worries me, because I am involved, in the broad sense, with all politicians and the political scene. I suggest to honourable members that the image that people have of politicians is formulated because of what we do and say. I hope that consideration will be given to the fact that everyone acts as he or she feels they should and carries out his or her duties according to convictions and beliefs. I think personal attacks are unnecessary. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): I support the motion. I propose to have something to say about this debate and, therefore, I was interested to hear the remarks made by the member who has just resumed his seat. Before I do that, I would like to talk about a matter that has been discussed in this House at fairly great length in recent times; that is, the matter of consultation. I want to make it perfectly plain that I do not want to impinge on anybody's ground. Although it is inevitable that I will have to mention the Public Service guidelines recently tabled, I

do not propose to refer to that document, or anything in it, at this time.

I do not hold myself up as a paragon of a person who consulted in every field whilst I was a Minister. Indeed, I suppose that in the early part of my career it could have been said that I certainly did not consult people fully enough. I do not want to give that impression at all. Nor do I want to give the impression that the consultations in which I did involve myself should be held out as examples. Indeed, early in my career I learnt the value of consultation. I think that the Deputy Premier, in particular, would remember the decision taken by the previous Government in late 1970 or early 1971 to purchase the township of Chain of Ponds. I learned a severe lesson from that decision, because no prior consultation took place with the people affected.

From that day on, I attempted always to take into consideration the people involved in any way in any decision that I had to take. As I have said, I may have been remiss on occasions, but I attempted at all times to do that. I think, basically, the Premier has made an error in the way he conducted consultations relating to the document to which I referred, in the sense that it is quite obvious that the document originally discussed and the document finally tabled were two entirely different documents. That is all I want to say about that matter.

What I want to emphasise to the House, and to the Premier, is that I believe that the most important part of this contract was entirely forgotten. Every committee of this Parliament is an extension of this forum, or that is what I understand. It seems to me that the chairmen of the various committees, and the members of those committees, were not consulted in any way about this matter. If I am wrong about that, I will stand corrected. In fact, they are the people who will finally be responsible for putting into effect the matters contained within those guidelines. I should have thought it would be a very much more practical approach for the Premier to use, in the first instance, the Joint Committee on Standing Orders (that is, the committees from both Houses that go to make the Standing Orders Committee, which is involved with matters that affect both Houses) and to give it the task initially of looking at the problem of witnesses coming before Parliamentary committees. If it was competent to do that, it could then have taken that document and discussed it with the Public Service Association and the Public Service Board and made certain that anything finally decided was, in fact, viewed by them (whether agreed to or not is another question) before being tabled in the House, and when it was tabled a debate could have taken place on that issue.

Irrespective of what has been said about this Parliament this afternoon, there is no doubt that in a debate on a specific issue certain points can be raised which would be overlooked, because every member in this place has some expertise, and I am certain that a debate on an issue such as that would bring something worthwhile forward. No Government has to be so intransigent that it will not listen at all to the proposals put forward in this House.

If that method was not satisfactory to the Premier, surely it would have been competent for the Premier to call together a committee consisting of you, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Legislative Council, the chairmen of the various Parliamentary committees, together with a member of the Opposition on those committees, with the Premier chairing the committee. That committee could get down to the work of seeing whether or not protection was needed, not just for public servants but also for any witnesses who come before Parliamentary committees. In my view that would have been the most ideal way to do it,

because people who are chairmen (you, Mr. Speaker, the President, and the Premier himself) are, after all, experienced in the sort of things that ought to be decided so far as protection is concerned. I believe that method would have brought about a very much better result.

I have heard some talk recently in press reports, about whether or not the Premier will withdraw these things. I suggest to him that, if he does, what I have said is the way he ought to handle the matter, because those committees do have the final responsibility. With regard to the other problems that come to mind, I wonder how those guidelines would affect the Public Accounts Committee, for example. In the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972-1974, section 14 provides:

The Committee shall have the same powers to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and compel the production of documents as a royal commission has under the Royal Commissions Act, 1917.

That committee would have the same power in respect of everything else, as that section goes on to point out. Therefore, the Public Accounts Committee at any time would be competent to take evidence in camera and require a witness to give evidence on his own. So much for the guidelines. I wonder whether that point has been overlooked. I think that is an important point.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee says that it has not; I would like to know how it has not been overlooked, and how it has been catered for.

I believe that something should be done about public servants coming before Parliamentary committees. I have been cited by the Premier as having been concerned about this matter. I have been concerned about it ever since the Public Accounts Committee report on the state of the hospitals in this State was published. Honourable members will recall that a public servant (if I remember correctly, his name was Mr. Barker) was subjected to what in certain respects I would call not questioning but a grilling. He was put through what could be termed in many respects the third degree. That was how it appeared to me. On that occasion the committee appeared to be acting not as a committee but as a kangaroo court. The member for Hanson was, I think, a member of the committee at that time, and he will recall how this person to whom I have referred was completely out of his depth, but he was brought back from time to time in an attempt to verify things that he was not competent to comment on or to report on. We do not want to see that sort of scene develop in our Parliamentary committees.

I have heard members of committees (and if any honourable member wants to know the sources, I am prepared to tell him privately) say quite openly that a witness who had come before a committee was quivering in his shoes. That is the wrong attitude, and it is a deplorable state of affairs that members of responsible Parliamentary committees would make such statements. What satisfaction does one get out of people appearing before a committee being in such a state that they cannot give the proper evidence, or that they do not feel disposed to do so, because of the questioning or the attitude of the committee? The committees of this Parliament are set up to get the facts, and they must draw their own conclusions from those facts, not draw conclusions from witnesses. We ought to look at the system and the way the chairmen conduct these meetings. Although I have not personally been a member of a committee for a long time, I have had enough experience as a Minister with the findings of committees and things that are said about committees to know that these sorts of things develop. I hope sincerely

that those people who are members of Parliamentary committees, particularly the chairmen, will heed what I have said today.

I refer now to the cost to the Government for its public accountability. We all tend to forget that, because Government is publicly accountable, hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars are spent annually to see to it that the Government is properly accountable. It is my belief that there is a very fine balance in how far you can go one way or the other. I have come to the conclusion that, if too many barriers are placed in the way of the Public Service, it will become inefficient. That is a thing that we all deplore, because we all want efficiency from our public servants, and we have had it. But if public servants are to be bound down because of the questioning, the searching and the constant niggling of all sorts of committees, we will see that result. I rue the day that that happens, because not only will it be bad for the Public Service but also it will be bad for the State.

I sincerely hope that what I have said is taken seriously. I am trying to be objective, and I hope that the Government does not get itself into a situation where there are so many requirements on public servants that their initiatives are taken away. I have seen occasions where initiatives have been taken by public servants in good faith, something has gone wrong, and then a public servant has been clobbered. As soon as he has been clobbered, everybody has gone back into their shells. We can take the example of the railways, for instance. If the railway workers worked to regulation, they could effectively slow the system so much that they might as well be on strike. Surely that must indicate to us how ridiculous that situation is. Indeed, I know that the Government (and I certainly was while I was Premier) is looking at all sorts of regulations to see whether we cannot do away with them in order to streamline some of the unwieldy procedures which currently exist. I know that the present Government is pursuing that, and I wish it success.

Those are the points that I want to make about committees in this Parliament. I am concerned about the way in which some committee inquiries are conducted. I think that at times it has been particularly difficult for some of the witnesses, and I agree that there is some need for the matter to be reviewed. However, I think the matter should be handled differently from the way the Premier has gone about it.

I return now to the point that I made at the outset of my speech concerning the usefulness of this debate. I believe that the time has come when we should be curbing this debate dramatically. I have obtained some figures pertaining to the past five years, and I will later seek your permission and that of the House to insert these figures in *Hansard*; they are of a purely statistical nature. This debate is made up of a series of speeches which, in the main, are entirely unrelated. In other words, somebody may talk about unemployment, for example. The next speaker does not necessarily follow that topic, and it may be 10 speakers later before that subject is referred to again. There is a mixture of subjects talked about, and I suppose the best way to put it is that some members speak about their particular hobby horses; some members talk about the benefits of trade unions, for example; some members talk about the fact that they are of no use; and there may be philosophical arguments. Not only do members advance their own philosophies (which may be a good thing, because other members can work out whether they are on the right or left of their own Party) but also members condemn one another's philosophies.

Reference is made to local issues, of course, and I suppose members would be sad if they were deprived of

that particular advantage. However, there is also personal abuse and muck raking, as the member for Goyder has just said. Apart from the fact that everyone has the opportunity to speak for an hour if he so desires, what is the end result of the debate? Members almost feel obliged to speak for an hour, or else they will have let down the side. I believe the shorter the speech the more effective it is, because you have to prepare it, or you wander on; in other words, anyone can make a speech for an hour.

The end result of this debate is as follows: you will, Sir, proceed to Government House with members of this House and you will say:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the Members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceeding of the session.

That is the end result of a debate which lasted last year for a total of 29 hours 16 minutes, which was 11.4 per cent of the total time that the Parliament sat. In 1979, we spoke on the Address in Reply for 19 hours 48 minutes, which represented 27.5 per cent of the total time spent in this Parliament. I think that those figures alone would be sufficient to make members question whether or not they are getting the value out of this debate that they think they are.

I believe that time spent on private members' Bills and motions could be of more benefit to members of the Opposition and individual back-bench members of the Government than the time we now spend debating the Address in Reply. The Bills and motions that are put forward are properly thought out and considered, and members have the opportunity to address themselves to a wide variety of related subjects.

In 1979-80, we spent 29 hours 16 minutes on the Address in Reply, and on private members' Bills we spent 5 hours 5 minutes, which was 2 per cent of the total time spent in the House. Time spent on private members' motions was 11 hours 46 minutes. I think that the tables ought to be turned, and we ought to be spending 29 or 30 hours on private members' business, and not the time we are currently spending on the Address in Reply. I go so far as to suggest that the Address in Reply could become a mere formality because, if we consider members having the opportunity to raise local issues, they have Question Time. Perhaps Question Time could be extended by half an hour to give more opportunity for members to raise matters of local interest.

Mr. Becker: It used to be two hours.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I can remember quite well that those two hours were not always fully utilised. Questions on Notice are also available to all members. We also have the adjournment debate on most occasions; and that could be extended from three speakers to four or five speakers, with every member being given an opportunity to raise an issue important to him in that grievance debate.

I believe the Government could decide to use some of the time saved for specific debates in this House on important issues. I cannot think of one more important than the one announced yesterday by the Minister of Transport. It should be possible for a Government to say that a matter is of sufficient importance for the Parliament to debate that question forthwith, or give notice that it will be debated soon. The whole day of that sitting could be devoted to that topic, without breaking into private members' time. Government time available through

cutting down the Address in Reply debate could be used. It might not be the sole province of the Government to decide that; it might be, instead, the Opposition having to revert to a no-confidence motion. The Opposition could request the Government to make a day available for something it considered to be of paramount importance.

I know that the Standing Orders Committee, of which you, Sir, are Chairman, is currently studying this proposal. I would like you to take into account the figures that I have had taken out over the past five years. They vary, of course, because in 1977 there was an election and the sitting was much shorter. Nevertheless, you can see the trend, where almost three times as much of the sittings of Parliament is devoted to the Address in Reply as is devoted to the important business of private members. I hope that your committee will see fit to change drastically the present form of this debate, which could be a mere formality. It could be simply a one day debate, where the speakers from the Government put forward their support for the Governor's Speech, and an equal number of speakers from the Opposition put forward their views of the matter. The time allowed for each member could be reduced to half an hour. I am sure that members could say all that needed to be said in that time. Comments may have to relate to something in the Governor's Speech, instead of rambling across the board.

I hope you, Sir, and your committee will take note of what I have said on this subject. I have noted the number

of speakers and the variety of subjects covered in 1978-79. It is true, as the member for Goyder has properly said, that the standard of debates during the Address in Reply has deteriorated, and members see it as their duty to speak for one hour, and they have to drag up all sorts of stuff in order to fill that hour. Hence the muckraking, the challenging of one another's ideals, and so on. I seek permission to have statistical information about the matter incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

ADDRESS IN REPLY STATISTICS

Session	Per cent		Total Session Time
	Time spent in A/R	Time spent in A/R	
1979-80	29-16	11-4	256-37
1979	19-48	27-5	71-38
1978-79	25-06	7-7	327-27
1977-78	18-30	6-9	269-40
1977	26-17	47-0	55-55
1976-77	26-48	6-7	400-23
1975-76	20-15	6-8	295-46
1974-75	25-56	5-8	448-26
TOTAL/AVERAGE	191-56	9-0	2 125-52

PRIVATE MEMBERS' TIME STATISTICS

Session	Per cent		Per cent		Total Session Time
	Time spent on P/M Bills	Time spent on P/M Bills	Time spent on P/M Motions	Time spent on P/M Motions	
1979-80	5-05	2-0	11-46	4-6	256-37
1979	—	—	—	—	71-38
1978-79	9-15	2-8	22-33	6-9	327-27
1977-78	1-46	7	22-38	8-4	269-40
1977	—	—	4-18	7-7	55-55
1976-77	8-31	2-2	39-50	9-9	400-23
1975-76	9-05	3-1	29-19	9-9	295-46
1974-75	15-06	3-3	42-59	9-6	448-26
TOTALS/AVERAGE	48-48	2-3	173-23	8-2	2 125-52

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Another matter that I believe is of importance to this State is the completion of the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin. I know that the Premier has had a conference with the Chief Minister (Mr. Everingham), and indeed the Labor Party in the Northern Territory has supported the move being made. We know that the history of this matter goes back to 1910, and it was in 1929 that the first link from Port Augusta to Alice Springs was completed. I believe it is of great significance to South Australia as well as to the Northern Territory that this Alice Springs to Darwin line be completed as soon as possible. I think all members would have received last week a review of the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link that was sent out by the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory. I searched in vain for his speech to the Commonwealth Society, but I was sent copies of the cover, instead.

I think that the comments on the review made by the Chief Minister in his letter to the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) are well worth reading. The Chief Minister said:

The view of my Government is that the Study Team's Report provides clear and overwhelming support for the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link and fully justifies the

earliest possible construction of the line. This follows from the principal conclusions of the report which, I believe, can be stated as follows:

- the growth in freight associated with the growth and development of the Northern Territory would provide justification for the railway on financial grounds within the foreseeable future;
- the construction of the railway will have an enormous economic impact on the Territory and will serve as a major impetus to development;
- the non-economic considerations such as defence, energy and the social impact all point forcefully and unambiguously to the need for the railway.

Trade for this State is involved in this proposal, of course. I do not think I need say any more than that to support it. Despite what the Premier has already done and what the Leader of the Opposition has already said in press releases, I hope that the Premier will see fit to move a motion in the House and that a similar motion will be moved in another place fully supporting the efforts on the part of the Northern Territory Government to pressure the Federal Government to get on with this job. I am not trying to tell the Premier how to do his job, but this would

be another mechanism by which we could seriously impress the Prime Minister of the importance of this rail link being completed.

Mr. Gunn: I've got a motion on the Notice Paper supporting it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the motion ought to be moved by the Premier, with great respect to the member for Eyre. I am not trying to write down his efforts. I am certain that the Premier need have no fear that it would not be universally supported. It would give members an opportunity to speak to it and to impress on the Federal Government its great importance. This line is just as significant as is any of the so-called mining issues currently under review: that is how important I believe it is. I hope that the Premier will take note of what I have said and see fit to move that motion at an appropriate time. I have not spoken about this to my Leader, but I am certain from the contents of his press release that he would fully support the motion. The motion should be sent not only to the Prime Minister but also to South Australian Senators, who are supposed to represent South Australia. If we can enlist the support of South Australian Senators, it would add to the pressure that ought to be applied to the Prime Minister.

Finally, I will say a few words about a local issue which, whilst it does not lie in my district but is in that of the Minister of Health (the member for Coles), affects people living in my district. I have had an intimate knowledge of this subject, because I was involved in negotiations between the Government and the Campbelltown council to take over a wildflower garden in an area now known as Blackhill Reserve. It has come to my attention that the Blackhill trust has been told that the activity of the nursery, which is a native plant nursery, is to be wound down, if not discontinued. That is a disgraceful action.

Let us go back to those negotiations. If my memory serves me correctly, a letter was handed by the Government to the Campbelltown council, from which that park was purchased. The letter gave a clear undertaking that we would provide nursery facilities for the cultivation of native plants for the people in that area and to encourage people in the area to use them. Not only are they attractive plants, but their use means that the quantity of water required on gardens is dramatically reduced. I want to know from the Minister of Environment whether there has been a positive direction in this regard. If that is not the case, I shall be pleased to accept his assurance.

I believe that, if there has been such a direction, it was probably because of Government philosophy that private enterprise is best equipped to do these things. That would not be the case, because I think that about \$250 000 has already been spent on the relocation and building of the new nursery. It is a first-class facility run on first-class lines. It really is servicing the people in that area, not only in the north and north-east, but also in other parts of the metropolitan area. It would be a great pity, indeed, if any move were made to run down this activity or to discontinue it in the long term. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Environment will take heed of what I have said and, if I am wrong, correct me. If I am not wrong, he should give the House the opportunity of hearing the reasons for going back on what I believe was a positive agreement, in 1974 or 1975, when it was handed over.

Believing that members should not make long speeches in this debate, I think I should be consistent. Thus, I do not intend to introduce any new matter. I will simply go back over the points I have raised, namely, the Public Service guidelines and the way in which I believe they

should be handled. I hope that the Premier, if he is having second thoughts on this matter, will see fit to take up one of my suggestions.

The second point I made was in relation to the Address in Reply debate. It can be adequately shown that the usefulness of the debate has deteriorated to the extent that it ought to be reviewed; the time now allowed for this debate should be spent on matters of more benefit to the workings of Parliament. The third point I made was the importance of the rail link between Alice Springs and Darwin. The fourth point I made was about the important nursery in the Blackhill Reserve.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I, too, support the motion, and will comment on something that the member for Goyder said. Perhaps this debate is used for politicking, but I do not intend to do that. My colleagues and I have been extremely disappointed at Government members' attitude to this debate. Mr. Speaker, if you were to go back over the past two weeks, you would see that time and time again, we have been forced to draw the attention of the Chair to the state of the House. Government members have consistently refused to come into the Chamber. We have had situations where Ministers, who should have been in charge of the House, have left the Chamber, thus showing complete arrogance and contempt in relation to this debate and members of the House. I have called for 15 quorums in the House. Whilst I called them, I have known that Government members were upstairs playing billiards or skulking in their offices. All we will get is that the standard of playing billiards by Government members will improve, but their attitude in the Chamber can only deteriorate. I hope that, whilst I am on my feet, a quorum will be maintained at all times. It is obvious that a majority of Opposition members is in the House at present, and that Government ranks are thinly spread.

I know that no more Government members are due to speak in this debate but, when we have the next Address in Reply debate, I hope they will show a little more concern about being seen in this House rather than being upstairs playing billiards.

On Saturday, along with many of my colleagues, I took part in the beef march. We all know the history of the beef march of 1931, which was prompted by a decision of the Government of the day to deny the unemployed a beef ration and to replace it with hogget. The unemployed people in Port Adelaide decided to march on the Treasury Building. In the course of the march from Port Adelaide to Adelaide, the marching crowd swelled to about 12 000 people.

The reason for Saturday's march was so that people could identify with the plight of today's unemployed. In 1931, the Government of the day panicked and set the police and the troopers on to the marchers, an action similar to that of this Government with regard to the pickets at Schrader-Scovill. Those present at the march included members of church groups, community groups, trade unions, the Unemployed Workers Union, Labor Party branches, and the Communist Party, Labor Party politicians, and Australian Democrats; in fact, all levels of the community were represented, with the exception of one. Not one member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party wanted to be identified with the plight of the unemployed.

I could have forgiven them if they had felt that the distance from Port Adelaide to the Festival Plaza was too great for them, but they could have attended the speeches at the plaza. However, not one member of the Government Party was present. If we look back, there has not been one mention of the plight of the unemployed in

any of their speeches during the course of this debate. There is no mention of the unemployed in the Governor's Speech. We know that the unemployed have no place in the policies of this Government. At the moment, 423 720 people are registered in this country as unemployed.

Mr. Whitten: How many hidden unemployed?

Mr. HEMMINGS: And, as the member for Price said, how many hidden unemployed? It has been estimated that if we took the figure—

Mr. Becker: By whom?

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Catholic Society of St. Laurence. I would like to take its word. If we took the hidden unemployed as well as those unemployed who appear in the C.E.S. figures, it would represent a figure equal to the population of the third largest city in this country. If we include their dependants, the figure moves up into the category of the second largest city in this country. In July, South Australia had the worst unemployment figure—7.7 per cent of the work force. There is no mention in the Governor's Speech or by members opposite of the unemployed.

I should like to speak briefly about the Schrader-Scovill dispute, covered so adequately last week by the member for Elizabeth, and to comment on what the Minister of Industrial Affairs said this morning, when he condemned State members who have in their electorate these people who were sacked from Schrader-Scovill. He said that we were playing politics, and that he wanted to take the dispute out of the glare of public debate. Had it not been for the member for Elizabeth and the telegram sent by members of the State Parliament to Schrader-Scovill in the U.S.A., the Minister would have done nothing.

