## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 September 1980

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

### PETITION: RETAIL MEAT SALES

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose any changes to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat was presented by Mr. Hamilton.

Petition 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*: questions on the Notice Paper Nos. 5, 7, 13, 20, 21, 27, 34, 35, 80, 240, 285, 307, 317, 322, 330, 335, 368, 370, 390, 391, 395, 402, 412, 413, 416, 420, 430, 431, 438 to 459, 464 to 470, 480, 482, 488 to 490, 497, 514, and 515.

### PORT LINCOLN ROADWORKS

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (31 July).

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The delay in commencing earthworks on the western approach road into Port Lincoln was caused by uncertainty with regard to funding of the work by the Highways Department. However, the District Council of Lincoln has now been informed that work can now commence on this project.

### YATALA LABOUR PRISON

In reply to **Mr. WHITTEN** (27 August).

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The information requested by the Hon. C. J. Sumner, M.L.C., was provided in a letter dated 15 September 1980.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: IRAQ

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Today's media contains disturbing reports of the escalation of hostilities between Iraq and Iran, and no doubt members will be concerned at the implications of these for Australian citizens, and South Australians in particular, working in that region of the world.

I therefore wish to assure the House that in so far as employees of the Department of Agriculture or its operating company Salger Proprietary Limited are concerned, we are liaising very closely with the authorities to ensure that the interests of these people are in hand.

Presently there is only one officer of Salger in Iraq, arranging transport of equipment to the South Australian project site at Erbil in the north of the country and in connection with other administrative matters. Departmental officers, in fact, have spoken with that person today, and he has been in touch with his family in Adelaide.

He is in Baghdad with other Australians on the advice of the Australian Embassy. From the broader point of view, the South Australian Government is remaining in touch with the Department of Foreign Affairs in order to keep abreast of that situation. Three other members of the team were due to leave South Australia for Iraq tomorrow, but their departure has now been delayed for one week, during which time the situation will continue to be monitored in association with the Department of Foreign Affairs.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Public Examinations Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

II. Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975—Supreme Court Rules, —Order No. 30.

III. Flinders University of South Australia—Report and Legislation, 1979.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Institutes Association of South Australia—papers, 1979-80.

II. Pirie Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Report, 1979-80

III. State Opera of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. South Australian Land Commission—Report, 1980.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1979-80.

II. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1980—Regulations—Various Amendments.

III. State Transport Authority, Rail Division—Disposal of Surplus Land Return, 1979-80.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Betting Control Board—Report, 1979-80.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978—Regulations—Prescribed Hospitals.

II. Health Act, 1935-1978—Regulations—Swimming Pools.

III. Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia—Report, 1979.

IV. Builders Licensing Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

## QUESTION TIME

### MALLTOWN

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Acting Premier say whether the State Government has had any discussion with the developer of the Malltown building, which was purchased recently by the State Superannuation Investment Trust, and has the Government given the developer any undertaking verbally or in writing concerning the leasing of any part of Malltown for Government office use? Members would have seen in Saturday's *Advertiser* that the Malltown building, which has had a chequered history,

had finally been sold after being passed in at a recent auction. The price paid for the building was less than the price at which it was passed in at the auction. The building was owned by I.M.F.C., principals of which had taken a leading part in the mounting and fund raising for the job-rot campaign in support of the Liberal Party at the recent election. The building has been bought by the Superannuation Trust, which has come to an arrangement with Mr. Emanuel, who will redevelop and manage the building, guarantee a minimum level of income to the trust, and will share any income in excess of that minimum with the trust. I understand that Mr. Emanuel is planning to continue retail activities on the ground floor and basement of the building, and that the top floor will be a mixture of restaurant and entertainment facilities, with the remainder of the building being looked at for office accommodation.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The answer to the question is "Not that I am aware of". The Minister of Industrial Affairs and of Public Works is responsible for Government accommodation, and he is not aware of any discussion, either.

## HISTORIC SETTLEMENTS

**Mr. OLSEN:** Can the Minister of Tourism say whether the working party, convened by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Tourism, will be calling for submissions from the public in the development of a formal strategy whereby historic settlements in South Australia will be designated heritage towns?