The Minister has spoken to Mr. Dunne. Obviously, Mr. Dunne thanked him for allowing 83 police officers to be used to break the picket line. He might have explained why, in previous instances, different companies had used the support of the local police to break picket lines. We received a reply from the multi-national Schrader Automotive Group, in Nashville, Tennessee. I will not read out all the telegram, but one point struck me, bearing in mind Mr. Dunne's attitude to this dispute, as rather unbelievable. The group vice-president said in the telegram:

Manager Dunne has kept us advised on events since the dispute began. We believe he has acted and is acting responsibly to seek a settlement which both sides can accept.

I wonder whether Mr. Dunne had informed his masters in Nashville, Tennessee, that, at one stage in the negotiations, he refused to see members of the union delegation because the senior member was a labourer. He felt that talking to a labourer was below the dignity of Mr. Dunne, General Manager of the Schrader-Scovill Elizabeth plant. I wonder whether Mr. Dunne has placed this account of the facts before his masters in Tennessee. I very much doubt it. I would be interested to know whether he has told his masters that he declined to accept the settlement put forward by the Minister of Industrial Affairs that was accepted by the union.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about his comments about walking on water?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. For the benefit of members opposite, when members of the union delegation said that the way in which Mr. Dunne was acting in this dispute appeared almost as though he was walking on water, Mr. Dunne said that as far as he was concerned walking on water did not count. What he said in Schrader-Scovill was to be accepted and acted upon. That is the kind of man whose Tennessee masters say is acting responsibly.

I should like to move on to the general remarks made in this Address in Reply debate. It seems that all

Government back-benchers, except one or two, have been under instructions to concentrate on letting this House know about the safety of nuclear power. The member for Newland gave the lead, and devoted the whole of his time to a fairly well researched pro-nuclear speech. He was careful to depict the anti-nuclear lobby as alarmist and emotional; in fact, he gave the thousands of scientists and environmentalists, and members on this side, who are concerned no credibility at all. There is an ever-growing group of people who are more than ever convinced that the dangers of nuclear energy to mankind far outweigh any economic advantage. I shall expand on that later. The member for Newland gave us examples of how mining in general had created jobs in other States, and how mining royalties brought about more employment. He instanced Western Australia and Queensland, and told us that Queensland receives \$50 800 000 per annum, equal to \$23.40 per head of population.

Western Australia received \$51 600 000 per annum, equal to \$42.25 per head, and the member for Newland quoted the figure for South Australia, which was \$3 300 000 per annum, equal to \$2.60 per head. He used this as an argument to substantiate the fact that Roxby Downs will provide 7 000 new jobs—or is it 10 000, 17 000 or 27 000? It depends on who is speaking and when it is said as to how many jobs Roxby Downs will provide.

What the honourable member failed to explain was that, if mining is the economic answer to all of our problems in this State, why is unemployment as bad in Queensland and in Western Australia as it is in the rest of Australia? Why are Sir Charles Court and Joh Bjelke-Petersen arguing and threatening to introduce taxes to make their States viable? That explanation was not forthcoming, because the member for Newland was stating nonsense. We all know that mining does not really produce more jobs—it produces more profits for multi-nationals, and that is what this Liberal Government is all about. The member for Newland did not impress me, and I am sure that he did not impress my colleagues.

I would like to comment on the contribution of two members opposite, not because of their brilliance but because of the stupidity of what they said. I will deal first with the member for Henley Beach; perhaps he will stop making remarks and go to get an early tea. Apart from the honourable member's usual paranoic union bashing effort (which he does all the time—and he is completely wrong), he started in an incredible way. The honourable member was ecstatic in his support of the divine blessing on the deliberations of this House; he felt that that was the answer—we need divine blessing. I for one, and I am sure all of my colleagues, would always welcome any form of assistance whether it comes from you, Sir, or from above. After the 10 months of bungling that has come from the Treasury benches, I believe that members opposite need more than divine blessing to make this State work—they need a miracle. Perhaps the next time the member for Henley Beach speaks, as well as asking for divine blessing, he could place an order for a miracle.

The member for Mawson made an equally incredible, although in his case horrifying, statement. I understand that, in his younger days, he was a student of theology and is today a practising lay preacher. Yet, he went on record in this House as giving his unequivocal support for the Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea. That regime has systematically set out to turn back the clock in that country; it was responsible for putting to death between 2 000 000 and 3 000 000 of that country's men and women. In a true Christian way, the member for Mawson embraces the members of that regime as his brothers, and condemns the North Vietnamese for releasing those people from that

tyrannical regime. I hope that the honourable member's recognition of the Pol Pot regime is not that of his church.

That regime systematically destroyed every norm and value of civilised life in a country that has been known for centuries for its gentleness and culture. The regime had a doctrine of annihilation and extermination of people of all levels: the intelligentsia, the working people and the peasants. It had a policy of reducing the life of the survivors to point zero, to the level of the stone age, surpassing in cruelty and terror the worst savagery the world has ever known. It was out to build a glorious egalitarian society, where everyone who survived the holocaust would be turned into a peasant of the lower middle level.

The Pol Pot regime spared nothing that human kind had created; it destroyed everything. All educational and cultural institutions, religious shrines, temples, pagodas, churches and mosques were done away with. Libraries were destroyed and books were burned; the communication system (post and telephone network, road, rail and air transport) became non-existent for the civilian people—it functioned for the military. The monetary system, banks, markets, bazaars and trade currency were dispensed with; centres of art and music, song and dance theatres, museums, cinemas, TV stations and clubs for physical culture and sport were closed. Modern hospitals, clinics, factories and plants were shut down. Every modern machine and invention, such as cars, radios and refrigerators, were destroyed or abandoned. Even the common little bicycle was not spared destruction.

What remained of economic life was one of the most primitive blinds, and above all the regime of death made a bid to destroy family life. All private family cooking was banned; even cooking pots and fishing nets were confiscated as symbols of individualism. Human emotions, sentiments, fellow feelings, and love were frowned upon. Wives were separated from husbands, children from parents and brothers from sisters.

The intellectuals were a special target for the Pol Pot regime; people with any measure of education were deceived into writing their biographies on a plea of using their talent for the reconstruction of the country. Those who did so, in fact, wrote their own death sentence, as all intellectuals were considered criminals under a suspended death sentence and liable to be killed at any moment. About 1 000 Kampuchians living in Lahore were lured back to their country on the same plea of rebuilding it. On their return they were arrested and tortured; 900 were killed in cold blood.

It will interest the member for Mawson, being an ex-schoolteacher, to know that the Pol Pot regime did away with all educational institutions with a vengeance. Four-fifths of the teachers were killed. The school buildings, especially in the provinces, which were not converted to prisons or torture centres, were razed to the ground, and the stones and bricks were used for road making. The destruction caused to the infra-structure of education is revealed in a report of the Minister of Education of that new Government, that Government which the member for Mawson frowns upon and which, of course, the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, also objects to. It is a shocking document which details the slaughter of professors, teachers and students, and even primary schoolchildren and their families. Of a total number of registered teachers of 24 336 in 1968, only 2 974 remained in 1979, and of a total number of 1 108 000 students in 1968, in 1979 there were only 328 129 left. I seek leave to have the figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

ATTACK ON EDUCATION

	Number 1968	Number August 1979
Professors and Assistant Professors	725	50
Students in Colleges	11 000	450
High School Teachers	2 300	207
High School Students	106 000	5 300
Primary School Teachers	21 311	2 717
Primary School Children	991 000	322 379

Mr. HEMMINGS: The situation in regard to the medical profession is just as horrifying. Of 683 Kampuchean doctors, only 69 remain, yet the member for Mawson went out of his way to extol that regime.

Looking back on this debate, I wonder what we have learned from the views of Government members. The member for Eyre urged us to bring back the birch; the member for Morphett urged us to hang all drug offenders; the member for Henley Beach asked us to pray for deliverance at every turn; the member for Mawson supported mass genocide; and the member for Glenelg urged us to build more prisons.

Mr. Keneally: And give them to private enterprise.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, and the rest of them told us to forget the nuclear dangers because life will be very good in the future. With that kind of person sitting on the Government benches, perhaps I should go along with the member for Henley Beach and pray for some deliverance.

We were led to believe by Greg Kelton in one of his articles that this session would be busy indeed, with 100 Bills of significance being introduced. He said it would not be like the previous session when we sat hardly at all, but when the Government still claimed to be tired. He said this time it would be different. Is it going to be different? What have we before us? The Governor's Speech said it all, as follows:

A substantial programme of legislative reform is proposed by my Government. Amongst the measures to be introduced into the Parliament will be an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act providing for appeals by the Crown against sentence and enabling the Crown to refer a question of law to the Full Court where the question arose in proceedings leading to the acquittal of an accused person. The right of an accused person to make an unsworn statement in his defence will be abolished. Amendments will be made to the Electoral Act to overcome certain inadequacies which have appeared following the recent proceedings in the Court of Disputed Returns. Amendments will be made to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, the Residential Tenancies Act, the Builders Licensing Act, the Trading Stamp Act, the Land and Business Agents Act, the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, the Vertebrate Pests Act, the Pest Plants Act, the Registration of Deeds Act, and the Adoption of Children Act.

There was more to follow. The Governor's Speech continued:

Provision will be made to amend the South Australian Heritage Act to provide for voluntary agreements to encourage protection of significant vegetation on private land and other items of State heritage. . . . Amendments will be proposed to the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act.

That is not the kind of legislation that is going to get the unemployed and disadvantaged in my district jumping up and down with joy and going out in to the street waving flags. As I said earlier, not one piece of legislation mentioned by the Governor in his Speech deals with the problem of the unemployed in this area.

Mr. O'Neill: They don't care about the unemployed.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right; they do not care about the unemployed. On the day of the opening of this Parliament, members of this House and of the Legislative Council were present at the opening of the Constitutional Museum next door. I think that no-one will question the amount of work and attention to detail that went into restoring the old Legislative Council building to its former glory. The Premier, in his speech that afternoon, made the following remarks:

Today, with the opening of the Constitutional Museum, we are again expressing that sentiment in a visible and lasting form, one of which the whole community can be proud and for which a debt of gratitude is owed to everyone concerned.

Fine words indeed, except that there was no mention in any of the speeches of the one person who made it all possible, a previous Premier of this State—Don Dunstan. Not once was his name mentioned at the opening ceremony. But that is not the final insult. We need to go to the sight and sound segment to find that. Just before the end of that segment, which deals with the history of South Australian politics, we were told:

Your present Government was elected on the most democratic electoral system in Australia and has a mandate to retain the identity of South Australia.

Mr. O'Neill: And now they want to change it.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. We were then shown photographs in full colour of the "Gang of Thirteen" with "Flash Ted", the bagman of the Government, taking the centre position, where he so rightly belongs, being the man who employs all the dirty tricks of this Government.

I, and many of my colleagues, regard that part of the sight and sound segment as the most blatant piece of political propaganda. Not only has this Liberal Party bitterly opposed any electoral reform (and it was critical of the Constitutional Museum as well) but now it intends to implement another electoral gerrymander, to undo the previous Labor Government's legislation which ensured that, so far as voting for members of the Legislative Council was concerned, the wishes of the people of South Australia were carried out. Once again, this Liberal Government intends to retain control of the Legislative Council at all cost. No wonder members of the Government are seen by the people as a bunch of hypocrites.

This Government talks of electoral justice—that is a laugh! Power at all costs is this Government's by-word, no matter how it cheats the people. Returning to the sight and sound segment of the film shown at the Constitutional Museum, I understand that I was not the only one who complained about that segment. Quite a number of people have made comments about it to the trustees.

Mr. O'Neill: Some Liberal members were embarrassed, too.

Mr. HEMMINGS: There are some decent members on the other side. Perhaps in the near future we may see some change that truly reflects the situation regarding electoral reform and the part that the Dunstan-Corcoran Government played in achieving that reform despite Liberal opposition.

I now return to the question of nuclear safety. Whenever I hear politicians or representatives of mining companies (or, for that matter, scientists who have a vested interest) claiming to be speaking objectively, the warning bells sound. That is exactly what is being done now; we are being given a glib assurance that there is no risk to workers engaged in uranium mining, or in generating nuclear energy. We are told that a flight from Adelaide to Perth will expose us to more radio-activity than emanates from a nuclear reactor. Radio-activity

generated in a typical home is given as an example, also, of the kind of exposure to which we would be subjected. That kind of argument reminds me of a proposition expounded by United States chemical companies when the facts were emerging a few years ago about low synthetic chemicals producing effects harmful to U.S. workers and the general public. The record shows that many a politician and many a scientist sold his soul to multi-national companies such as Shell and Dow Chemicals. As I said earlier, the nuclear lobby portrays those of us who have doubts and fears for future generations as being emotional. In fact, the member for Newland did that recently in relation to figures I gave in this House relating to mortality rates in the U.S.A. for leukaemia, miscarriages and malformed babies. He accused me of using scare tactics and said that I was quoting from a discredited source (Professor Sternglass). If that honourable member, who is usually so precise with his information, biased though it is, looks at *Hansard*, he will see that I was quoting from official statistics ("official", mind) of mortalities in the United States for 1962.

Mrs. Mary Weik, Secretary of the Committee on Radiological Dangers, established a disquietening correlation between living in the area of a nuclear installation and the increase (sometimes quite large) in deaths by various causes among people living in those areas. I seek leave, Mr. Speaker, to have those figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

MORTALITIES

CAUSE	LOCALITY	INCREASE (per cent)
Leukaemia	Garfield, Montana	600
	Scaix, North Dakota	290
	Mohave, Arizona	270
Miscarriages	Morten, North Dakota	215
	Garfield, Montana	230
	Sherman, Oregon	162
Malformed babies	Massac, Illinois	240
	Sherman, Oregon	310
	Carroll, Missouri	273
	Massac, Illinois	240

(The percentage shows the increase as compared to the national average.)

Mr. HEMMINGS: If quoting a 600 per cent increase in deaths from leukaemia is considered as being emotional, then I admit to being emotional. If quoting a 310 per cent increase in malformed babies is classified as using scare tactics, I admit to that also. It seems that members opposite regard the health dangers of uranium mining and nuclear energy generation to workers and the general public as irrelevant and of no concern to them. As I said earlier, they are more concerned with profits.

I recommend that members opposite read the Senate *Hansard* of 29 August 1979, pages 363 to 374, which lists all the known accidents to date in the nuclear industry. That list was tabled by Senator Ruth Coleman of Western Australia, and makes interesting reading. The fact that it took 14 pages to list the number of known nuclear accidents to date is significant. I especially recommend it to all those instant experts on the other side who are quick to reassure the public that all is well in the nuclear power industry.

I now turn to the situation of health care in this State. No-one can deny that this Government has been consistent in that area. It has systematically embarked on a programme of reducing the cost of health care. No-one denies that, if a Government is to act responsibly, there is

a need to closely monitor its cost, but not in the indiscriminate way that the public hospitals in this State have been attacked. In the 1979-80 financial year public hospitals suffered a severe cut in funding which resulted in a dramatic decline in patient services. Nursing staff was cut to a minimum which resulted in their being overworked, new roster systems were introduced solely to save money, which meant that nurses were given inadequate rest periods, a situation which can be solved only in some fatality at some time or another. Many hospital administrators at that time said publicly that they could not stand any further cuts; that they had gone far enough. At that stage it could be said that the public hospital system was just about coping with the situation; it had been reduced not only from having minimum staff operating in both nursing and other capacities but also in having to resort to cost-saving activities such as limited choice of meals, the cutting out of biscuits, a subject that my able colleague for Unley so ably covered in his contribution to the debate, and in other areas, also. Lights were turned out during certain hours of the day, and nurses had to take over the jobs of ward orderlies. All this has resulted in a very real decline in patient care. As one union official said recently, public hospitals have become second-class institutions.

At all times the Minister of Health maintained that patient care was not suffering, that hospitals were managing. In fact, the Minister was practising the old art of politics, namely, that if you do not face up to a situation or if you deny that something has ever existed, eventually it will go away. What can public hospitals expect this financial year? Their position is even worse, because their Budget allocation is horrific to say the least. An article in the *Advertiser* on 30 July this year by Barry Hailstone stated:

The Royal Adelaide Hospital is considering urgently possible effects of its \$2.3 million Budget cut for 1980-81. Its chairman, Mr. L. Barrett, said this yesterday. He said the hospital would make a further submission to the South Australian Health Commission "as soon as possible", specifying the effect of the cuts.

The cuts were listed; in fact, they were quite frightening. It was reported that there was to be a 3 to 5 per cent cut in public teaching hospitals; a cut to the Royal Adelaide Hospital of almost \$3 000 000; the Adelaide Children's Hospital was to get \$700 000 less; the Queen Victoria Hospital would be about \$800 000 below; the allocation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was to be reduced by \$2 000 000; and the Flinders Medical Centre was to get \$1 200 000 less. As Opposition spokesman, I made statements, based on fact and on these reports, that these cuts would result in loss of several hundred jobs. What was the Minister of Health's reaction? She said that I was a public mischief, spreading alarm and despondency. We on this side of the House see our job as being such as continually to expose this Government and to inform people what the Government's policies will result in. If there is a reduction in the allocation of public hospital sector spending, as outlined in a report of the *Advertiser* of 29 July, jobs will be lost. Patient care will decline, no matter what the Minister says.

In fact, the Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital went one step further. He was reported in an article in the *Advertiser* of 5 August 1980 as follows:

Mr. Prescott said he was seeking immediate talks with the commission about the "unrealistic" budget.

The preliminary allocation for 1980-81 made available for his hospital was \$1 200 000 down. The article continued:

"There is no way in the world we will be able to achieve that," Mr. Prescott said. He said he had spent two hours

yesterday talking with department heads at the hospital who had said there was "a morale problem as well as a financial one".

"There is a feeling of depression over the hospital about the implications of the Budget cuts," Mr. Prescott said.

Did the Minister say that these people were a public mischief? They are saying exactly the same things that I have been saying, namely, that there will be a loss of jobs and a decline in patient care.

Things are even worse: if we are to believe a report screened on *Nationwide*, there will be a 10 per cent cut in health finance this year. If we take inflation into account, I can quite believe that there will be a 10 per cent cut in health spending. No amount of exhortations from the Minister that we should eat more fresh fruit and take more exercise will disguise the fact that under her Ministry the health services have been changed from the finest to the worst in the country.

Look at what has happened over the past 10 months. We had the Modbury Hospital shambles, where the Minister sheltered behind the Administrator and Chairman of the board, who eventually had to resign. Morale in hospitals is now really low. Staff are no longer sure what is going on. This state of affairs can be laid fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Minister. Her procrastination over Modbury, her failure to come to terms with her responsibilities and take action, have resulted in Modbury Hospital getting a reputation which it does not deserve and which will take a long time to live down. The Chairman of the Royal Adelaide Hospital had to resign, and we do not believe the reasons given by the Minister in this House. The Queen Victoria Hospital may well rue the day that a Liberal Government came to power in this State, with the present Minister of Health deciding its future. In reply to a question that I asked last week, the Minister made the following incredible statement in respect of the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital. The Minister said:

Until I have any recommendations before me in respect of the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital I am not prepared to make any comment and, indeed, it would be wrong of me to do so.

Later in her reply she said:

Until I receive such recommendations, I have no intention of commenting on the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital, other than to say that those who have established themselves in order to create what might be described as a fighting fund to "save the hospital" (and I use those words in inverted commas) may find that they are, in a campaign which is not necessary, using money which could well have been put towards the benefit of health services. I should also add that, if ever a women's hospital had a friend in terms of recognition of the special needs of women for obstetric and gynaecological services, the Queen Victoria Hospital has a friend in me.

In light of the callous, indifferent way that the Minister treated Modbury, in light of the report that we read in the *Advertiser* this morning, and in light of the statements that the Minister made to the National Council of Women last night, I think that the Queen Victoria Hospital may soon come to the conclusion that, in their case, who needs enemies when they have a friend in the Minister of Health. Also, in her usual churlish way, the Minister said in reply to my question:

I would be interested to know whether the honourable member, who says he is opposed to the closure of this [referring to the Queen Victoria Hospital], that and the other thing, has actually read the report of the task force. If he had done so he would realise that the provision of these services is

an extremely complex matter which requires very careful planning.

The Minister implied that members on this side had not even looked at the report or even into the problems of the Queen Victoria Hospital. I can assure members that we have read the report. We have visited the hospital, and we have talked to the Medical Superintendent and members of the board. We are sympathetic to the situation. We are opposed to the closing of the Queen Victoria Hospital, and we agree with the submissions that the Queen Victoria Hospital has made in relation to the final report of the task force.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. HEMMINGS: As I was saying prior to the dinner adjournment, the Labor Party fully supports the Friends of the Queen Victoria Hospital in their fight to retain the hospital's own identity. I think that, despite what the Minister said in the House last week, a decision has already been made about the Queen Victoria Hospital.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That's not so.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister says that the idea is that "perhaps", but, from what I have heard from fairly responsible citizens about what went on at that meeting, the decision has already been made. I will go on record in the House and say that that is what will happen. The recommendation from the Health Commission and the Minister will be that the complete operation will be transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is rather interesting to read in a newsletter that the Australian Council of Women had much to say about the reactions or actions of this side of the House to the Queen Victoria Hospital and had nice things to say about the Minister. From what I understand from my colleague in another place, the Hon. Anne Levy, the reception the Minister received at last night's meeting was very hostile. I think we will find that, despite what the Minister says about her not bowing to pressure groups, the decision will be made that the activities of the Queen Victoria Hospital be transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

I turn now to the question of community health services. In that regard, I was pleased to hear the Governor say the following:

My Government will continue to pursue its programme of expanding community health services. A greater proportion of the total Health Commission budget will be allocated to health promotion and preventive medicine in the present financial year.

If that is the case, I congratulate the Government. The member for Rocky River had something to say on this subject also in one of his newspaper articles under the heading "Promotion of Health Cheaper than Cures". I disagree with his statement that the responsibility for health care rests on the individual. We believe that Governments have a responsibility to legislate in the area of preventive medicine. It is not sufficient for the Minister to issue one of her many edicts on preventive health from the eighth floor of the New South Wales Bank building, in Pirie Street, on that matter. We need to have effective legislation as well. My information is that on the eighth floor of the building smoking is banned and that the use of lifts is frowned on. Every lift contains a little notice extolling the virtues of exercise. If that is the Minister's attempt to provide preventive medicine in this State, I am not very hopeful.

Her attitude to preventive health so far has not been very indicative of that of a person who is dedicated to health promotion. Let us look at what has happened. The Port Adelaide Occupational Health Centre has been axed.

Dr. John Coulter's mutagen-testing unit is closed, and this is where we come back to the vitally important areas of the health of workers in industry. Frankly, every women's community health centre has been tampered with by the Minister. We have had letter after letter of complaint from the people who are running the women's community health centres that the Minister and the Health Commission are tampering with the running of their centres. In my own district, approval was given by the previous Labor Government for the establishment of a women's community health centre; that centre has been shelved on the grounds that the Minister needs to have a report on women's problems in the State of South Australia.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: There must be a wide shelf on the eighth floor.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. Although I understand that the report is now available, I am not sure whether it will be released. I ask the Minister whether she will release it. There is one area in which this Government could make a worthwhile contribution to preventive health within the community; that is, by legislating to ban the advertising of tobacco products in this State. Early in her term of office, the Minister went on public record in support of the banning of cigarette advertising.

Mr. Randall: Do you support it?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. However, in this House later, she had to qualify her support. She obviously was told by Liberal Party headquarters the facts of life that one does not tamper with companies that contribute to one's election campaigns, so she changed her attitude to that of uniform legislation throughout the Commonwealth. Then she went further, because, when she was presented with a petition by that very august body, the South Australian Faculty of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, to introduce legislation, the Minister went on record as saying that it was against her philosophy and that of her Party to place any restrictions on advertising. When she was first a Minister and was keen to get publicity, she was going to change the situation. Then Ross Story got stuck into her and said, "You'd better change your tune," so, she qualified that. Now it is against Liberal Party philosophy.

We have had considerable information, especially from the member for Morphett, on the effects of alcohol and analgesics on the community. Perhaps he should have included in his speech the effects of tobacco, especially the role of tobacco companies and their advertising agencies. The report of the Senate committee on the problem of drugs in this country states:

Tobacco, particularly in the form of cigarettes, continues to contribute each year to the deaths of approximately 8 000 Australians from heart disease and about 3 500 from lung cancer. Smoking is one of the main avoidable health hazards in modern society; yet Australians continue to smoke 2 800 million cigarettes each month.

Dealing with smoking-related deaths, Professor B. K. Armstrong, Director, National Health and Medical Research Council, stated that the 16 000 deaths would not have occurred in Australia if there had been no smoking. Professor Armstrong's figure of 16 000 deaths represents—I am sorry that the Minister is leaving the Chamber, because she might be interested in this—the following equivalents:

44 Australians dying each day from tobacco related diseases; over four times the annual road toll; over five times the deaths attributable directly to alcohol; 3½ times the average annual loss during Second World War; more deaths in one day than occurred per year of Australians in the Vietnam war.

Regarding the risks that smokers take, it has been calculated that smokers run twice the risk of dying from coronary disease as do non-smokers. The following statistics apply:

- 10 times the risk of dying from lung cancer;
- 3-10 times the risk of dying from chronic bronchitis;
- 20 times the risk of dying from emphysema.

Deaths per 100 000 men standardised for age, by cause of death, method of smoking, and number of cigarettes smoked per day when last asked (extracted from a sample of British doctors) and excluding ex-smokers.

Annual death rate per 100 000 men, standardised for age							
Cause of death	Non-smokers	Current smokers					
		Cigarettes only	Pipe and or cigars only	Mixed (cigarettes and others)	Cigarettes only, No./day		
					1-14	15-24	25
Closely associated causes							
Cancer of lung	10	140	58	82	78	127	251
Cancer of oesophagus	3	14	11	27	11	12	21
Cancer of other respiratory sites	1	13	9	10	5	7	33
Respiratory tuberculosis	3	15	3	8	9	10	30
Chronic bronchitis and emphysema	3	74	28	34	51	78	114
Pulmonary heart disease	0	10	9	14	6	9	25
Aortic aneurysm (non-syphilitic)	5	33	18	23	17	38	52
Hernia	0	5	4	0	3	4	11

Source: Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, Drug Problems in Australia—an Intoxicated Society? P.P. No. 228/1977 Page 88.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I also seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table indicating the life expectancy of American men at varying ages, and years of life lost by cigarette smokers. The source is the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, Drug Problems in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Likewise, is that table purely statistical?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes.

Leave granted.

Life expectancy of American men at various ages, and years of life lost by cigarette smokers.

Cigarettes per day	Life expectation	Present age								
		25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65
0	Years expected	48.6	43.9	39.2	34.5	30.0	25.6	21.4	17.6	14.1
1-9	Years expected	44.0	39.3	34.7	30.2	25.9	21.8	17.9	14.5	11.3
	Years lost(a)	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.8
10-19	Years expected	43.1	38.4	33.8	29.3	25.0	21.0	17.4	14.1	11.2
	Years lost(a)	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.2	5.0	4.6	4.0	3.5	2.9
20-39	Years expected	42.4	37.8	33.2	28.7	24.4	20.5	17.0	13.7	11.0
	Years lost(a)	6.2	6.1	6.0	5.8	5.6	5.1	4.4	3.9	3.1

(a) The decrease in the number of years of life lost by cigarette smokers as they get older (which may suggest that their outlook improves as they continue to smoke) is, of course, due to the shortening expectation of life. The *percentage* reduction of expectation of life gets greater with advancing age. Thus the smoker of 10 to 19 cigarettes per day has an expectation reduced by 11 per cent when he is 25, but by 21 per cent when he is 65.

Source: Royal College of Physicians, *Smoking and Health Now* (1971), p. 29.

Source: Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, Drug Problems in Australia—an Intoxicated Society? P.P. No. 228/1977 Page 89.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Dealing with smoking and employment, the facts become even more horrifying. A survey in Britain found that 50 000 000 work days were lost annually because of tobacco-related illness. A similar survey in the United States found that 81 000 000 work days were lost annually. If the United States figure is applied to Australia, 5 192 000 work days would be lost annually. This is about double the number of work days lost by strikes. Taking average weekly earnings as \$240, this would represent a loss of \$178 000 000. If those figures are related to Government revenue from tobacco, it is found that in 1978-79 the Government collected \$657 700 000 in excise duty from tobacco, and in 1979-80 this amount was expected to increase to \$675 000 000.

What are the economic costs of smoking? I refer to the figures supplied by Dr. Garry Egger, of the New South Wales Health Commission, who carried out a detailed examination of the economic costs of smoking in 1974 and who has recently updated that study using 1975-76 statistics. I seek leave to have the figures in his results inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: The table is purely statistical?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will hand the tables to *Hansard* without delay?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.
Leave granted.

ECONOMIC COSTS OF SMOKING

	Low Estimate \$ (millions)	High Estimate \$ (millions)
Costs from Medical Disorders		
Through death		
Productivity losses	318.2	439.5
Through illness	80.1	116.9
Hospital costs	20.6	31.2
Doctors services	4.9	8.2
Prescription drugs	5.9	11.5
Pension payments	11.8	18.4
Total medical	441.5	625.7
Non-medical costs, etc.		
Import of cigarettes, etc.	110.0	110.0
Cost of fire damage	62.5	62.5
Research costs	0.1	0.1
Avoidance costs	1.2	1.2
Dividends paid overseas	7.1	—
Grand Total	615.3	806.6

Mr. HEMMINGS: I should like to make a few comments about those figures. Most of the categories are self-explanatory. The research costs determined by Dr. Egger involved medical research specifically related to smoking and the effect and research aimed at improving tobacco yields and quality. The avoidance costs involved the expenditure of anti-smoking education and treatment.

In relation to the economic costs of smoking, I refer to the economic benefits, including customs and excise, wages and salaries, advertising and promotions, except earnings, and shareholder dividends, involve a total amount of \$726 500 000 as opposed to a cost of \$806 600 000. This involves a net loss to the people of Australia. I refer now to the cost of advertising. A recent *Advertiser* report claimed:

\$11 000 000 is spent on advertising tobacco in the major metropolitan daily newspapers each year. This represents 8.1 per cent of all advertising so placed.

The National Heart Foundation quotes a figure of \$25 000 000 for all types of tobacco advertising. Figures produced by the advertising industry themselves state that 3.5c per packet is spent on advertising tobacco products. The 21 800 million cigarettes sold in Australia each month is equivalent to between 112 000 000 and 140 000 000 packets and, if the figure of 3.5c is accurate it would mean that the industry spends between \$47 000 000 and \$58 000 000 on advertising alone.

The Minister has said, apart from the fact that tobacco companies and advertising agencies contribute considerably to Liberal Party funds, that it is impossible for this Government to legislate on this matter. In the short time remaining to me, I point out from research undertaken in the Library that 47 countries surveyed, 22 placed a health warning on cigarette packets; 37 placed some form of restriction on tobacco advertising; and 12 banned totally all tobacco advertising.

There is much more that I would like to say but, in the short time remaining, I refer to the recommendations of the Senate Standing Committee to give the Minister some heart. I can assure her that as a member of the Opposition I will fully support her in any action that she takes on this matter. The Senate committee recommended:

That State Governments and local government authorities be encouraged to ban the advertising of tobacco products.

That the Federal Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development, and the State Ministers responsible for youth, sport and recreation, appeal to sportsmen and sportswomen throughout Australia not to lend their names and prestige to the promotion of tobacco products.

I was pleased to read in the *Advertiser* that members of the South Australian Football League—

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): In common with other members in this debate, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Also, I join other members in extending my condolences to the relatives of the late Maurice William Parish. While all of those who have referred to this gentleman have been quite sincere in their condolences, I have noticed a certain bemusement that we should in 1980 be remembering someone who has recently died but who was elected to this place as early as 1915.

I believe I may have some slight advantage over other members in that, although I did not know Mr. Parish personally, I corresponded with him. Mr. Parish was elected for the Labor Party to the State seat of Murray in 1915, and was one of many Labor members of Parliament who were overtaken by the holocaust of the conscription battle which raged through the Party, one of those matters of principle with which Parties founded on principle rather than on expediency from time to time have problems. He was not part of the official Labor conscriptionist group. He may, indeed, not have been a conscriptionist at all, although he was loyal to his Leader, Crawford Vaughan, and he appears to have rejoined the Labor Party in later years.

One of the points I wish to make in relation to this gentleman was hinted at by the member for Goyder, who mentioned that, since this gentleman had lived until 1980 and had been elected to this place in 1915, he must have lived a long and full life. The other point that could be made is that he must have been very young when he was elected to this place. In fact, he was 24 years of age, and he, along with two other famous Labor colleagues, perhaps gives the lie to the idea that in those earlier years this place was inhabited by greybeards, and that youth came into it only in later years.

In 1918, Mr. O'Halloran was elected to this place at the age of 23 years, and in 1924 Mr. Bert Hawke, who later became Premier of Western Australia and is Bob Hawke's uncle, was elected to this place, also at 23 years of age, marginally younger than Mr. O'Halloran had been. In those days, it was possible for young people to be elected to this place and, significantly, the three I have mentioned—and I do not think I have been particularly selective—were representatives of the Australian Labor Party.

In turning to the main body of my speech, I want in a sense to continue the theme set by my remarks in this place on 4 June, when I had some things to say about this Government's record to date in education. I am glad to see that the Minister of Education is in the Chamber, and I hope that he will see that the remarks I have to make are made in a spirit of helpfulness. I bear no ill will towards the Minister as an individual. I have a warm regard for his abilities and his personal relationships with all of his fellows in this place.

However, it is interesting that the Minister should have been bracketed with the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Health in a recent article in a weekend newspaper and, generally speaking, there are those people who are asking why it is that, in the mind of so many people, this

Government has fallen from grace in education so soon after being returned to office and, indeed, so soon after being returned to office in an election when it was confidently predicted by some people that its policy had the greater potential for educationists.

If honourable members opposite think that I am exaggerating when I talk about a fall from grace, I refer them to a newspaper report on 8 July of this year which, under the heading, "Teacher blast at Minister", states:

The South Australian Institute of Teachers says it is dissatisfied with the performance of Education Minister, Mr. Allison. It wants the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, to step in. It is seeking a deputation with the Premier to gain "speedy action" on unresolved matters, promised since the Government took office, and pledges made during the election, says SAIT's acting president, Mrs. Cath MacNaughton.

"We want the Premier to take matters into his own hands to ensure a speedy resolution of the matters which are now before his Minister," Mrs. MacNaughton said. Mrs. MacNaughton said SAIT's move underlined its growing concern that a variety of matters on which the Government promised to take action some time ago are still unresolved.

That, on the face of it, could be interpreted as a very straightforward personal attack on the Minister. It certainly was not intended to be, as subsequent events were to indicate. The Premier, for his part, responded in an extremely forthright manner. I have been unable to get a copy of the Premier's statement on this matter. It appears that the gentlemen's agreement that exists between the Premier's office and the office of the Leader of the Opposition in relation to an exchange of press releases was not honored on this occasion, or, if I do the Premier a disservice, perhaps there was not even any written statement. Perhaps the Premier just reached for the telephone and said certain things down the telephone.

The statement appears not to have got into the print media at all, but it came over certain of the electronic media. Perhaps the press felt that it was not worth running, or perhaps certain friends of the Premier in the press felt they were doing the right thing by the Premier in not running it. Perhaps they thought, "Poor old David has been hit by a bit of an attack. We had better not run this, because he will realise how embarrassing it is once he sees it in cold print."

The Premier blasted the institute and said that he thought his Minister of Education was doing an extremely good job, and so on. The response to that serve by the Minister was a letter sent on 10 July to the Premier by Mrs. MacNaughton, the Acting President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I think it is worth reading out this letter, because it is most extraordinary. It must be rare for a professional association to write to the Premier of a State in these terms. It also indicates that the institute was not gunning personally for the Minister of Education. The letter states:

Dear Mr. Tonkin,

With reference to your press statement of 9 July, we would like to know whether your public support of the Minister of Education can be interpreted that he will now be permitted to make the decisions necessary for the smooth running of his department. We would particularly like assurance that he will be able to meet the contingencies which must of necessity arise from time to time, without innumerable delays and reference to yourself and other members of the Government.

We would also like you to consider that the Institute of Teachers has had a long history of co-operation and negotiation with the Education Department in past Governments. Indeed, it has had the reputation amongst other organisations of being a "tame cat". However, if we

can meet with no response to negotiation and co-operation, the tamest pussy-cat may be found to have claws.

We believe that the past few months have seen the development of a new era in SAIT relations with the Minister and Government, in which it has been proven impossible to deal with the Minister of Education as the person responsible for the Education Department.

We would draw your attention to the objects of the institute, the first and most important of which is in every possible way to further the interests of education in South Australia. To this we have always held; to this we will always hold. We believe therefore that a public apology is due to us over the suggestion in your press statement that "the institute can only have a negative effect on the education of children". We believe that this is an uncalled for insult to most dedicated professional people who at this time are among the lowest paid in their profession in Australia.

Our members have never disrupted a school or in any way done anything to obstruct or subtract from the educational needs of the children of this State. Indeed, time without number they have sacrificed themselves and their families to ensure the best possible service is given to our children despite the bungling and lack of response shown to them in their efforts by the Government.

Note, Sir, not the Minister, but the Government. The letter continues:

Perhaps we can hope that with a fully responsible Minister we can return to our previous good relations with the Government. If indeed you really intend to allow your Minister to be responsible then perhaps it may be possible to remedy the present situation.

Yours sincerely,

C. E. MACNAUGHTON, Acting President

It was made clear in the letter that copies were being sent to the Minister, to my Leader, to me, and to the member for Mitcham. I thought the House should have the benefit of the contents of such an extraordinary letter, which could have been brought about only by an extraordinary set of circumstances. What in fact the institute is saying in that letter is what I told this place on 4 June, in the last session of Parliament.

In fact, the Minister was being so hemmed about by his Cabinet colleagues that he was not able to do his job as effectively as he would otherwise have been able to do if he were given a freer rein. The problem does not only exist with the member's Cabinet colleagues: it also exists with certain of his back-bench colleagues who have come bumbling in from time to time to surely worsen relations between this Government and teachers in general. In the time available to me I will probably have time to refer only to two honourable gentlemen opposite. The first matter relates to the Ceduna Area School, which of course must mean the inimitable member for Eyre.

Not all members will be familiar with the circumstances behind this matter, so I will briefly outline the events. The Ceduna Area School was expecting certain Demac units, I believe, from Stuart High School. The people at Stuart High School said that they were not going to let those units go, and not so much a tug of war as a triangle of forces then developed between the department and the two schools.

The Hon. H. Allison: And the unions.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly the unions were involved. However, I am not so much concerned with that matter: I am more concerned with the member for Eyre. Tempers were frayed in this matter and perhaps motions were moved that should not have been moved. I believe that at one meeting in Ceduna a resolution was carried by a group of teachers calling the Minister of Education "spineless". I think that that was unfortunate, but

nonetheless it happened. One would have thought that the Minister's emissary in this matter, the member for Eyre, would have acted diplomatically and would have been prepared to cool passions as much as possible. But, oh no, I am told (and I have some documentation to back this up) that the member for Eyre attended a meeting with the teachers and got stuck into them; he gave them an almighty serve.

Knowing the member for Eyre the way we do, that is hard to imagine! He did not give them the rounds of the kitchen; he gave them the rounds of the staff room. Since there seems to be a certain scepticism among members opposite, I point out that on 25 June 1980, in a letter to the Editor of the *West Coast Sentinel*, a Mr. Kevin Nelson, of Ceduna, said:

I wish to express my disappointment at the manner in which Mr. Graham Gunn, M.P., has acted in response to the decisions taken by the Ceduna Area School staff in relation to the inadequate provision of student accommodation in the new school. The staff have nothing to gain by taking the action they have felt necessary. They have jeopardised their relationship with their employer, the Education Department. They have risked their generally good personal and professional standing in the community. The teachers have given up a great deal of their own time to help resolve this issue. Many of the teachers will not even be at the school in the three or four years it will take to provide the necessary new buildings in Ceduna.

The teachers want a satisfactory resolution to this problem as soon as possible. Their action has been taken for the sole reason that the staff feel a stand must be taken on the quality of education that is to be offered to the children of Ceduna. Mr. Gunn's action has been less than helpful to resolve the situation. At a meeting of parents and teachers and a later School Council meeting, at the school on 9 June, his manner was threatening and provocative. His actions and statements did a great deal to add heat to a meeting that until his arrival had been orderly and fruitful.

The letter concludes:

Mr. Gunn has made no approaches to the school staff, since the beginning of this dispute, to gain an understanding of the situation that exists at the moment. If Mr. Gunn is unable to approach this situation in a reasonable manner I feel that our school and community would be better served if he left any further action on these matters to people who were able to act in a reasonable manner. I sincerely regret Mr. Gunn's action.

I received the original report on that matter from a very senior source in the Institute of Teachers, and I have just quoted the documentary evidence to back it up. However, that is not all, because some time ago, in response to the fears people had about possible cuts in education spending (fears that were fed from time to time by members opposite and, not in the least, by the Premier himself, although I do not want to go back into that matter, because I covered it rather fully in my remarks on 4 June), the Principal of the Mitcham Primary School issued a circular to the parents of his school. That circular was no different in tone from many circulars that have been issued by principals of schools, and was no different in tone from letters that have been written by secretaries of school councils. Heaven alone knows, I have a thick pile of papers relating to these things, including 3 per cent cuts, speech pathology in Mallee, Sturt C.A.E., and so on.

But of course, who has a child at Mitcham Primary School? Again, the member for Eyre. So before they know what is going on the staff at Mitcham Primary School find that that circular is apparently on the Minister's desk and that questions are being asked around the place. Here again, the member for Eyre is acting as the enforcer on

behalf of his colleague the Minister of Education.

Mr. Millhouse: The people at the school were certainly not too pleased about it, either.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: They were not too pleased at all. This is really not good enough. However, let us not stop with the member for Eyre. If we have members opposite embarrassing the Minister by acting as enforcers, we also have people embarrassing the Minister by making commitments which apparently the Minister never intended to make. I have before me a letter similar to many that were written to me earlier this year.

Mr. Gunn: Are you finished with me?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: For the moment, yes. This letter is from the Murray Lands region and relates to speech pathology services. There appears to have been some genuine misunderstandings about the Government's intention in this matter. For example, I notice that, in a press release he made on 15 August, the Minister himself has taken to task Mr. Neville Gotch, the Principal of the Tailem Bend Primary School. If, in fact, Mr. Gotch was incorrect in relation to the information that he gave out, which formed the basis of a statement he may have made to the local newspaper there, well and good.

However, I think we would have to say that something the Minister told me in this House is gospel and that, if the Minister says in this Chamber that he is going to do or has done certain things, then obviously that is correct. On page 406 of *Hansard* the Minister set out in reply to a question I asked of him exactly what is happening in the Murray Lands in relation to the flood of correspondence that no doubt he has had and I have received in relation to speech pathology services. On that occasion the Minister said:

During 1980, Murray Lands will be provided with a speech pathologist service from outside the region. Arrangements to this end have been made with regional officers. Earlier intentions to appoint a speech pathologist full-time in the region could not be met following resignations in the speech pathology service. Of the two regions currently without a speech pathology appointment, only Murray Lands can be offered a viable service from outside the region. Eyre region has a somewhat larger school enrolment and is more remote from the city than Murray Lands. In July, seven speech pathologists graduated from the Sturt College of Advanced Education. Following a six-weeks induction programme they will begin work in schools. One of these will take up an appointment in the Eyre region.

That is well and good. It is not all that the people had hoped for, but perhaps on balance they will accept it.

What is interesting, of course, is that the member for Mallee had been doing the rounds and had spoken to the Lameroo Area School Council Inc. and made certain commitments in relation to what would happen. It would appear to the Lameroo Area School Council that what is to happen is rather less than the member for Mallee had undertaken to do, so we find the Lameroo Area School Council, through Mrs. Miegel, its Secretary, writing to the member for Mallee on 8 August, as follows (and again, this is a rather extraordinary letter; I wonder how many members have been written to in this tone):

Dear Mr. Lewis, It has come to the notice of the Lameroo Area School Council Inc. that the Murray Lands region of education is to receive the services of Adelaide-based speech pathologists for a total of eight days a month.

I am not quite sure whether that is right, or whether that quite coincides with what the Minister said in the letter. Whether or not it is correct, let us look at what the member for Mallee had apparently committed this Government to. The letter continues:

During the meeting at which you addressed the School

Council and other parents, you made it quite clear that this region would receive better than one salary, due to arrangements made after no speech pathologist was to be appointed to Murray Bridge. The information you gave us was obviously wrong, and, through the School Councillors, this misinformation has been promulgated throughout the district. We expect you to learn the correct information and reasons for non-appointment of a speech pathologist to this region, and inform us by letter so that we may correct the false impression you formerly gave us. We await a prompt response, because we are indignant that so many people have been misled.

Yours faithfully,

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who was that?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member for Mallee. This is the point; it is not just the Minister's colleagues who are making life difficult for him, it is his back-bench colleagues as well. I wonder whether we should push this a little further, because in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 7 August a Mr. Stewart Cockburn, who seems to have a licence from the *Advertiser* to be an instant expert on practically everything and gives us the benefit of his instant expertise, had an extremely critical article about teachers. It related to over-payment of teachers, and Mr. Cockburn suggested that his image of teachers had been severely tarnished by the way in which these people had not promptly repaid this money to the department. I will not read out the whole article, as time is limited, and I have given the House the substance of the letter.

That article was replied to almost immediately in three letters, two written by Mrs. MacNaughton, Acting President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, on 9 and 15 August respectively, and one written by Mr. Bevan Connor, Secretary of the Institute of Teachers, on 9 August. They indicated in those letters the problems that have existed in relation to payment of salaries to teachers, how often the computer seems to have fouled the system, and all the rest of it. They also took Mr. Cockburn to task for not having checked his facts a little more carefully.

Now comes the interesting aspect of this whole story. Mrs. MacNaughton, as Acting President of the institute, rang Mr. Cockburn and put to him that he should have checked his facts a little more carefully. Mr. Cockburn protested that, indeed, he had done all that could be expected of a journalist by ringing the Information Officer of the Education Department and getting the facts from that person. Now, of course, Mrs. MacNaughton was bemused by this information, because there is no such person as the Information Officer of the Education Department.

She pressed the journalist a little more closely and got the name of the individual concerned. That individual turned out to be a member of the Minister's political staff. So what is being said around the traps is that a member of the Minister's political staff misled this innocent journalist as to what the situation was in relation to a matter which has come out as casting grave reflections on the professional probity and integrity of teachers. I do not know whether or not this is news to the Minister.

The Hon. H. Allison: The girl did not give any information. She referred the reporter to two members of the Education Department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is not quite what I have been told. I did not want to say anything in relation to the identity of the individual concerned, because we are talking about somebody with whom I have had professional dealings from time to time and whom I have found very competent in every way.

The Hon. H. Allison: She gave no personal information at all.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly, there was a phone call. I simply lay that before the Minister. If the Minister is in a position to clear the air about this matter, nobody will be happier than will I. Again, it is simply a part of the picture which seems to have been built up in the minds of a lot of people, that this is a captive Minister, that he is not being given a fair go by his colleagues in general and that, indeed, problems have been created for him from time to time in his own office.

I want, in this context, to refer to one other matter. Again, I cast absolutely no reflections at all on the Public Service staff of the Minister, because they are excellent people; they serviced me as they are servicing him, so this particular matter has got to get back to the Minister or, indeed, to those who are even closer to him. One of the delicate matters in an area where the dollar for education is not easy to get hold of is this whole business of class sizes and the way in which we measure it. I want to be, again, useful to the Minister in this matter.

As long ago as November of last year, I tipped him off as to a method of attacking this problem, a mode of approach which would perhaps enable the debate to be carried on at a higher and more productive level than has hitherto taken place. I refer, of course, to my Question on Notice No. 43, in the last session of Parliament. It is a question which the Minister looks like taking a year to answer. It is possible, of course, that the survey to which I refer is no longer available to the Minister and that somebody has lost it. In that case, perhaps the Minister could come back to me and say that he did not have access to that information and that he was therefore not able to answer the specific points that I made. I would then respond by coming back with perhaps a further aspect of that problem. It is really extraordinary that a question which may, indeed, have to be answered simply on those grounds (that that information is no longer available to the Minister and the department) in fact has not been answered over that period.

So there it is. It seems that the problems that the Minister is currently facing, the problems of credibility, are largely those not of his own making, but those that have been rained down upon him by his colleagues and others. Finally, apropos of nothing whatever, unless, of course, somebody wants to read something else into this matter, I ask the question: who is S. F. Adams? Why is it that a letter to the Editor of the *News* on 29 July 1980, very similar in some ways in tone to Mr. Cockburn's article, but written from the point of view of an insider, a member of the profession, should be signed in the City-State edition as S. F. Adams, of Adelaide, and should be signed in the last edition as S. Adams, of Adelaide? Why should the second initial have been deleted? We are, of course, well aware of somebody called "Sweet Fanny Adams". She has been around for a long time, almost as long as has Mary-Lou Chotsworth.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: She's a nice lady.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: She is, indeed. Our American cousins go so far as to say that when they opened up Eighth Avenue for the underground tramway they found one of her rattles in the same layer of mud as Peter Stuyvesant's wooden leg, so that is a long time ago. Everyone is asking, "Who is S. F. Adams?"

There are certain other matters to which I now wish to turn which relate to general Government administration in the education field and which, perhaps, further indicate why there is this feeling of malaise and demoralisation about. I was interested in the Minister's statement in the *Advertiser* of 16 August this year, headed "Teachers' rent will not rise". This was the first positive statement that we had had from the Minister since he came into office in

relation to teacher housing rents. It has not been without a certain amount of prompting from this side: I have devoted portions of my speeches to comments on the matter. The member for Stuart has asked a question or questions in the House about it, and the member for Whyalla has also asked a question or questions about it, as teachers in their electorates are affected by it. We are well aware (and I do not have to remind the House) that this Government came to office on a policy of reducing teacher housing rents. The article states:

The South Australian Government has deferred an increase in housing rent for teachers at a cost of about \$400 000 this financial year.

I rather fear that that is the reduction that the Government promised: that this deferred increase is the reduction that the Liberals promised us. The Minister goes on to say:

Increases had been due in September, but would be absorbed by the Teacher Housing Authority. The Government had deferred increases since March while it reviewed the situation. The deferral would apply to houses leased and owned by the authority and those leased on school grounds by the Education Department. The decision—

and this is the important point—

followed an election pledge to reduce authority rents and give teachers more incentive to work in the country.

I think that that is it. As they say in the courts, "I rest my case." The teachers are going to see this as more than a semantic quibble. They are going to see it as a means by which the Government is wriggling out of the back door. I know the problems facing the State in regard to teacher housing and the financing thereof. It is not an easy problem; if it was, I would have resolved it, and the present Minister would never have had to make his election commitment. The commitment to reduce teacher housing rents cannot be delivered in the form of deferred increases which are then seen as reductions in an inflationary period.

The Hon. H. Allison: That is a specious argument—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Minister is now giving us a species of fine print which was not in his election manifesto and which will be seen by teachers in general as not having been in his election manifesto. Again, if the Minister is satisfied with his efforts in this matter, good luck to him. However, he cannot then turn around and be surprised if the teachers jump up and down and say, "Foul, foul". However, I turn to another matter.

I refer to the school building programme. It would appear that, if there is to be any real slaughter in the Budget to be brought down in the next couple of days in this Chamber, it is likely to be in the school building programme. It is significant that this Government tends to talk in terms of a combined capital recurrent expenditure. That is the way that the Premier was able to manufacture his surplus. It is also known that there has been a considerable cut-back in capital works this year. That was part of the same deal. It seems that what is going to happen in the predictable reduction in overall expenditure for education is that probably recurrent expenditure will be kept up (that, after all, is the more sensitive political area) and that capital expenditure will be slashed. I have no inside information, but I know that the Minister budgeted for \$37 500 000 this year. He has almost certainly spent a good deal less than that, and he is probably budgeting for about \$32 500 000 this year. I may be wrong, but it will be interesting to see what Thursday brings so far as my crystal balling is concerned.

It has been a little difficult for us on this side, from the contradictory statements that have been made by the Premier and Treasurer in relation to how much money has been moved from Revenue to Loan or back the other way,

to know what has been happening. However, it appears that there has been a slow-down in the school building programme, and that will be exacerbated in the forthcoming Budget. People will not like that too much. I remind the House and the Minister that he has not stopped building new schools. He has Leigh Creek, Reynella East, Hackham South, and another one, which I should remember as I received an answer only a day or two ago.

Mr. Russack: Flagstaff Hill?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, a further stage of Flagstaff Hill. There is that ongoing commitment. There is also a commitment that I left with him in relation to the holding schools. I have gone around and said to people (I want to be perfectly frank in these matters) that I made mistakes when I was Minister of Education, but that there is one mistake that I am not sure whether I did make as yet, as I am in the present Minister's hands. I refer to the holding schools. If the Minister is able to adhere to the implied programme for the translation of those holding schools to permanent capital facilities, as everyone is expecting, the holding schools programme will be seen as a very successful experiment. But, he is not able to do that. If his Premier and Treasurer rips the money off him and puts it into another area, these holding schools will become the permanent temporary arrangements that we came to know so well in the fifties and sixties—the sort of thing that we see at Elizabeth South, which is still largely a collection of wooden temporary buildings. That is a commitment on which I have an interest in seeing the Minister deliver, because, if he does not, I have to say that in part it was my mistake—that I should never have allowed a situation to arise whereby a subsequent Minister could use a decision I took, arising out of uncertainty in enrolments, etc., and translate that into a return to what happened in the fifties and sixties in relation to temporary buildings. So much for the school building programme for the time.

It is significant and a little ironical that Senator John Button (Labor's education spokesman) has put the prime emphasis in his statement into refurbishing of primary school capital stock. At a time when this Government seems to be downgrading that, my Federal colleagues are saying that they see it as a high priority indeed. I am not altogether actuated by political partisanship when I say that I agree with Senator Button in this matter rather than with the Minister and his colleagues.

I now turn to the matter of the Women's Adviser. It is a matter which seems to have been clumsily handled by this Government. It is a matter which has brought a good deal of criticism down on the head of the Minister and, unfortunately and deservedly, his Director-General of Education—and for what positive outcome? I can see no positive outcome emerging from this matter at all. There are those who want to suggest that the departments were a little alarmed by the rather amateurish way that the Minister went about this matter earlier this year in interviewing people personally in San Francisco.

The Hon. H. Allison: That was only to save \$2 000 in return fares.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That may be the case. The question is whether it is reasonable that a Minister who, after all, wants to move this position out of the political arena altogether, and has seen this as the main thrust and success of what he has done, should be taking a personal interest in the direct selection process. However, the question remains: what is to be gained from this change of role? There appears to be no gain to be made at all.

I want to come to grips with the matter. I think that if the Minister had been in my shoes three years ago, or whenever it was that the appointment was made, he would

have seen it as something which in the first instance should be a contract arrangement. The advisory committee that first put up to the then Government that such an appointment should be made saw the appointment as being appropriate, that it should be a contract appointment, and although Mrs. Bradley had direct access to me, she did not formally report to me; she reported to Mr. Giles, the Deputy Director-General of Education. She saw certain great advantages in operating at that level. I have no doubt that if I were in the Minister's shoes now I would, of course, be pushing in Cabinet that it now should be a permanent Public Service appointment. I think that is reasonable. The position has been tried and tested; it has been found to be a very useful appointment. Therefore, why not make it permanent? Why not make it a Public Service appointment?

That is only reasonable, and I do not see that the Minister should get any kudos for that. He gets brickbats for having completely destroyed the role and function of the position. The only way that I can see that he can get out of it is by almost creating an empire. He would have to have for this equal opportunities adviser certain people under that person who will report to that person in relation to problems of ethnic communities, problems of Aborigines, problems of handicapped people, problems of women, and so on. What will that cost his departmental budget? Also add to that the fact that there is likely to have to be a duplication of that sort of machinery in the Department of Further Education. If the Minister can get out of it in some other way, good luck to him. Again, it is one of those decisions which brings the sort of headline that the Government and the Minister really could do without. I refer to the *News* of Thursday 14 August 1980 which states:

Teachers meet on adviser—new role seen as insult.

Of course, what is interesting is the Minister's whole approach to these matters. The Minister will recall that I asked him a question in relation to this matter on 6 August and I mentioned that I thought he had a bit of a blind spot, despite his sterling qualities in many other directions, in relation to women's matters. I instanced the press release that he made on 30 November 1978 as Opposition spokesman on education. It is interesting to note the answer that I received; the Minister said:

... I have a good memory. I distinctly recall that two to 2½ years ago I was being pressed by, shall I say, the more conservative elements in our society (many of whom still exist) regarding the proliferation at that time of a variety of material, some of which was being commissioned for publication and use within our schools, regarding the then anti-sexist campaign.

So the Minister was being pressured by certain conservative elements. Did he have to be the nice guy and go along with it? Could he not have told these conservative elements to go to the hot place, or something like that? This statement has not gone down too well outside. We are all pressured from time to time by conservative elements. I received a thing in my pigeon hole the other day from the League of Rights. What am I supposed to do in relation to this matter? Am I supposed, because I am a nice guy, to come into this House and read out great sections of it in deference to the wishes of these people? I do not know that the Minister in his statement really goes on record as saying that he altogether agreed with all that these conservative elements were enjoining upon him.

The Hon. H. Allison: I was expressing concern over the articles presented to me, let me put it that way.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: All right. The Minister certainly made the point that he had certain articles in his possession for which he did not show much liking, but the

whole thrust of this reply was that he felt that it was a good tactic to go along with these conservative elements at that time, which simply adds fuel to the fire of what people are saying outside in relation to the non-continuation of the position of women's adviser, as originally conceived—nothing to do with Public Service positions; simply an individual who has prime responsibility for the problems of women in education both as teachers and, I remind the House, as students.

So much for that. I could go on and talk about the sort of petty parsimony that has occurred from time to time in relation to many of these matters. I am told that there is to be a 20 per cent reduction in seconded personnel in curriculum areas; that teacher support groups are to be cut by 50 per cent; that regional advisers will have their appointments reduced from two to one year; that the reading development centre is to be reduced in staff from 10 to five; and that the principal's position is to be downgraded from a professional to a Public Service position. Also, at some stage I would particularly like a comment from the Minister on this final matter, namely, that the multi-cultural centre received \$250 000 from the Commonwealth Government this year, but did not employ extra people with that grant.

None of these things add up to large amounts of money, but they are irritants which add to the general spirit of malaise which exists in the teaching profession. Basically, teachers look to the Minister to be their champion, a person who will speak out against the sweet Fanny Adamses and others in the community who feed on prejudice, and who try to spread these ideas based as they are on prejudice. For the most part the Minister has not done that, and it is part of the general thrust of my thesis that he would like to do it, but he has been prevented by his colleagues from doing it.

I was very disappointed with the Minister's (and here perhaps for the first time, Sir, you might say that in my remarks I am making a direct attack on the Minister) response to my article in the *South Australian Teachers' Journal* of 6 August concerning school costs, because, of course, the Minister, among other things, suggested that if I had liked to be a bit patient I might have been put in possession of certain facts as to what he and his department were doing on this matter.

The Hon. H. Allison: We were dealing with the school equipment grant.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course, I was very patient in relation to this matter. I have told the House many times what we intended to do in relation to the school equipment grant in this particular matter, and I was very frank with the House as to what I saw as the shortcomings of the Labor Administration in relation to school costs. That is the whole point of the exercise, that this must be the next stage. Given the efforts that the Labor Party put into school staffing during our period in office, the next stage surely must be (provided that the present Government does not do too many drastic things in relation to school staff, so that we do not have to turn around and do their job again) to look at school costs. I hid nothing in my statements to the House and, given the constraints on space in the *Teacher's Journal*, I hid very little in that article. But the Minister says that I have been political in this matter.

What I intended to say, before the Minister's interjection got me a little off the track, was that members in this House waited for weeks and weeks for a response from the Minister in relation to my private member's motion, which in turn finally led to the setting up of this inquiry by the Parliamentary Labor Party. It may well have been that, if the Minister had seen fit, or if his

Premier had allowed him to reply to the statements that I made and the statement that the member for Ascot Park made on that occasion, we may not have proceeded with this inquiry. We made it clear at the time that if the Government was not prepared to agree to a Select Committee, or was not prepared to give us a reasonable reply to the points we were making, we would go ahead and do the job ourselves; that is what we are doing. In a sense, that is political, but in a sense everything in this House is political. What nonsense it is to be talking about bringing politics into Parliament, and deploring that. This is a political body—of course it is.

I make the point that this has naturally been done in a constructive spirit. It would be too easy for me, as Opposition spokesman on education, simply to ask what the Government is doing about this matter. However, Opposition members choose the more constructive pathway of doing something about it themselves. It may well be that the Minister, as part of his administration, can use the information that is gleaned as a result of our deliberations. Surely, that is a constructive role to play. Of course we are being political, and the Minister realises that; he knows that there is nothing wrong with that in the Parliamentary sphere. The Minister was trying to say that we are not being constructive, but we are. Indeed, we are being very constructive. The Opposition is joining with the profession and parents in order to come, we hope, for the first time, to real grips with the problem of school-based costs.

Regarding the whole matter of costing, it is time that the litany that we get from this Government in relation to expenditure was modified drastically. We got it the other day in relation to a helpful and constructive question that I asked the Minister in this House regarding Commonwealth spending on pre-schools. I know that the Minister has a problem in relation to this matter, because I had such a problem. The Commonwealth Government has cut back drastically in this area since the Fraser Government came to power, from an automatic 75 per cent funding of salaries down to something like 25 per cent now, which funding is not automatic but a block grant made to the States.

That is a remarkable turn-about. The Minister, instead of perhaps thanking me for joining with him in the obvious pressure that he must be putting on Senator Guilfoyle to get a better deal for this State, instead read me a lecture about the over expenditure of the Whitlam Government and all that sort of thing. I suggest that the Minister reflect on these matters. First, there has definitely been a considerable down-grading of education expenditure under the Fraser Government.

The Federal Government outlays on education have been reduced from 9.2 per cent of total Budget outlays in 1976-77 to 8 per cent in 1980-81, representing in real terms a cut-back of \$236 000 000 or 7.6 per cent during the period of the Fraser Administration. Of course, the cuts have not been consistent over the whole sector. Real spending on TAFE has increased by \$50 000 000 or 36 per cent over that period. That is not perhaps quite as spectacular as it appears, because it started from a fairly low base. However, I suppose that that could be taken as some sort of a strike against the previous Commonwealth Labor Administration.

Over the period, expenditure on universities has fallen by \$96 000 000, or 18 per cent. Schools Commission programmes for Government schools have been reduced by \$53 000 000 or 13 per cent, but for non-government schools the programmes have been increased by \$78 000 000, or 33 per cent. Federal payments to the State for child migrant education have risen by \$3 000 000, from

a low base, and the new school-to-work transition programme has been funded to the extent of \$32 000 000. However, child care and pre-school programmes have been cut by \$32 300 000 or 44 per cent, while educational programmes in the States have been cut by \$1 700 000 or 20 per cent.

These figures obviously represent a dramatic restructuring of Federal Government policies for education. Of course, expansion has occurred in other areas. Not only has defence expenditure and industry assistance been expanded substantially at the expense of education and other social programmes but also funds have been redirected to what the Government considers to be the most important purposes of education and its most valuable clients. One sees in the Federal Budget a seeking to reassert elitist and utilitarian concepts of education and, in the process, a redefining of who should pay the costs and who should gain the benefits.

It may well be that the Minister is not really all that disturbed, as he may, like his Premier, be a disciple of Friedmanite policies. He may believe that we must willy nilly cut down on public expenditure. The Minister may be a disciple of the low-tax society. If that is so, let him and his colleagues reflect on these figures. Let the Minister reflect on the total Federal taxation burden as it exists now and as it existed back in the so-called big spending days of the Whitlam Government. The total Federal tax burden, not just simply income tax—

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the Minister of Industrial Affairs well knows, this Federal Government has been trying for a long time to move the tax burden from the progressive tax area, which hits the Minister's supporters, to the indirect tax area, which hits my supporters. The OPEC countries have now given the Federal Government the perfect out in this matter, and every petrol pump becomes an office of the Federal Taxation Department.

Let us look at the total Federal taxation burden as a proportion of the gross domestic product. For example, in 1970-71 the proportion of g.d.p. taken in taxation was 24.1 per cent; in 1973-74 (by which time the Whitlam Labor Government was in office), it was 23.3 per cent; in 1977-78 (by which stage, I am afraid, Mr. Fraser was with us), the figure was 26 per cent; and, if one looks at the estimate in the current Budget, one sees that the figure is 26.7 per cent.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs can interject all he likes. The point is that taxation, as a proportion of the g.d.p., has increased under this Government. It is no good the Minister of Education, the Premier and others, when Opposition members try to assist the Government in its negotiations with the Federal Government to try to get a better deal for education, health and welfare generally, reading us a lecture in relation to taxation and expenditure, when these figures are about, when they cannot be denied, and when it is clear that the Fraser Government is a high tax Government.

I am not quarrelling with that. If I look at the high tax countries and the low tax countries, I know where I would rather be living. I would much rather be living in one of the social democracies than in a banana republic. However, the Government seems to think otherwise, except when it comes to their colleagues' track record. Of course, taxation, despite the Friedmanite nonsense, has remained high, and the shekels have gone into other things.

Education has been downgraded by the Fraser Government, and it is being slowly and insidiously downgraded by this Government. If it wants to get back to

a better relationship with teachers and parents generally in schools, the Government needs to adopt a more statesman-like stance and to come out as the champion of education and not, by default, its denigrator.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I, too, rise to support the motion and, in so doing, concur wholeheartedly with the remarks made earlier today by the member for Hartley regarding this debate and its future as we know it in this House. Opposition members no doubt support this motion believing that the Government has a mandate in a general sense for the measures that it proposes in its outline of work for the current session of Parliament.

However, we have seen in recent years in the Federal area in particular (and now coming into the State area) that Governments tend to treat mandates with gay abandon. Despite the fact that votes were gained in return for the promises of one reform, programme or another, those things have not been forthcoming. We have seen such incredible turn-about as statements that "Medibank will remain," but it has not remained. We have also heard that taxation will be indexed, that there will be taxation cuts, that inflation will be at a single-digit level, and that unemployment will be reduced.

All these promises made and mandates sought have proved untrue. "We care for the aged" is often a catchcry of the conservative Governments in Australia. Then we see such measures taken as the removal of a half-yearly indexation of pensions and actions taken in direct contravention of statements made in lead-ups to elections.

Many of the Bills that will come before the House in this session will try to water down or remove from the Statute Book popular and hard-won consumer protection laws; these matters were not raised prior to the last general election. Inquiries, we are told, are being conducted to determine where the scissors should be used with respect to this legislation, but we have already a number of matters that will come before the House for our consideration which will diminish the rights of consumers to get a fair deal in the marketplace in our community. We do not know the contents, but we know that the only reason why the Residential Tenancies Act will be brought before us and the Trading Stamp Act, the Land and Business Agents Act and, no doubt others, will be so that some of the restrictions currently existing in those Acts can be relaxed. We see already that the deregulation programme, so much vaunted by the Government, will be applied to such persons in the community as auctioneers and appraisers. There can be no clearer indication of the effect of deregulation as to take away all ethics, all standards and all sense of responsibility for such a profession as that of auctioneer.

In the vital areas of education and welfare, we have no indications of promises of increased funding or a continuation of existing funding. We have been told that there will be inquiries into these vital areas for the welfare of our community. No doubt those inquiries will be used as hooks on which to hang reductions in expenditure, reductions in staff, and reductions in programmes, as time goes on. The greatest single social problem facing this State and, indeed, this country now is unemployment, which was not mentioned once in the programme that was put to the Parliament by the Governor. The word "employment" rarely appears, either. The Government is trying very hard, no doubt, to convince itself and the community that unemployment does not exist. It couches its approach to this matter in terms of employment or employment-creating programmes, or on employment-creating initiatives. However, when one looks at the programme before us, one sees that a council on

technological change is to be established in this State whose object, we are told, is to ensure that industry will adapt to and adopt such changes as are appropriate. No mention is made of its effects on employment and the resultant unemployment which we know will come and which the Myers Report, so recently released, has told us to anticipate.

We are told that tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in the world, and there will be an inquiry into that as well—predominantly into the Department of Tourism. In line with the often-stated policies of the Government to sell off to private enterprise such areas of government that are in competition with private enterprise, one can expect that a great deal of the services provided by the department will be offered to private enterprise. No mention is made of the effect that this, or the inquiry, will have on unemployment or employment-creating programmes. Many people believed the media campaign before the September election that a Liberal Government would create 7 000 jobs in this State, but they were fooled. Over 1 000 more young people are now looking for work than at this time last year. An overall increase of about 4 000 persons in this State is looking for work. The Leader of the Opposition has outlined to the House in this debate some of the hundreds of jobs that have been lost in this State since this Government came to office.

We know that part of this decline in job opportunities is structural and that part is due to technological change. The Government came to office on the coat tails of vested interests in this community and in the State. It came on the slogan "Stop the job rot". It has not stopped the job rot, and it appears that it does not want to stop the job rot, which is now running riot and roughshod throughout the community and is causing inestimable damage in terms of human resources in our community. One of the interesting sidelights of this campaign that we saw in August and September last year in this State was the openness now of the link between business interests and the Liberal Party in South Australia. Thousands of dollars of corporate money was spent on some of the most foul political advertising ever seen in this State. No wonder the Liberals opposed amendments to the Companies Act last year which would have required companies to tell their shareholders details of donations to political Parties.

No doubt the reason behind the objections to the disclosure of pecuniary interests further strengthens the link between corporations and the Liberal Party. If shareholders were to know the sum that was spent on political campaigning, they might not be so keen to give that authority the next year round to their directors and management. They might realise that that is not the best way to spend money in the interests of their company or State or of proper industrial relations and proper use of funds in that way.

The pecuniary interests legislation has been consistently opposed by Government members. One can only conclude that their objection is simply to hide the vested interests that so many Government members take for granted as a way of life, I am sure, without realising the harm this creates to good government in this State. Often, they are oblivious to the outrage that this practice is to the traditions to the Westminster system of government. We saw it in this House a few months ago with respect to Government subsidies to industrial development in this State, where the Premier admitted that he forgot to tell the House of a Cabinet Minister who had substantial investments in a recipient company. It ought to be done as a matter of course. That information should always be available to members and, indeed, to the public so that

members' interests, attitudes and speeches cannot be called into disrepute.

Unemployment, as I have said, is the most intransigent problem facing Government today. It must be faced up to. It cannot be avoided or swept under the carpet; we have seen an attempt to do that in this debate and in the subject of this debate, the Governor's Speech. This matter is not to be shrugged off as not a State responsibility, because the welfare of families, young people, the aged and the sick are concerned. To keep our cities free of crime and to provide the homeless with homes and to eliminate poverty are all clearly State concerns. It is not possible to isolate unemployment out of the other areas of social concern in our community. I have spoken previously in the House in other debates on job-creating programmes sponsored by the Government, but, sadly, this Government rejects this philosophy out of hand. I have also spoken previously of the attitude of the Minister whom I am pleased to see in the House, and who shared my enthusiasm for the work carried out in his own district with respect to the provision of essential community recreational resources.

On the other hand, he was one of the architects of the closing down of the SURS programme. I remember the Minister speaking of the excellent work done on that scheme by unemployed persons. We do not hear the Government talking today of the thousands of jobs that have now been lost because the SURS programme has been discontinued and similar programmes have not been created. With the stroke of a pen, thousands of families in this State are without a breadwinner today. I can only conclude that this Government is not concerned at all about unemployment and about the unemployed.

I have looked at the breakdown of the unemployment figures from the Commonwealth Employment Service in my district. It can be clearly seen that those people out of work predominantly are unskilled workers, young people between the age of 16 and 19. There are nearly 10 000 of those unemployed young people in South Australia, and the majority are girls.

Many people over the age of 50 years are out of work and have little hope of ever finding work again. A high percentage of unemployed people are non-Australian born or the children of non-Australian born parents. Of course, the handicapped people in our community have very little hope of finding employment outside of sheltered workshops. It is interesting to look at the job vacancies that came on the market during the month for which I analysed the statistics and to examine the statistics in relation to the jobs filled. Certainly, there was little joy for the groups that I have just mentioned. Clearly, unemployment hits hardest amongst those in our community who are already disadvantaged.

A closer analysis of the unemployment situation shows that many young people are moving into the unemployable category. Many of those young people will find it increasingly difficult to obtain work; perhaps they will never obtain work. Certainly, many of them will have to undergo some form of retraining, some rejuvenation programme before they can rejoin the traditional labour market.

Many older men, especially those who have work related injuries, are gearing themselves towards an early retirement. I see the need for laws to be enacted to protect people who have suffered injury. All too often a person who has been through a workers compensation case and who has either recovered or partially recovered has been told by the court, his lawyer, by doctors or his former employer that he is suitable for light duties.

Such a person may then seek such a position and is told to fill out a form on which he is asked whether he has ever

received workers compensation benefits. If he says "Yes", he is immediately told that he is not wanted, or he is told at some later date for some unknown reason that he is not wanted. Workers compensation laws to that extent are working against the interests of a partially handicapped person who has experienced a period of illness or injury through work-related accidents.

What is the response within the community and by the Government to the unemployed? I have looked in my own district at the organisations to whom the unemployed can turn for assistance, sustenance, direction and support whilst they are unemployed. In my district I have one of the two adult unemployment groups that exist in South Australia. It is the only unemployment group for adults that has a professional staff member, namely, one organiser. Unfortunately, that group has come under increasing scrutiny by the Government, which seems keen to cut its funds.

That group, which is dependent upon the whim of the Government as to its funding, had been established by, and given guarantees of funding by, the previous Labor Government. It was a creation of the South Australian Council of Social Services and was a pilot project in this important area that had not been previously charted. It involved a programme for adults who were unemployed. An average of 50 people a day used the facilities and the programmes conducted at the centre. Despite this, demand after demand has been made by departments such as the Department for Community Welfare to know exactly the number of people who come in, how the programmes are being used, what the staff at the centre is doing and so on.

Much of the staff's time is being spent on justifying itself, rather than in doing this most important work that is so lacking in the community. I appreciate the assurances that have been given to me by the Minister of Community Welfare that he will visit the centre and have an assessment conducted by some independent and less emotional officers of his department to re-assess some of the demands made by the department of that centre.

However, to conduct an impressive array of programmes is in fact a taxing burden to place not only on the one staff member but also on the effectiveness of such a programme in the community. The activities conducted include craft workshops and numerous art and craft classes. There are quite economic motor and bicycle repair workshops that conduct work on the open market, a theatre group, and a well established legal centre providing advice and assistance for persons with legal problems.

The legal centre is staffed by about 20 voluntary legal practitioners and a similar service is conducted by accountants, who give tax advice and other budgetary advice to the community. The centre acts as an information and welfare centre and is a recreational centre in that community. It is the only one of its kind in South Australia, yet it lives month by month under the threat of discontinuance of funding by this Government. Few announcements have been made by the Minister or the department in support of this sort of programme, and less encouraging statements have been made about expanding this programme to other parts of the metropolitan area and the State.

I refer now to another programme, the "Care and Share" programme about which I spoke in this House early last year. That programme closed down because of the approach of the Federal Government to self-help programmes for young unemployed people. The programme was an initiative taken by a number of people active in their churches and by young unemployed people,

and it brought in goods and chattels that were reprocessed for sale.

In fact, it was an income-generating programme, a co-operative. It was set up as a co-operative and received assistance from the Industrial Development Division of the Premier's Department. It received a grant from the Department for Community Development, as it was then known. However, the programme made the mistake of advertising what it was doing and having a photograph in one of the daily newspapers picturing its participants. As a result, the Department of Social Security and the Commonwealth Employment Service investigated about 30 young people who were involved in the programme. The Commonwealth department had a requirement that young people involved in self-help programmes could not participate in such programmes for more than eight hours a week. In fact, at that time its requirement was that young people seeking work had to be in full-time pursuit of employment, and anything detracting from that meant that their benefits were cut off.

That happened in the case of this programme as a result of the publicity given to it. Several of the participants and the leaders of the programme had their unemployment benefits cut off and, as a consequence, this self-help programme just could not continue.

Representations were made by the former State Government to the Department of Social Security about this matter, and, whilst some of the changes that have appeared in the recent Federal Budget have overcome some problems, they still prohibit such self-help programmes as "Care and Share".

Another institution in my electorate is the Norwood Youth Shelter, which provides a valuable service, much needed in the community. The Government has made many statements about the needs of homeless youths. However, it is interesting to contrast those statements with the attitude the Government has taken to the continuation of this centre in Norwood. The police, the Department for Community Welfare, and welfare agencies generally refer young people to the centre. In fact, no-one goes there without being referred by a welfare agency.

The shelter has an excellent record of rehabilitating many of these young people into community life. It receives support from many and varied sources in the community, but the property in which the shelter operates is owned by the Highways Department. Although the centre was given some assurances last year by the previous Government that it could continue to occupy the building, it has lived this year under a cloud. It appears that the Department for Community Welfare does not want to purchase the building or take over control of it from the Highways Department; in fact, both departments seem keen to offload it on to the open market, leaving this valuable service without a home.

Mr. SLATER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. CRAFTER: We can see that, whilst community service programmes for the unemployed and the disadvantaged receive such barriers to their continued programmes, the statements made by this Government have been hollow. The member for Spence spoke earlier in this debate about the need and programmes that exist for finding homes for the homeless young people in our community. It is simply not good enough to allow such groups to occupy surplus premises, and to be put under threats from time to time to justify themselves, the meagre expenditure that they incur, and the small grants that they receive so that they can continue at least a basic service to this now enormous group of people in the community.

The record of this Government already is very clear: cut out programmes such as SURS, and departments such as the Community Development Department, and diminish grants to community groups. The staff of departments such as the Department for Community Welfare become not supportive but inspectors to check on funds, funding and programmes wherever there is an opportunity and where there is little resistance to the cutting and curbing of programmes and staff. On the other hand, we find the Government talking continually about voluntary workers, self help, and new names for people who really do not count at all with this Government.

Many people in the community believed last year the promises in relation to the creation of jobs—parents of school-leavers and of the young unemployed, and the young people themselves. They are looking now to the programmes of the Government to see where those jobs will appear. It is sad to see the Premier trying to squirm out of the promise, as he tried to do recently in the House. If what he has said is now the Government's position, those full-page advertisements and the radio and television advertisements were false, mischievous, and misleading, to say the least.

We know, and he knows, that there are 1 000 more young people looking for work now than there were when this Government came to office. The pay-roll tax deduction scheme obviously is not the answer. We saw statements made before the election last year, particularly those in the ethnic press, and an article which appeared in the *Il Globo* newspaper states:

Every time a factory or a company closes, the migrants are the hardest hit. Although one Australian in 20 is unemployed, one migrant in nine remains without work. We didn't come to Australia to continue being unemployed and to live off Government handouts. We came here to work and to give our children a better life. We are workers, not beggars. We want work, not charity.

Our children receive a poor education, and when they finish school all they can do is work as a factory hand or field labourer. But, with the closing down of factories and companies and with the disappearance of industry and commerce because of the Labor Government, our children are and will remain unemployed. Even our right to educate our children the way we want to has been denied us by the overbearing dictatorship of the A.L.P. A Liberal Government will change all this.

Mr. Lewis: And it will.

Mr. CRAFTER: It has not done too well so far.

Mr. Lewis: It has done very well.

Mr. CRAFTER: In fact, things have got worse. There are now 4 000 more people looking for jobs on the queues and in the streets, and 1 000 of those are young people. This promise, like all the other promises I have mentioned, is hollow. In fact, it was political rhetoric.

Mr. Lewis: Piffle!

Mr. CRAFTER: The advertisement went on to make statements such as this, which the member for Mallee may also like to refer to as piffle:

A Liberal Government will make it safe for our daughters to walk in the streets without being molested by all those thugs who, for the last 10 years, have been acting as if they own the place.

I do not know whether he agrees with that, but that was called by the Court of Disputed Returns a less than desirable approach to politics in this State. Of course, the last line in the advertisement was, "Vote Liberal for the salvation and future of our children." We have seen the despair of the community in the first 12 months; in fact, there is no hope for the young people and the disadvantaged if there is a continuation of the programmes

which we have seen so far, which we can expect in the forthcoming session of this House, and which no doubt we can anticipate in the Budget this week. We know that there is a direct link between unemployment and crime. That can be clearly shown, yet here we have a Government that has come into office, making such outlandish statements, so incorrect and defamatory, and its own record will show the people their folly and the shortcomings of such promises, particularly to the disadvantaged.

The answer is, first, in accepting that unemployment is in the community. It is here, and it is here to stay. It is structural unemployment, and, as long as the present Federal Government continues its economic policies towards the poor and disadvantaged, we will have rising unemployment. We must be looking more and more at job creation schemes. We all know that they are not the answer to overcoming the problems of lack of job opportunities.

Mr. Lewis: Then why advocate them?

Mr. CRAFTER: Because it is the most humane way to help people who are unemployed.

Mr. Lewis: They are economic insanity, and you know it.

Mr. CRAFTER: They may be, but in the long term there is also a cost to the community, that is, the social cost of unemployment. That cost will be incredible. Bringing the public sector into being and creating some diminishing factor in this cost in the long term will certainly outweigh the short-term disadvantages that are seen in these programmes. It is not just the experience that we have had in South Australia: as I mentioned earlier, the community has had a taste of some of these programmes. Job creation schemes have proceeded in a limited area of activity, but it is an indication that the community has come to see the value of such programmes. This experience is not confined to South Australia: it applies to numerous countries throughout the Western world.

I suggest that no country can stand by and watch its unemployed become isolated, rejected and left out of Government programmes, and yet still call itself a humane country. That is a contradiction. I refer to a speech made in 1978 by Willy Claes who was the Belgian Economic Affairs Minister at a time when his country was facing incredibly high unemployment. Belgium is one of many countries that have tried to bring about some humanity in this massive problem of unemployment in the community. First, he issued a warning about the intervention of public moneys in job creation programmes, and then said:

Nevertheless, in my opinion the State has become—in early 1978—the only potentially certain source of the restoration of an additional purchasing power, of the recovery of an overall demand which might return to its sufficiently increasing self: which will obviously not be thanks to businesses, nor to exports, nor even probably to private consumption (except by a deliberate action by the State at household and available income level). Such an action seems today to be necessary to start an upturn. Its temporary nature is necessary, on the other hand, to reconcile the requirements of economic recovery and the more structural demands of a systematic reorganisation of the State's finances and a stabilisation of the social security scheme. This reorganisation is essential but will, however, be tendentially more difficult if it cannot be carried out in a context of minimum recovery. Thus, a medium-term balancing of public funds and social security can only be tolerated in an expanding economic environment . . .

If we let the world settle down to under-employment [which is what I assume members opposite want to happen] and under-activity, it is quite clear that we will prevent the

extension of the production capacities, in particular of raw materials, in such a way that a few years of slow growth will probably be sufficient to recreate, all the same, shortages of basic commodities, leaving the door open to soaring prices and distribution quarrels comparable with those we have just emerged from. It will all happen simply at a much lower level of prosperity but the issues will not be for all that less difficult to resolve.

More generally speaking, it is in fact permitted to believe that any settling in an equilibrium of under-employment will only increase social struggles, sectorial issues, regional inequalities. Nor will the context be favourable to the necessary evolution towards a fairer international economic order for the developing countries.

We must tackle some public programmes in this area if our community is to have some vestige of humanity. I will briefly mention some of the employment-creating schemes that were devised in Belgium just prior to that time, when there was a climate of deteriorating employment. At that time the new Belgian Government introduced a number of employment-creating schemes. Briefly, those schemes involved employment by public authorities where a lump sum daily payment defrayed part of the cost of hiring employees. Employees received the market rate for their labour.

Another programme involved the replacement of workers retiring early by persons under 30 years of age. Under that scheme, a worker opting for early retirement was paid an interim pension consisting of the unemployment benefit plus half the difference between that benefit and his final wage. That final component was paid by the Ministry of Employment and Labour. Any worker retiring under this provision must by statute be replaced by a young unemployed worker seeking his first job. Another programme included in-work training originally relating to enterprises employing over 100 workers, which enterprises were required to employ first 1 per cent, and then 2 per cent of persons under 25 years of age who had never worked and were classified as unemployed. The training courses lasted six months and were renewable for a further six months. The allowance paid was at first 75 per cent of the normal wage, and 90 per cent of the training was extended. The scheme was later extended to enterprises of between 50 and 99 employees.

A fourth scheme was a special temporary work force that offered a moveable flexible work force of public employees to public authorities and community associations to carry out particular projects. The contract offered to workers could not exceed one year and the wage paid was the normal starting salary for that particular job. It was stipulated that projects undertaken should not compete with activities in the private sector.

A fifth scheme was early retirement for older unemployed workers, and I referred to this problem earlier. Men who had turned 60 or women who had turned 55 and had been unemployed for at least one year could opt to receive continued unemployment benefits plus a pension of 1 000 Belgian francs per month until they reached pensionable age. A sixth programme was the humanisation of working conditions. A fund was set up to finance 30 per cent investment and 50 per cent of feasibility studies that would contribute towards the improvement of working conditions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a chart indicating the results achieved by those schemes, followed by a table showing the trend since 1974.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the material of a statistical nature?

Mr. CRAFTER: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.
Leave granted.

SCHEME RESULTS

Type of Measure	Target set (1977+ Situation 1978) end 1978	
Employment by public authorities	25 159	28 350
Training	28 454	31 471
Replacement of workers opting for early retirement	17 500	22 350
Special temporary work force	24 000	24 310
Special early retirement	18 000	13 380
Humanisation of work	1 500	600
Total	114 613	120 461

TREND

Year	Per cent Unemployed	Numbers wholly Unemployed
1974.....	2.3	90 000
1975.....	4.2	162 000
1976.....	5.6	215 000
1977.....	6.3	247 000
1978.....	6.8	265 000

Mr. CRAFTER: I point out that these schemes did not bring about a reduction of unemployment in that country. However, it can be seen that in a period of rising unemployment, they did help, particularly in relation to male unemployment, to level out the rising unemployment graphs. It is also interesting to note that during that period, in the secondary sector of Belgium's economy, 193 000 jobs were lost in the five years prior to these schemes being implemented.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Have you looked at the effectiveness of the SURS scheme in relation to permanent jobs created?

Mr. CRAFTER: I believe that this is where we need to carefully review what happened in SURS. One of the obvious areas that needed to be looked at was the length of time that people worked in those projects. International experience indicates that that period may have to be extended for longer than the periods we experienced in South Australia. In fact, many of the programmes perhaps had an over-emphasis on skilled labour rather than unskilled labour. Certainly, there is an area for review and possible improvement. At the moment, however, there is no hope for the unemployed in our community, because these programmes do not exist.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CRAFTER: I have pointed out five schemes that are available. Numerous schemes can be created if one turns one's mind to it. The member for Mallee is now contradicting himself, because he said earlier that they were economic madness; such is his concern for the disadvantaged in our community.

A matter which is second only to unemployment but which is one of the great social concerns in our community at the moment is the availability of housing for low-income groups, which is fast becoming, if it has not already become, a privilege rather than a right. I have just been talking about young homeless people in my district and the community generally and about the hollowness of the Government's statements in this area.

People regularly come into my office (and no doubt into the offices of other members) looking for rental housing. These people join a waiting list in excess of 20 000 people in this State who are looking for rental housing. It is the

greatest number of people to be in that situation since the last war.

Mr. Lewis: It is a direct result of the previous Government's policy on landlord and tenant relationships.

Mr. CRAFTER: If the honourable member listens, I will explain to him why this is happening. There are, in fact, incredible social problems resulting from the lack of low-income housing in this community. Recent increases in the home savings grant based on a figure of up to \$55 000 are an indication of how out of touch—

Mr. HEMMINGS: Once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am forced to draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. CRAFTER: So-called initiatives such as raising the upper limit on home savings grants do nothing to help low-income groups to obtain housing. We have seen that one of the real problems for young people is raising a deposit to buy a house that they can afford. There is little help available at the moment for young people who want to buy a house of their own but do not have a sufficient deposit. On the other hand, we see those people who were enticed into home purchase schemes involving a low deposit now being faced with incredible debts. After occupying houses for 15 years and making mortgage repayments for that time they now find that they owe more than they owed when they first occupied their homes. Many of the schemes that exist do not help low-income families.

The Land Commission has helped keep land in this State, and consequently houses and land packages, at much lower price levels than those existing in other capital cities of Australia, particularly Melbourne and Sydney. With the winding down of the role of the Land Commission, one can expect that it is going to be increasingly difficult for young people to find a sum of money to purchase their own block of land and, subsequently, their own house. We find an increasing number of aged people looking for rental housing, and there is an increasing number of unemployed people. These people cannot continue to make payments on their houses or save money to buy a house. The lack of the real value of wages in the past decade has meant that many more people have had to change their option from owning a house to renting one.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense!

Mr. CRAFTER: I suggest that the honourable member ask them. I acknowledge that the State Government has just announced a further injection of funds into the welfare housing programme of this State. I think, from memory, that those funds are sufficient to build another 325 houses. However, when one considers that 20 000 or more people are waiting for rental accommodation, that will not satisfy much of the need that exists, particularly in view of the Government's decision to sell off a considerable number of its rental houses, particularly the double-unit Housing Trust houses. When such stock is sold on the private market, the stock of rental housing will be diminished. One can anticipate that that waiting list will then grow even longer.

The crucial factor in providing low-income housing in our community is the amount of funds that comes to us from the Federal Government. There, indeed, is the source of a tragic story in recent years in Australia. This Government, of course, is implicated, because it has not spoken out against the Federal Government's priorities in providing funds for low-cost housing throughout the States.

Mr. Evans: Do you think income tax should be increased to pay for this?

Mr. CRAFTER: No, I think funds should be distributed

more evenly. We can see in the Budget just released that this programme is continuing. Net payments to the States for housing in 1980-81 are only one-eighth of the amount received six years ago. That is a damning statistic in itself. The States are being robbed by the Federal Government as it withdraws from its responsibility to provide housing security. There has been a dramatic reversal in the allocation of housing funds to the States. In 1974-75 the States had available 73 per cent of total payments for use in housing programmes, and spent 27 per cent in debt servicing. In 1980-81 debt servicing has risen to 73 per cent, and the net amount of usable funds has decreased to 27 per cent, completely changing the tables.

No doubt, after unemployment, housing is the most serious social problem in Australia. Over 1 per cent of Australia's population is homeless. The home-building industry throughout Australia is operating well below capacity. Housing price inflation is rising and will continue to rise in this State, although no doubt it is not rising to the same extent as in Melbourne and Sydney, where it is rising

at a frightening rate. There is a widespread dislocation of people resulting from structural changes in the industry. In this State alone, the dislocation of people through changes in the staffing of Government departments is a major housing problem in itself. Housing, for example, for Engineering and Water Supply Department workers transferred to many country town is impossible to find. As a consequence, the problems of housing require greater attention than ever before, yet we see that only one-eighth of the funds available six years ago is now available for housing. The Budget figure of \$366 000 000 announced last week for housing represents less than one-third of the amount made available by the Labor Government in 1974-75. Housing outlays have been reduced from 3.9 per cent of the total Federal Budget outlays in 1974-75 to 1 per cent in this financial year. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical chart of payments to the States for housing.

Leave granted.

Net Payments to the States for Housing
(\$m current prices)

	Total payments	Repayment of advances	Repayment of interest	Total repayments	Net payments
1974-75	392.4	19.2	88.2	107.4	285.0
1975-76	371.6	21.9	105.0	126.9	244.7
1976-77	391.8	24.7	119.1	143.8	248.0
1977-78	405.6	27.7	133.9	161.6	244.0
1978-79	335.5	30.9	148.5	179.4	156.1
1979-80	265.5	33.5	158.2	191.7	73.8
1980-81	276.0	35.6	164.7	200.3	75.7

Net Payments to the States for Housing
(\$m constant 1980-81 prices)

	Total payments	Repayment of advances	Repayment of interest	Total repayments	Net payments
1974-75	709.6	34.7	159.5	194.2	515.4
1975-76	584.3	34.4	165.1	199.5	384.8
1976-77	550.3	34.7	167.3	201.9	348.4
1977-78	528.1	36.1	174.3	210.4	317.7
1978-79	411.2	37.9	181.9	219.9	191.3
1979-80	296.0	37.4	176.4	213.7	82.3
1980-81	276.0	35.6	164.7	200.3	75.7

Mr. CRAFTER: When the situation in respect of South Australia is analysed we see that net payments to South Australia for housing in the 1980-81 Federal Budget represent 11 per cent, in real terms, of the net payments made to this State in 1974-75; they are down by 89 per cent. Nationally, the 1980-81 net payments are 15 per cent, so we are worse off than the national average in this area of welfare housing. This is, indeed, one of the major reasons why we cannot keep up with the growing need for this basic welfare service in the community. In 1974-75, 72.5 per cent, or approximately three-quarters, of total payments were available for use by the South Australian

Government in housing programmes. In this financial year, the usable funds made up only 21.9 per cent, or less than a quarter of those funds. I seek leave to have a further statistical chart relating to this matter inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the chart of a purely statistical nature?

Mr. CRAFTER: Yes.

Leave granted.

Net Federal Payments to South Australia for Housing (Current Prices)

Financial year	* Federal payments (\$'000s)	Repayment of advances (\$'000s)	Repayment of interest (\$'000s)	* Total repayments (\$'000s)	* Net payments (\$'000s)
*1974-75	57 453	2 398	13 391	15 789	41 664
1975-76	57 453	2 797	15 899	18 696	38 757
*1976-77	58 774	3 213	18 115	21 328	37 446
1977-78	60 331	3 645	20 397	24 042	36 289
*1978-79	49 652	4 108	22 602	26 710	22 942
1979-80	38 274	4 488	24 078	28 566	9 708
*1980 81	38 236	4 773	25 087	29 860	8 376

(Source: Budget Paper No. 7, 1980-81 and 1977-78, Payments to or for the States and Local Government Authorities Tables 38 and 105.)

Net Federal Payments to South Australia for Housing (Constant 1980-81 Prices)

Financial year	* Federal payments (\$'000s)	Repayment of advances (\$'000s)	Repayment of interest (\$'000s)	* Total repayments (\$'000s)	* Net payments (\$'000s)
*1974-75	103 893	4 336	24 215	28 552	75 342
1975-76	90 335	4 398	24 998	29 396	60 939
*1976-77	82 548	4 513	25 442	29 955	52 593
1977-78	78 556	4 746	26 559	31 305	47 251
*1978-79	60 848	5 034	27 699	32 732	28 115
1979-80	42 669	5 003	26 842	31 846	10 822
*1980-81	38 236	4 773	25 087	29 860	8 376

Mr. CRAFTER: So, we can see very clearly that, with unemployment and welfare housing, conservative Governments give these a low priority. We find at the same time statements now pervading the community about the overbearing costs of welfare services in the community. Not only are they discontinuing funds, as they are in this State, to SURS programmes and in housing at the Federal level, but also they are telling people that too much money is being spent on welfare programmes, that that is a burden on taxpayers and the community, that we should be engaging in self-help programmes, and that the poor should be looking after themselves and that the Government should not. That was espoused very clearly in the speech made in this debate by the member for Rocky River. He quoted various theorists who have come to this State to tell us about the overburdening welfare costs that we find. We find statements such as the following by the member for Rocky River:

If Australians want the benefit of an affluent society following the industrial society, they will have to work hard for it and maintain it through continued work effort.

But, if one asks those 50 000 people in the State who are out of work (and statistics show that there are no vacancies) how they can participate in the rebuilding of this society, particularly when no support is given to them through Government programmes—

Mr. Olsen: The economic base is the reason why it has been established in the first place.

Mr. CRAFTER: Or that there is no support for the basic needs of families so that they can live with some dignity, let alone have the opportunity of getting work. The honourable member makes no reference to technological change and the rapid erosion of job opportunities for that reason alone in the community.

Mr. Olsen: I did refer to compassionate grounds for the level of unemployment benefits.

Mr. CRAFTER: A small token indeed in this massive problem. We see on the one hand, as I explained, the Commonwealth Government, through its own miserly approach to the unemployed, having a self-help programme close down in my own electorate, yet we find members saying that we need a greater effort being made by people. It is simply not possible, and we find that the record of this Government is 4 000 more people out of work now than when it came into office, and 1 000 of these are young people. I simply ask: "What do we do with these people?". What does one tell them if their programmes have been closed down and their families and parents cannot find adequate housing for them?

We find that there is now appearing in our community, amongst the disadvantaged group, a sense of despair. They cannot look to this Government for any solution to their needs. This Government does not attempt to identify itself with the problems and hardships of the unemployed and with the homeless. I would suggest that one area that the Government might consider looking at with respect to low income housing in our community is to ask local government to address itself to this problem. I believe that more initiative will be shown at that level than at the State Government level to work with the community in solving this problem and to work with financial institutions and share more equitably the financial resources that are available for low income housing.

In New South Wales, I notice that the Nambucca Shire has received direct Commonwealth funding for low income housing programmes. That shire has formed a co-operative building society and is undertaking the development of two housing estates within its local government area, at Maxville and Nambucca Heads. The programme has indeed very attractive advantages and, based at the local level, it is possible to include in it, in a co-operative way, the resources of that community, with

the local government body itself sharing their resources amongst the homeless. I believe that there is a clear role to be established for direct Commonwealth funding to local government bodies for the provision of low income housing in the community. No doubt people around Australia are watching with great interest the initiatives taken by the Nambucca Shire, and no doubt by some other local government authorities, in this new area. We will have little to look forward to if the current housing policies as I have outlined continue to exist at the Federal level.

The final point to which I refer is the need for a review of the Licensing Act with respect to noise control of licensed premises, particularly hotels. In my own electorate last year, considerable harm was caused in the community by behaviour not so much in the hotel but in the surrounds of the hotel. As members are no doubt aware, the law has been clarified recently to say that the proprietor of the licensed premises does not have to concern himself with the behaviour of patrons outside his premises. It seems that there is no authority within the community to overcome this problem of people causing harm to others.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Are you referring to people inside the premises or outside?

Mr. CRAFTER: Outside. There is no authority. The police, the local government body and the proprietor of the licensed premises are concerned about this matter, as are the residents in the area. We had round table meetings last year to try to solve this problem. Everyone wants the problem solved, but there was no single authority that could address itself to the problem. It is exacerbated in the community by the fact that many licensed premises exist in residential areas—they are taverns or traditional inns. They have become major entertainment centres, established in residential areas, and this problem needs attention urgently. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL LAND

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

APPRAISERS ACT AND AUCTIONEERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to make some comments in reply to some of the inaccurate statements made by the member for Baudin. We were treated to a spate of inaccurate and selective quotations this evening, and it is appropriate that I put the record straight. Unfortunately, I came into the Chamber at the end of the brief history that he was attempting to give of some of the activities that have taken place at the Ceduna school. The honourable gentleman quoted from a letter that appeared in the *West Coast Sentinel* on 25 June. He

omitted (for his own convenience, as it did not suit his argument) to read an article which appeared on the front page of that rather prominent journal on 2 July 1980. The headline was "MP 'very active' in helping school classroom plight". Nothing from the member for Baudin. The article states:

The Chairman of the Ceduna Area School Council, Mr. Bill Tonkin, said today that the Member for Eyre, Mr. Gunn, and the Regional Director of Education, Mr. Ralph, had both been "very active" in putting the council's request for urgent classroom accommodation to the Minister, Mr. Allison.

That completely gives the lie to what the honourable gentleman was saying. During the past few months it has been very interesting to note the silence that has come from the Labor Party in relation to this matter, because it was the member for Baudin, as Minister, who reduced the size of the new school at Ceduna. It was that honourable gentleman who cut it back, and that is why we are having the problems today. In regard to what Mr. Tonkin said, the article states:

Mr. Tonkin was replying to last week's statement by teachers that they were still not satisfied with assurances given by Mr. Gunn and the Minister, Mr. Allison, that everything was being done to overcome the problem of the school's increasing enrolment. "The article has prompted me to wish to make clear the stance taken by the school council on the matter of additional teaching space at the school," he said.

"Since becoming aware of the problems, as pointed out by the staff in mid-1979, the council has endeavoured to bring home to the Education Department the serious lack of teaching space. More recently on learning the Demac building from Whyalla would not be relocated at our school, we have enlisted the help of the Regional Director of Education, Denis Ralph, and Parliamentary member, Graham Gunn. Both have been very active in putting our requests to the Minister of Education, Mr. Allison, and his facilities people at the Education Department."

Mr. Tonkin said that the most recent request as passed at the school council meeting on June 23 asked for more specific dates on the arrival of transportables from Crafers and Demac buildings from Leigh Creek. In addition, the council sought an assurance that provision of these buildings would not jeopardise Ceduna's need for a new junior primary school which the council felt a current demographic survey would support.

"That, I believe, is the current position of the school council put concisely as possible. I would have thought the matter should then rest until the Minister had received our request and given his reply. If the reply we receive from the Minister is still considered unsatisfactory then I believe Denis Anderson (spokesman for the school staff) could properly go to the media as a spokesman—for the staff and not the school council as many readers of the *Sentinel* last week may have deduced."

Mr. Tonkin said the school council would continue to work to see that the space shortage was overcome . . .

To clarify my situation after what had been said about me, I wrote to the local paper, as follows:

I wish to briefly reply to Mr. Nelson's letter (*Sentinel* June 25) as well as make a brief comment in relation to the article which appeared on page one of the same issue. It would take a considerable amount of space in your paper to fully reply to the provocative statements which have been made in relation to the Minister of Education and myself.

I totally reject that either of us has been unreasonable and do not intend to be told by Mr. Nelson how to carry out my duties. However, let me reassure all those people who are genuinely concerned about the problems at the Ceduna Area

School that the Minister, the department and myself are most concerned and intend to see that the problems are resolved.

It would appear that there are certain people who are more interested in using the issue as a vehicle to attack the Minister on an issue created well before the election of this Government. Most people will be aware that there has been a concerted campaign by certain sections to endeavour to make life unbearable for the Minister.

I have not yet received any resolutions made at the last school council meeting and have responded to all the previous requests from them. During the time I have been the member for Eyre, I have been in constant contact with them and over that period have strongly supported their actions and shall continue to do so. It is fairly obvious that it will be necessary for me to clearly explain in the next grievance debate in Parliament the complete history of this particular matter.

I think that that puts to rest the nonsense that has been put forward by the honourable gentleman tonight, except in relation to the other school that he mentioned. I would not make any comment at this stage but I will do so at a later stage, because I gave some undertakings to certain people that I would not publicly discuss the matter. However, there is another matter which I want to refer to and which is in relation to my constituents living at Yalata. This concerns certain actions by people endeavouring to muscle in on their land. Recent action has prompted me to raise this matter because over the past week or so there have been a number of articles appearing in the press. One article appeared in the *News* on 19 August headed "Row erupts over tribal land control", and this refers to the Mintabie area.

Then, we had a report in the 19 August issue of the *News* headed "Miners threaten to fight land take-over", in which it was stated that opal miners at the Far North gem field of Mintabie might take legal action. Thereafter, we saw a report by Mr. Robert Ball (to whom I have referred previously) in the 22 August issue of the *Advertiser*, in which the following appeared:

The Pitjantjatjara Council has sent a telegram to Mintabie opal miners assuring them that it will not seek to restrict opal mining at the field. This followed reports in the *Advertiser* this week that opal miners at Mintabie, 250 kilometres north-west of Coober Pedy, fear that the Pitjantjatjara want to expel them from the area.

Later the report states:

Last night, the Pitjantjatjara lawyer said, "We don't want to be unreasonable—we simply expect the same standards of behaviour at law by people at Mintabie as the standards necessary elsewhere in Australia. Mintabie has been a constant source of social concern. . ."

I am afraid that many people are concerned about the undertakings that were given, because I have had given to me a telegram that was sent to C.R.A. Exploration Proprietary Limited by the Pitjantjatjara Council. In my view, the telegram would have been drafted by the lawyer who represents the council. It states:

Deeply disturbed that although you have now been made aware of Pitjantjatjara Council traditional interest in your exploration areas north of Maralinga no attempt has been made to contact us to arrange meeting. Pitjantjatjara Council now feels it necessary to take all necessary steps to prevent your operations on those lands unless proper consultation undertaken. Your conduct in this matter makes it extremely unlikely that your company would succeed in seeking access for mining on the Pitjantjatjara lands soon to be legislated on in South Australian Parliament. We urge you to seriously reassess your approach to this issue if you wish to prevent avoidable confrontation with our council. You must be prepared to talk with us directly. We do not delegate the task

of negotiating to protect our law and sacred places. We hope to hear from you soon.

Chairman, Pitjantjatjara Council.

I have read that telegram to the House because, in anyone's language, it is a fairly threatening telegram. The land to which they refer has, I have been told by my constituents at Yalata, nothing to do with the people in the Far North. That land traditionally belongs to the people who were shifted out of the Ooldea area when the atomic tests were conducted. If that sort of telegram was sent to those people, we should seriously consider the assurances given in relation to my constituents at Mintabie. I make clear that the people at Mintabie have every right to remain there as miners, and that no attempt should be made to move them or to place unreasonable restrictions on them. Also, there should be no system of permits or any other restrictions. Those people are entitled to stay in that area. I believe that many of the press comments by people who are speculating have done nothing to improve the situation. I sincerely hope that the Government will soon in a submission be able to make—

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I am pleased that the appropriate Minister, under whose aegis the subject matter with which I wish to deal in the few minutes at my disposal comes, has now entered the Chamber. I refer, of course, to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will not deal with the O'Bahn now, although, if the Minister so desires, I could take up the 10 minutes at my disposal discussing it. However, for the moment, I should like to deal with what was the Minister's pet subject last week. The Minister will recall that I had a brief but meaningful discussion with him last week, when the Minister announced that the Government had decided to allocate \$1 000 000, through the agency of the Totalizator Agency Board, to this State's racing codes. As I said to the Minister last week, I was indeed pleased with the allocation.

I believe that the Government needs to be reassured by the racing codes (I deal with the three racing codes *en bloc*) that all other problems outside finance, such as problems indirectly interfering with the finances of the three codes, should also be considered. I think, from memory, the Minister privately assured me that, when the full recommendations come before the House, they will be tabled so that all members will be given an opportunity to peruse them in depth. I am grateful for the Minister's assurance.

I deal now with part of a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 21 August arising from the Minister's discussion. I will read part of it, because I think it is important and because I have been, as the Minister knows, involved recently in one of the codes in my own district. The report states, in part:

The Chairman of the South Australian Dog Racing Control Board, Mr. J. Dunsford, said the assistance was very welcome, and certainly a move in the right direction. The changes follow recommendations made in an interim report of the committee of inquiry into racing established by the Government in November. In a Ministerial statement, Mr. Wilson told the Assembly the committee had strongly argued that the financial position of the codes was critical and that their viability was dependent on significant increases in stake moneys.

I pause there to say to the Minister that I could not agree more. It is a known fact in the three codes that, across the board, in every State, including Queensland (the banana

republic), the stake money is far greater than it is in this State. Obviously, the three codes cannot compete with the other States until stake money becomes at least comparable to that of other States. The report continues:

The committee had said the level of stake moneys in South Australia was depressed in comparison with those of other States and argued that the industry required additional funds urgently. It had also said that static income from the T.A.B. to the clubs in times of rising costs had prevented clubs from increasing stake money, with a consequent drop in the quality of racing. The committee believes that the Government could well treat the T.A.B. as a joint venture between the Government and the codes in which both share equally the net operating surplus.

That is the point about which I have some reservations, because it is all very well for the three codes to say that they want to share something, being a big money matter, and have no responsibility; or, let us assume that no responsibility is accepted for what goes with accepting the money. For example, on numerous occasions in my district, I have pointed out that the administration and facilities of the three codes are far too fragmented. Time and time again, we are placed in the serious position of having every club within a particular code wanting to do its own thing, many times at the expense of the industry as a whole, and that is one of the reasons why I quoted the first paragraph of the *Advertiser* report.

In the dog code itself, Angle Park, the so-called home of dog-racing, was built, I contend, with very little regard for financial implications. In fact, it is well known that Angle Park has the greatest financial problem of all the dog tracks in this State. Over all, Angle Park, the Gawler dog track (your own track, Mr. Speaker, with respect) and subsequently Strathalbyn were all vying for recognition through the T.A.B., yet they were all in financial difficulty. Further, those three clubs are all represented on the Dog Racing Control Board, under the chairmanship of Mr. Dunsford, and represented, I put to the House, in self club interest, not in the code. Those tracks were all built in the image of each other, and all requiring additional finance from the T.A.B.

For each dog track to which I refer (I could refer to horse-racing, and trotting is an even better example) a multiple of costs is incurred each time a club is formed. It has been argued to me on many occasions that somehow a club appears, builds a track and other facilities, and therefore has to have T.A.B. coverage. The argument put to me by the control board of each code is about what the board should do once there are such clubs. I can tell the House that there is one thing which we should not do but which is being done presently: that is, to allocate racing dates to clubs practically at wish.

Mr. Lewis: Why didn't you do something about it when you were in Government?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a classic example of the understanding of what this issue is all about. I am not saying that I did not try to do something about this matter when we were in Government. What I am saying is that I took it up with the Minister of my Party's Government, and I am now taking it up with the Minister of the Liberal Party's Government, and I will continue to take it up because I believe seriously that an injustice has occurred.

Mr. Slater: Should we have a racing commission to run the lot?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not think that that is improper.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you advocating a reduction in the number of clubs?

Mr. MAX BROWN: No. As the Minister is aware, I wrote to the Dog Racing Control Board on another matter in which I became involved, and I can only repeat what I

have said: in my experience from writing to the Dog Racing Control Board I found the self interest of clubs. I do not believe that the industry as a whole (and this is an important issue) is served in the best interests by having a club-controlled management or a code-controlled management.

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

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): This evening I should like to address my remarks to the new public transport system that has been announced by the Government to service the north-eastern suburbs. My remarks are necessary because I believe that either members opposite have been putting out deliberately misleading statements or they just completely misunderstand the concepts that the Government is going to introduce for the benefit of the residents of my district and other residents of Tea Tree Gully.

Many of the comments by members opposite have been quite inaccurate. First, I refer to some of the comments by the member for Salisbury. I have always had respect for that member, but I have been extremely disappointed about the comments he has made since he returned from overseas. It appears to me that in many cases he has not really gone into enough detail to come up with correct statements in relation to the guided bus system.

Mr. Oswald: He'll still get Bannon's job.

Mr. ASHENDEN: He could not do worse than the present Leader. First of all, the member for Salisbury has said, in relation to guideways:

When these guided rails go down the various suburban roads in this city, will we be able to allow them to travel at that speed [80 km/h]? What about the hazards to pedestrians? Will they still be expected to abide by the normal speed restrictions applying to every other vehicle within the suburban area? I think the answer will have to be "Yes".

Obviously, no-one could misunderstand more the concept of a guided busway, because, where the buses go along the guided section, there will be no pedestrians. At no stage will the guideway be along any suburban roads or streets, so why he brought that up I have no idea. However, he was right in one respect. He said, in relation to the l.r.t. system that the previous Government was espousing, that people had to change their mode of transport in Tea Tree Gully and get into another form of transport, and this was inconvenient. Indeed, that is so. That is a comment I can heartily endorse, and it is one of the main reasons why the Government has introduced the busway system. There will be little, if any, need for persons to interchange at Tea Tree Plaza.

Mr. Oswald: If only he would understand.

Mr. ASHENDEN: He has had some difficulty there. He compounds the situation by making even more inaccurate statements.

He also says that he has been pleased to learn that, if a bus breaks down within the guided rails, it will not be the serious problem that he had thought it would be. That is true, and I am delighted that he has acknowledged it publicly, because the Minister has made this point clearly in relation to that aspect.

He went on to say in this House that trams in many parts of the world, including our own city, have lasted for decades, and yet the generally accepted figure for buses is 15 years. True, but then he said:

Therefore in the long term it cannot be said that the capital cost of the O'Bahn system is cheaper for equipment than is the l.r.t. system.

There he is quite wrong. Initially, the cost of the busway will be \$39 000 000 in 1979 terms, and the monument

which the Labor Party wanted to erect to the previous Minister of Transport was going to cost \$115 000 000 initially. In another 20 to 25 years, or in 15 to 20 years time, when all of the buses are due for replacement (and this will have advantages, as I will point out shortly), even then the cost of the busway will rise, with the replacement of those buses, to approximately \$64 000 000. At that time, the l.r.t. would have cost approximately \$126 000 000, so even after the first changeover of buses we are still looking at only half the cost of the busway proposal as compared to the l.r.t. system espoused by the previous Government.

There is another advantage that I am sure even members opposite would acknowledge. Today, technology is advancing more quickly than ever before, with the result that, in replacing the buses in 15 years time, we will be able to take advantage of technology which at the moment probably has not been thought of. The Minister has pointed out that we will be using diesel buses initially because that, for the next 10 years, will be the most economical system we can use. However, after that time, we will have a choice of trolley buses, battery operation, l.p.g., l.n.g., methanol, and any other number of options, as well as combinations of those. Therefore, again the system proposed by this Government will enable the use of advanced technology much earlier than would any l.r.t. proposal.

The member for Price made some statements which are so inaccurate that I do not think anyone could have believed them. He said that diesel buses have a road life of about seven or eight years. I think he should do some homework, and he will find that even members opposite acknowledge that the life is 15 years. He said that the O'Bahn system is an experiment only and that the system has not been tried fully or tested anywhere in the world to any extent. That is not so, because there have been uses of the O'Bahn system overseas.

Mr. Slater: Where?

Mr. ASHENDEN: I will come to that. I have an article from the *National Times*, written by Peter Burden, headed "The Coming Transport Revolution". He gave an answer to the point made by the member opposite that:

I understand that the Daimler Benz company has recently completed a 1.3 kilometre test track at Essen. Think about that, a 1.3 kilometre test track at Essen is all that Daimler Benz has.

He does not even know where the test track is located, because in fact the test track is at Kassel. Essen is the area where there will be the first widespread public use of the O'Bahn system. Another one is being developed for Regensburg. As Mr. Burden pointed out in his article:

The O'Bahn system has been around for some time. It quite obviously works and works very well. Its promise for mass transit is enormous and the things that it can do are astounding.

Remember, that is from a gentleman who is a specialist in reviewing this type of transport system. He has looked at all of them, so his comments certainly have no political connotation whatsoever. He went on to say (and this is for the benefit of members opposite, if they will listen):

The O'Bahn system has already proved itself as a transit system. One was installed late last year as a feeder in the northern German city of Hamburg. More than 300 000 passengers were successfully carried.

Therefore, the O'Bahn system has in fact been used. The article then goes on to point out many of the other advantages, and states:

A mass transit system which can utilise an existing mode (buses), which is less expensive to construct than other systems, which conserves space and which appears to trouble the existing environment less than any other is worth a considered thought.

He then says:

We have the first truly new and practicable mass transit system in years.

Perhaps we should now look at a criticism that members opposite level at my Party when they have said that we are conservative. In relation to this issue, I ask just who are the conservatives. Members opposite have said that, because this system is new, we should not have a bar of it. I am sorry, but I just cannot understand the logic of members opposite. Also, there are many examples of its use: there is the test track used by Mercedes-Benz for 10 years and I have already mentioned Hamburg, where it has been used. It will soon be used in Essen and will replace a present light-rail transit system there in Germany. That obviously means a lot. If it were not going to be successful, why would they move away from one system to another?

The Leader of the Opposition has also come out with some very inaccurate statements. He has tried to build up a story that the costs mentioned are not correct, and I have already referred to that matter.

Mr. Moulton-Smith, who we thought would have known more about it, said that replacement costs would be tremendous. But it costs only \$150 000 to replace a bus, compared to \$800 000 for a tram. Almost six buses can be purchased (in other words we can have six changeovers), before we meet the cost of one tram. It is acknowledged that the tram life is about double that of the bus life, so that at no time will we find the costs—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 27 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 August 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MOORE'S BUILDING

19. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How long does the Government propose that the Charles Moore building in Victoria Square remain unused, and why it is not being used?

2. What plans, if any, does the Government now have for its future use, and when will such plans be put into effect and at what cost?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The building will remain unoccupied until the end of the year to enable preliminary design work, investigations and testing to be undertaken prior to the commencement of building work in January 1981.

2. In agreement with the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, who own the building, the State Government intends to develop the complex into law courts.

Detailed cost breakdowns are not yet available.

MEMBER FOR MITCHAM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Premier: How should the member for Mitcham make contact with a Minister, as a matter of urgency in an emergency, out of office hours?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A list of contact telephone numbers for all Ministers has been provided for the member for Mitcham.

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

41. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What arrangements exist for the inspection of second-hand musical instruments before their purchase by schools?

2. Have any significant changes taken place in recent years regarding the numbers and types of firms and individuals involved in sales of second-hand musical instruments to schools?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Music Branch of the Education Department provides an advisory service to schools with regard to the purchase of new and second-hand instruments. The school either contacts the Principal of the branch seeking assistance with the inspection of an instrument or, in the event of the school already supporting an instrumental programme, deals directly with the instrumental teachers servicing the school. The branch is also happy to act as an agent for a school regarding the locating of a suitable, second-hand instrument. This service is often called upon by schools in country areas.

2. No significant changes have taken place in recent years regarding the numbers and types of firms and individuals involved in sales of second-hand musical

instruments to schools. However, during the last six years, at least two firms have established an instrument hire service. A number of schools and parents of instrumental students have availed themselves of this service.

FURTHER EDUCATION EMPLOYEES

48. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the nature of the information contained in the personal files of Further Education employees?

2. When was the current policy regarding personal files laid down and how does it differ from previous policy?

3. Under what circumstances are such files destroyed?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The information contained in Department of Further Education personal files is associated with the qualification, promotion, classification, leave, resignation and other matters relevant to departmental service. Not all personal files are as yet completely updated.

2. Following lengthy negotiations with the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the policy regarding the use of personal files was formally approved by the executive of the Department of Education on 27 March, 1980. Previously there has been no formally documented policy regarding personal files in the Department of Further Education. Officers of the Management Services Branch are responsible for the maintenance of personal files and the method adopted generally followed the system operating throughout the South Australian Public Service.

3. No personal file is destroyed. When employees terminate their service with the department, information on personal files is placed on microfilm and filed in departmental archives. The storage facility used in this instance is located in a lock-up area in the basement of the Education Centre. This area can only be accessed by officers of the Management Services Branch.

NEW SCHOOLS

49. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many new schools will open at the beginning of 1981, where will they be located, and what form of construction is being employed in each one?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Four new schools will open at the beginning of 1981. They are Hackham South Primary, Leigh Creek South Area, Reynella East High, and Stirling North Primary. Hackham South will be provided in high quality relocatable buildings in 1981 with work commencing upon solid building accommodation at the start of that year in readiness for the opening of the school year 1982. Leigh Creek South Area will be built in Hassell materials fitting into the general town concept. The project is planned in conjunction with the Electricity Trust.

Reynella East High will be a solid school. During this year the first students at Year 8 level were housed within the Primary School as a deliberate planning measure. The excellent Primary, Secondary relations that exist will be enhanced when the secondary school becomes an entity in its own buildings. Work will begin upon the final stage of the school to accommodate students past the 600 mark during 1982 for the opening of the school year 1983. Stirling North Primary is being built in Demac and will be available at the start of 1981.

AUCHMUTY INQUIRY

53. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Further to the reply to question number 702 of the last Session, is it the Government's intention to make any submission to the Auchmuty Inquiry and, if so, when will it be made and who is preparing it and, if not, is the Government aware that the working party was set up by its predecessor to make such a submission, why has it decided to amend its function, when was the amendment decided upon and when was the decision conveyed to the working party?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The South Australian Inquiry into Teacher Education was established with terms of reference which make it quite clear that its responsibility is to report to the Minister of Education and that its relationship with the National Inquiry into Teacher Education, chaired by Professor Auchmuty, is one of co-operative independence. Those terms of reference have not been changed. Because of recent changes in the circumstances of individual members and the need to co-ordinate the work of the inquiry, with related investigations being carried out by the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia and the new Inquiry into Education under the chairmanship of Dr. John Keeves, the South Australian inquiry has recently sought and gained approval to have its lifetime extended. It will now report to the Minister by the end of August.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

74. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister intend to further travel overseas in 1980 and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) what countries will he visit;
- (c) what is the purpose of the visit;
- (d) who will accompany him and for what purpose; and
- (e) what will be the cost?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

- (a) Possibly in November/December 1980.
- (b) Jordan, Tunisia, Algeria, Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom.
- (c) To follow up proposals and investigate trade possibilities based on transfer of agricultural technology.
- (d) Director-General of Agriculture, as technical adviser.
- (e) Estimated cost is \$17 654, although this amount could be considerably reduced with hospitality being provided by foreign governments.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE EMPLOYEES

76. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: What number of people are expected to be employed in the Department of Agriculture under the Public Service Act, as at 30 June 1981?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: 743.

GYMNASIUM

101. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the future of the gymnasium at the Adelaide College of Arts and Education?

2. Is it intended that the gymnasium will continue to be available to classes conducted by the Institute of Fitness Research and Training?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Adelaide College of the Arts and Education proposes to retain the gymnasium in its current form, although modifications are currently being made to the change rooms to meet the special needs of performing arts students. During 1980 the Kintore Avenue gymnasium was utilised almost exclusively during the week by students of physical education. From next year, with the opening of the new physical education complex at Underdale, the gymnasium will be more readily available for use by performing arts students, the Institute of Fitness Research and Training and for student and staff recreation.

2. See reply to 1 above.

I.M.V.S.

106. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In the Division of Clinical Chemistry at the I.M.V.S., how many positions are there, what are they, when was each created, what are the duties of each and who at present fills each of them?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There are 72 positions, of which some were created as far back as 1939. Many positions have been repeatedly reclassified over the life of the institute and it would be an extremely difficult and costly procedure to attempt to trace each back to its origin. Many weeks of research would be required to establish this information and for this reason this detail has not been provided. Attached is a summary which provides other details on each position in the Division of Clinical Chemistry at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

MINISTERIAL ASSISTANTS

176. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. In relation to Ministerial assistants—

- (a) how many are there now;
- (b) why is it necessary to have them;
- (c) who are they, to which Minister is each assigned, what are the duties of each, and what salary does each receive; and
- (d) is the Government contemplating appointing any more and, if so, when and why?

2. How many Ministerial assistants were originally appointed by the Government soon after it took office?

3. Was it not then the policy of the Government not to appoint additional Ministerial assistants?

4. Has the Government adhered to that policy and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Sixteen.
- (b) To assist the Ministers in the performance of their Ministerial duties.
- (c) See attached.
- (d) Not at present.
2. Fifteen.
3. No.
4. Not applicable.

Name	Assigned to	Duties	Salary
Hon. C. R. Story	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$24 432 p.a. + 25 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Feuerheerd	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$24 365 p.a.
Mr. G. Laughlin	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 25 per cent allowance
Mr. M. Cundy	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. J. Kimpton	Deputy Premier Minister of Mines and Energy	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 20 per cent allowance
Mr. D. K. Pearce	Minister of Industrial Affairs Minister of Public Works	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 15 per cent allowance
Mrs. J. Williams	Minister of Industrial Affairs Minister of Public Works	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$14 977 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. L. Crosby	Minister of Education Minister of Aboriginal Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Miss P. Graham	Chief Secretary Minister of Fisheries Minister of Marine	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Miss D. V. Laidlaw	Minister of Local Government Minister of Housing Minister of Arts Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$18 430 p.a.
Miss V. Emerson	Minister of Agriculture Minister of Fisheries	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$14 051 p.a.
Mr. D. Hansen	Minister of Environment Minister of Public Works	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. B. A. Edwards	Minister of Transport Minister of Recreation and Sport	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. B. P. Griffin	Minister of Transport Minister of Recreation and Sport	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$14 977 p.a.
Mr. R. Worth	Minister of Community Welfare Minister of Consumer Affairs	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. L. Z. Nowak	Minister of Water Resources Minister of Irrigation Minister of Lands Minister of Repatriation	To assist the Minister in the performance of his Ministerial duties.	\$21 648 p.a.

MINISTERIAL PRESS SECRETARIES

177. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. In relation to Ministerial press secretaries—
 - (a) how many are there now;
 - (b) who are they, to which Minister is each assigned, what are the duties of each, and what salary does each receive; and
 - (c) is the Government contemplating appointing any more and, if so, when and why?
2. How many Ministerial press secretaries were originally appointed by the Government soon after it took office?
3. Was it not then the policy of the Government not to appoint additional press secretaries?

4. Has the Government adhered to that policy and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Twelve.
- (b) See attached.
- (c) Yes, as soon as possible. The present situation is that the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Agriculture share the services of a press secretary as do the Minister of Local Government and the Minister of Health. The Government considers each Minister should have a press secretary to carry out the duties set out in 1. (b).
2. Eight.
3. Yes.
4. It has been found that a press secretary shared between two Ministers is unsatisfactory.

Name	Assigned to	Duties	Salary
Mr. M. Stone	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 25 per cent allowance
Mr. M. Quirk	Premier Treasurer Minister of State Development Minister of Ethnic Affairs	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 25 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Yeeles	Deputy Premier Minister of Mines and Energy	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 20 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Trowbridge	Attorney-General Minister of Corporate Affairs	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. C. Rudd	Minister of Industrial Affairs Minister of Public Works	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Ms. L. Blieschke	Minister of Education Minister of Aboriginal Affairs	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Rickards	Chief Secretary Minister of Fisheries Minister of Marine Minister of Agriculture Minister of Forests	To assist the Ministers in the dissemination of information relating to their portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Lower	Minister of Environment Minister of Planning	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. R. G. Burnett	Minister of Transport Minister of Recreation and Sport	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. D. Lewis	Minister of Community Welfare Minister of Consumer Affairs	To assist the Minister in the dissemination of information relating to his portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. R. Lawrence	Minister of Local Government Minister of Housing Minister of Arts Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs Minister of Health Minister of Tourism	To assist the Ministers in the dissemination of information relating to their portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance
Mr. A. A. Luks	Minister of Water Resources Minister of Irrigation Minister of Lands Minister of Repatriation	To assist the Ministers in the dissemination of information relating to their portfolios.	\$21 648 p.a. + 10 per cent allowance

APPRENTICES

180. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many apprentice carpenters does the Highways Department have at the Northfield depot?

2. Is it proposed to put off any of them at the end of the year and, if so:

(a) how many;

(b) why;

(c) what notice will they be given; and

(d) what help will be given to them to find other jobs?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Eight.

2. Apprentices are only guaranteed employment for the period of their indenture. This is because the department may not have work available for them when they complete their apprenticeship. All apprentices were advised, prior to indenture, that a job would not necessarily be available

on completion of their apprenticeship. The final year apprentices have been reminded of this and formal notice will be given in early October, that is at least three months prior to completion of their apprenticeships. The total period of notice will, therefore, be a minimum of six months. The number of final year apprentices to be retained has not yet been determined. Reasonable time off with pay will be given for apprentices to attend employment interviews, together with such personal assistance as can be reasonably expected.

TODD ELECTORATE OFFICE

191. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: On what basis did the Minister approve the shift of the Todd electorate office from Hope Valley to Dernancourt; is the rental at the new location nearly double that in the old premises and what was the cost of outfitting the new premises?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The relocation of the Todd electorate office was approved in accordance with the lawful authority of the Minister of Public Works. Rental for the new accommodation is \$3 900, plus rates and taxes. Rental for the former electorate office was \$1 960. It should be noted that the higher rental is in part off-set by the inclusion of carpet, partitioning, light fixtures and air-conditioning. Commissioning costs for the Dernancourt office were \$1 342.

CANTEENS

200. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many people are employed in the operations of firms such as Jiffy Foods?

2. Are the meals supplied by this firm to Edwardstown industrial establishments not large enough to have a canteen, having an impact on the livelihood of the proprietors of delicatessens and lunch shops located near such industrial establishments and if so, are the employment prospects of the employees in these small businesses placed at risk and, if so, would the number of jobs at risk be greater than the number of jobs created within the Jiffy Foods operations?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. Information on the number of employees and other details of individual business enterprises, gained by officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment in the course of their official duties is privileged. If the honourable member wishes to know how many people are employed in certain firms, he should enquire at those firms.

2. It is not appropriate for the Government to be expected to answer this question.

MICROGRAPHICS CENTRE

203. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

What are the Government's intentions concerning the implementation of the previous Government's plans for a Government Micrographics Centre?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Micrographics Bureau has been operating at the Education Building, 31 Flinders Street, Adelaide since September, 1979.

245T

211. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How much 245T was used in South Australia during 1978-79 and 1979-80, respectively, and how much of it was used by Government departments, statutory authorities and pest plant boards, and which?

2. When was 245T first approved for general use in South Australia?

3. What are the trade names of 245T products and mixtures approved for South Australia, and what is the percentage of 245T in each product or mixture?

4. For which plant species does the Department of Agriculture recommend using 245T for control programmes?

5. What is the minimum size of containers of mixtures in which 245T is present and what warnings are required on the labels?

6. What is the maximum level of dioxin permitted in

commercially available 245T products, and how often is this level checked, and by whom?

7. For what operations is 245T essential?

8. Does the Government have a policy of reduction of use of 245T and, if so, what is it and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Sales figures indicate that approximately 8 000 litres of 245T of various concentrations were sold in South Australia each financial year during 1978-79 and 1979-80. How much was used is unknown.

Government departments over the years have purchased on average about 10 per cent of the annual sales. During 1979-80 Government departments probably used no 245T. The exact usage by pest plant boards is unknown but probably has not exceeded 100 litres. Most boards do not use 245T at all.

2. 245T was first recommended as a herbicide for blackberry control in 1950. It has been a registered agricultural chemical in South Australia since 1958.

	Per cent 245T
3. (1) Lane 245T Amine 20 Herbicide	20
(2) Weedone BK 32 Low Volatile Selective Herbicide	8
(3) Weedone Special Liquid Concentrate Selective Herbicide	36
(4) V-23 Blackberry Killer	25
(5) Agchem Pty. Ltd. Blackberry 80	80
(6) Farmco T-80 245T Ester Herbicide	80
(7) Elderado "But-Weed" 80	80
(8) Hortico Blackberry & Tree Killer	40
(9) ICI Butoxone 80 Selective Weedkiller	80
(10) Nufarm Five T Brush Killer	80
(11) Lane Blackberry and Tree Killer	20
(12) Lane 245-T Butyl Ester 40 Herbicide	40
(13) Lane Brushkiller 40 Herbicide	20
(14) Tordon 1040 Basal Bark Herbicide	40
(15) Tordon S-20 Herbicide	20
(16) CRC Ban-Oxalis	20
(17) Tordon 105 Herbicide	20
(18) Lane Creeping Oxalis and Clover Killer	20
(19) Farmco TLV-40 Low Volatile 245-T Ester Herbicide	40
(20) Lane 245-T Butyl Ester 80 Herbicide	80

4. 245T is recommended to control:

- (1) African boxthorn
- (2) Apple-of-sodom
- (3) Blackberry
- (4) Cape honey-flower
- (5) Castor oil plant
- (6) English and cape broom
- (7) False caper
- (8) Furze
- (9) Horehound
- (10) Mesquite.

5. (a) The smallest container of 245T available on the market holds 100 millilitres.

(b) Warnings on the label appear on all products and are determined by the National Health and Medical Research Council. They must also be approved by the Registrar of Agricultural Chemicals.

Warnings state:—

POISON

NOT TO BE TAKEN

KEEP OUT OF THE REACH OF CHILDREN
READ SAFETY DIRECTIONS BEFORE USE

6. The maximum levels of TCDD (sometimes called dioxin) permitted in commercially available 245T products is 0.1 ppm (one part in 10 million).

Levels of TCDD in all 245T products are checked

annually in each State. Samples are taken by State Departments of Agriculture or Health on behalf of the Commonwealth Department for Primary Industry, and analyses are performed by the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories.

7. In South Australia 245T is essential to economically control those weedy species listed in answer to question four.

8. The Government actively supports a policy to keep to a minimum the use of all herbicides and pesticides. In the case of 245T the Government acknowledges the 1978 report of an "Enquiry into the use of 245T in South Australia" initiated by the then Minister of Health. Those involved in that inquiry unanimously agreed that there was no scientific evidence of a casual link between the use of 245T and human birth defects. Just recently a further detailed scientific examination of 245T has cleared the chemical's safety so that the Government at present sees no reason to place any additional restrictions on the use of 245T. A technical 'position' paper on the subject is available from the Department of Agriculture on request.

PRIMARY PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE

216. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Have any primary producers affected by the bush fires in the Adelaide Hills and Coonalpyn applied for assistance for the transport of stock to agistment or for the transport of fodder to their properties and, if so, have the applications been approved, and, if so, how much money has been provided and is the assistance in the form of a grant?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: There were 9 applications (8, Adelaide Hills; 1 Coonalpyn) received for Freight Concession assistance in terms of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967 from victims of the bush fires on 20 February 1980. All applications have been dealt with and approved. Total value of advance is \$2 910. The advances have been made as grants representing 50 per cent rebate of the freight costs incurred in moving stock to and from agistment and/or the cartage of fodder.

LOBSTER FISHERY

218. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many rock lobster authorities have been transferred each year from 1972-73 to 1979-80?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The administrative work involved in obtaining this information could not be justified at the present time.

RETRENCHMENTS

221. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. In which regions and divisions of the Department of Agriculture have the 180 weekly paid employees been retrenched in accord with the answer given by the Minister to a question on 5 June 1980?

2. How many retrenchments have there been to date in each division or region?

3. Which programmes have been diminished or cancelled due to lack of manpower?

4. How many of the 180 weekly paid employees who have been retrenched have been found alternative employment in other Government departments?

5. What is the estimated savings in wages in 1980-81 from this reduction?

6. How many weekly paid staff remain in the Department of Agriculture?

7. Are further reductions intended for 1980-81 and if so, how many?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There have been no retrenchments in the Department of Agriculture as suggested by the question. My answer to the Hon. Mr. Arnold on 3 June 1980 advised of certain reductions in positions which is quite a different proposition from the retrenchment of staff. However, the following information is pertinent to the question:

All of the 180 weekly paid employees were located in the Plant Industry Division of the Department.

—152 were short term workers who were employed to cope with the additional workload during the fruit fly eradication programme.

—28 were employed to carry out work associated with the Aphid Task Force project and either ceased work of their own volition during the term of the project or at the end of the project.

2. Not applicable.

3. There have been no reductions in Department of Agriculture programmes due to lack of weekly paid manpower.

4. Not applicable.

5. Not applicable.

6. As at 4 August 1980, 259 weekly paid employees were being paid.

7. In line with normal procedure the continual need for all positions is being reviewed on vacancy.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

222. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Which six public service positions in the Department of Agriculture will be abolished as indicated by the Minister in answer to a question on 5 June 1980 and in which division or region will these positions be abolished?

2. What programmes will be diminished or cancelled as a result of these reductions in manpower?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: No Public Service Act positions will be abolished as suggested by the question. The reduction of six positions referred to in my answer on 3 June 1980 resulted from a national reduction in the level of funding available from the Commonwealth Extension Services Grant (C.E.S.G.).

PRAWN FISHING

223. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many Ministerial permits to trawl for prawns are there for Investigator Strait?

2. What is the appropriate number of prawn fishing units for the Strait?

3. Does the Government intend to convert the Ministerial permits into authorities for this zone?

4. Will the zone be merged with St. Vincent Gulf zone?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Five.

2. An appropriate number has not been determined.

3. No.

4. Not at this stage.

SQUID FISHING

224. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What squid ventures will be operating in waters off South Australia during 1980-81, who will be involved in them, and where will they operate?

2. What representation has been made by the Government on behalf of South Australian fishermen for involvement in squid fishing ventures?

3. What representations have been made by the Government on behalf of South Australian processing companies, when were they made, and have they been successful?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. No applications for off-shore squid fishing ventures have as yet been processed by the Commonwealth for the 1980-81 season.

2. The Government has supported the increased involvement of Australian fishermen in the exploitation and utilisation of the squid resource.

3. The Government has supported processors in asking for:

- (a) Landing of a percentage of the catch in Australia.
- (b) Packaging of part of the landed catch as product of Australia.
- (c) Processing of part of the catch for market evaluation purposes.

SALVATION JANE

226. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the Government appear before the Supreme Court to oppose the case of the graziers and bee-keepers who are seeking to prevent the release of biological control agents for salvation jane?

2. Will the Government present to the court the cost-benefit study prepared by the Department of Agriculture which shows that, in most cases, the costs of biological control of salvation jane in South Australia outweigh the benefits?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: As this matter is *sub judice*, it is inappropriate to comment.

OVERSEAS PROJECTS

227. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the Government made any *ex gratia* payments to Australian Agricultural Consulting and Management Ltd. in response to their public claims for consultancy fees with regard to South Australian Government overseas projects and, if so, how much and with what justification?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: No.

SOIL CONSERVATION

228. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Where does the Minister intend to declare the additional soil conservation boards that he considered necessary in a reply to a question on 5 June 1980?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The decision as to where additional Soil Conservation Boards will be formed will be made when the full details for proposed Commonwealth funding for Soil Conservation are known—probably following the forthcoming Budget. Boards will thus be

formed where they are considered necessary to help implement an approved group conservation scheme under this programme.

RAILWAY SERVICES

232. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When was the Minister first advised of the proposed curtailment of passenger services on the Australian National Railways for the—

- (a) Peterborough line; and
- (b) Gladstone line?

2. Has the Minister or his department had discussions with the A.N.R. or the Federal Minister of Transport with respect to a reduction of interstate passenger services from Adelaide and, if so, when and what interstate passenger services were discussed?

3. Does the Minister agree that a daylight Melbourne interstate passenger service from South Australia should be introduced?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

- 1. (a) 22 February 1980;
- (b) 7 May 1980.

2. No.

3. Under the terms of the Railway Transfer Agreement the State Government has the right to object to the cancellation or reduction of rail services by the ANR Commission in South Australia, but the right to instigate new services lies entirely within the ambit of the Commission.

HELIPAD

233. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Government any plans to provide a "helipad" at the Adelaide Railway Station or in the near vicinity and, if so, when and who will operate the services?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority is presently negotiating a lease of portion of the Adelaide Railway Station Yard for a "helipad" with Lloyd Helicopters Pty. Ltd., the operators of the State Helicopter Rescue Service.

RAILWAY TICKETS

234. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many complaints has the State Transport Authority Rail Division, received from passengers in the last financial year with respect to the lack of ticket selling facilities on the concourse of the Adelaide Railway Station?

2. Does the S.T.A. intend to locate a ticket selling booth on the station concourse and, if so, where and when?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Five.

2. The redevelopment of the Adelaide station concourse is currently being considered by the State Transport Authority. Included in the Authority's considerations will be the future location of ticket selling facilities.

PENSIONER FARE SUBSIDY

235. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What was the amount of subsidy provided to

the State Transport Authority for pensioner fares in the 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80 financial years by—

- (a) the State Government; and
(b) the Federal Government?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

	\$
(a) 1977-78	\$1 212 000
1978-79	\$1 358 300
1979-80	\$1 504 800
(b) Nil.	

PALM VALLEY

236. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister had any discussions with the Australian National Railways with respect to cartage of Palm Valley oil and gas by rail to metropolitan Adelaide and, if so, what did those discussions entail?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

BALCANOONA STATION

242. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Who, at present, is the lessee of Balcanoona Station and upon what tenure?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Minister of Environment is the lessee of the Balcanoona Station. The term is for seven years from 8 February 1980. Crown Miscellaneous Lease No. 17672 refers.

243. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it the intention of the Government to declare any of the land (and which part of the land) now known as Balcanoona Station a national park and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. An announcement in this regard is expected in the near future.

REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

247. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is it the Government's intention to review regional boundaries?
2. Will this review apply only to the Education Department or will it involve other departments and instrumentalities?
3. Who will carry out the review and when, and why is it considered necessary?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Not in the immediate future, although the final report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia may contain some recommendations which might suggest that this be done. The Government will consider that matter at the appropriate time.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT CONFERENCES

254. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Minister intend to continue the annual staff conferences?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The holding of annual staff conferences in the Education Department is a matter for determination by the Director-General of Education. That

decision would be influenced by the cost involved and the importance of the issues for discussion. A decision in relation to a conference in 1981 has not yet been made.

CURRICULUM WRITING TEAMS

255. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Government intend to provide curriculum writing teams with word processors?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are no plans to provide word processing machines to curriculum writing teams in the 1980-81 financial year.

T.R.A. ALLOCATIONS

256. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What changes have occurred recently in the allocation of T.R.A. days to individual schools, why have these changes been seen as necessary and what changes are envisaged in the near future?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There have been no changes to the allocation of T.R.A. days to individual schools.

The following procedures are followed—

1. Target allocations are granted to schools in September each year for the following 12 months.

These target allocations are based on formulae established in 1977. These formulae have not been changed since that time.

2. As schools employ temporary relieving assistant days, so they are counted against the target allocation.

3. If a school approaches its target allocation, then the Principal is expected to apply to the appropriate Regional Director for additional days.

4. The Regional Director is expected to discuss the matter with the Principal and allocate days to cover the school's anticipated needs.

5. If additional days are required, then the above procedures are repeated.

6. If a Regional Director exhausts the pool of days that are held in the region, then he or she is expected to apply to the Director or Personnel for additional days.

These procedures appear to work well provided that the school Principal uses the resources available to him or her in a sensible manner.

TASKER REPORT

277. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the present status of the Tasker report "Prison Education in South Australia"?
2. Have its proposals been costed and, if so, what would be the cost to the Treasury of fully implementing them in the one financial year?
3. When are these proposals likely to be implemented?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Tasker report was endorsed by the previous Government (9.7.79). The report was launched by the current Chief Secretary and the Minister of Education. The proposals were supported subject to the provision of funding.

2. The proposals have been costed. The costs of implementation in one financial year amount to \$110 000 approximately.

3. The proposals are being implemented as resources become available. The Department of Correctional Services and the Education Department are maintaining

the programme with expansion where possible. Currently the Education Department has four teachers seconded to this area.

The proposals related to the Department of Further Education taking over prisoner education and other related developments have not been included in the D.F.E. 1980-81 budget.

ENDERSBY REPORT

278. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Minister read the Endersby Report?
2. What is the Government's attitude to its proposals?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. The Endersby Report proposes major changes to the promotion structure for teachers in Government primary and secondary schools. The Education Department is currently undertaking a review of transfer arrangements and of promotion structures and procedures for teachers. In conjunction with the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and using funds provided by the Australian Schools Commission, it is currently involved in a project known as the JESIFA Project, which aims to inform teachers of the current situation and to seek comment on future strategies. Included in this study is a consideration of the concepts contained in the Endersby Report.

The JESIFA Project team will provide a report towards the end of 1980. When this report has been studied, future strategies will be formulated by departmental officers for my consideration. Since the proposals contained in the Endersby Report are some of many options being discussed and considered, it would not be proper for me to comment on them until the report of the JESIFA Project is available.

FERRYDEN PARK SCHOOL

284. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has Mr. W. Marsh, Assistant Director of Personnel, been conducting an investigation with the following terms of reference—

“To determine:

1. the causes of dissension, conflict and tension at Ferryden Park Primary School which led to the collapse of the integrated services programme;
2. the role of the Principal in discharging his duties in relation to the school and the programme;
3. the guidelines to be laid down for the operation of integrated services in schools in general”, and if so, why, and if it is not yet finished, when will it be?
2. If such an investigation has been made—
 - (a) when was it finished and to whom has a report been made;
 - (b) what are the recommendations, if any, in the report and what action, if any, is to be taken as a result;
 - (c) will the Minister make available a copy of the report to the Ferryden Park Primary School Council and if so, when and if not, why not; and
 - (d) will the Minister make the report public and if so, when and if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr. W. C. Marsh, Assistant Director of Personnel, is

conducting an investigation at Ferryden Park Primary School with the terms of reference described by the honourable member. The investigation has not yet been completed, and it is not known when the investigation will finish.

2. The report will be made available to the Director-General of Education when completed. Until that time, it is not possible to say whether the report will be made available to the school council or not, or whether the report will be made public or not.

It should be noted that the terms of reference require Mr. Marsh to establish “the causes of dissension, conflict and tension at Ferryden Park Primary School which led to the collapse of the integrated services programme”. The investigation will range over a number of issues which affect not only the Education Department but other departments and agencies. Because of this, it may not be desirable to make the full report available to the school council or to the public generally. However, the school council will be advised of matters that are pertinent to it.

MOROCCO PROJECT

302. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the agronomist mentioned in the Minister's press release in January 1980 relating to the establishment of a South Australian project in Morocco taken up his duties and, if not, why not, and when is it expected that he will do so?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: No. The agronomist has not taken up his position, as the South Australian project in Morocco did not eventuate.

S.A.H.T. TENANTS

323. **Mr. CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does the South Australian Housing Trust receive tenants salary information from other Government instrumentalities and departments and private employers without the approval of the tenant and, if so, under what authority is this information obtained?

2. Are periodic checks made of income information provided by tenants when applying for rental accommodation?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. No trust officer is authorised to request information from employers without the permission of the tenant or applicant.

2. Systematic checks of applicants circumstances are not carried out by the trust. However, when applicants contact the trust to inquire about their applications, the trust takes the opportunity to bring all relevant details on applications up to date. Tenants who seek reduction in rent because of financial incapacity are requested to provide information periodically on their incomes.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

326. **Mr. CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Will the Minister request the South Australian Housing Trust not to remove an applicant's name from the list of persons seeking rental accommodation without the prior approval of that applicant and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: In assessing the demand for various types of housing the trust can only reasonably take

into account those applicants who have applied and are currently waiting to be considered for trust rental housing. It would be imprudent for the trust to plan its activities to meet the needs of those who have gone overseas, moved interstate or made alternative satisfactory housing arrangements without cancelling their application to the trust. Applicants are requested to keep the trust advised of any changes affecting their applications. This enables further consideration to be given when the application is coming into line, or if there has been a marked adverse change in circumstances.

An application is only removed from the current waiting list if an applicant fails to maintain contact over a considerable time, or the trust in endeavouring to contact by letter or home visit meets with no success. The application removed from the waiting list is not cancelled, but is held in a "reserve" file. An applicant who has not kept an application current may arrange to discuss the reasons why contact has not been maintained as required. In cases where it is justified, the decision is made to give benefit to the original date of the application.

MARTINS ROAD EXPRESSWAY

336. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the minimum distance of the houses presently being built by the South Australian Housing Trust on Martins Road (between Kings Road and Shepherdson Road) from the proposed alignment of the Martins Road Expressway?

2. How many houses are within six feet of this minimum distance?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. 27 metres.
2. One.

C.B. RADIOS

337. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: How many complaints have been received over the past 12 months by the South Australian Housing Trust regarding the operation of unsuppressed C.B. radios by trust tenants?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No records have been kept by the South Australian Housing Trust.

338. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the South Australian Housing Trust made any effort to control the activities of tenants who operate unsuppressed C.B. radios that disturb and create nuisance to neighbours and, if so, in what ways, and are any changes anticipated in the future?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. Where complaints are received regarding tenants who operate unsuppressed C.B. radios the tenant is reminded of his/her obligation under the "conditions of tenancy", not to cause or permit any interference with the reasonable peace, comfort or privacy of neighbours and advised to seek the advice of Telecom Australia if the disturbance is arising from a technical fault. The person lodging the complaint is advised to contact the Noise Control Section of the Department of Environment if disturbance is resulting from the volume at which the equipment is being operated or Telecom if the C.B. equipment is interfering with radio or television reception. No changes to these procedures are anticipated.