When will that occur, and what period does the Minister anticipate being made available for the preparation of such submissions? Following the recent joint press release by the Ministers, considerable interest has been expressed in the Cornish triangle in regard to participation in the concept of historic settlements and towns, as indicated by the Ministers in their press release, particularly in view of the considerable input that the triangle has made to the development of South Australia over a number of years.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that the District of Rocky River has a very rich heritage, which is very much bound up with the State's mining history and economic development. As all members would be aware, the importance of heritage to tourism is growing year by year, as more and more people become aware of the richness of Australia's culture and the importance of our becoming more aware of our past if we are to participate fully in the future of Australia's development. Visits to historic towns, precincts and monuments are becoming more and more a part of the tourist's programme. South Australia is fortunate in that it still has visually strong aspects of economic development, and the towns of Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina are examples of that, as are Burra, Robe, Goolwa and Port Adelaide. One could go on and on naming the important historic towns of South Australia.

I am not aware whether the working party intends to call for public submissions, but I can see the value of that being done. Honourable members may be interested to know the terms of reference of the working party, which have not yet been published, although they have been made available to the media. The membership of the working party, which is convened by the Department of Tourism, comprises representatives of the Heritage Unit of the Department for the Environment, the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, the Urban Conservation Committee of the National Trust, and the Local Government Association. The terms of reference are as follows:

*(a)* To investigate a proposal for designating "Heritage Towns" in South Australia, encouraging the restoration of historic precincts within such towns and promoting them as tourist attractions, leading up to the State's sesquicentenary year in 1986.

*(b)* To recommend procedures by which certain towns in South Australia can be classified as "Heritage Towns" for the purposes of the proposal.

*(c)* To recommend procedures by which appropriate restoration works are to be identified in relation to these towns.

*(d)* To recommend the nature and extent of Government and other financial incentives necessary to initiate such work.

*(e)* To recommend the most appropriate methods for undertaking the work.

*(f)* To recommend the nature and timing of the resulting tourism promotion campaign.

*(g)* To recommend methods for overcoming any deficiencies in existing tourist infrastructure identified during the investigations surrounding the proposal.

*(h)* To recommend appropriate action for incorporating the conservation aspects of the total proposal into future planning and development control measures.

*(i)* To provide details of the monetary, manpower and administrative requirements associated with these recommendations.

I have asked the working party to report to me by the end of the year. I shall certainly forward to the working party the honourable member's suggestion that public submissions be called and, if that is done, it may be necessary to extend the time given to the working party, but it could well save further time after the event when the Government considers the working party's recommendations.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** In view of the South Australian unemployment increase of some 2 200 from August 1979 to 45 970 in August 1980 (according to the Commonwealth Employment figures released today) and the increase in the unemployment rate from 7·3 per cent to 7·7 per cent, the highest in Australia, will the Acting Premier tell the House what measures the Government is taking to offset this rise in unemployment?

Last Tuesday, from memory, I asked the Premier, who was with us on that occasion, a question on unemployment. He questioned my judgment in relation to the A.B.S. figures, and said that the Commonwealth Employment Service figures were now the appropriate figures of which to take notice. It is apparent to me that there can be no retraction today from that situation because it is now the C.E.S. figures on which I am relying, and on which the Government relies. Can the Deputy Premier say what measures are to be taken to overcome this situation?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We all know perfectly well in this House where the explosion in unemployment occurred on the national scene and when unemployment in this State became the highest in Australia: it was the advent of the Whitlam Administration, in Canberra, which saw unemployment and inflation

go through the roof. We know that, during the life of Liberal Governments in this State, we, in South Australia, had the best employment figures of any State. We know that, if we are talking about the highest unemployment in the Commonwealth, something about which we are all not happy, we know when it occurred. The Deputy Leader has asked me what we are doing about it. I might well ask him what his Party did about it. We know perfectly well that the Labor Party, both Federally and in this State, indulged in short-term band-aid remedies such as the RED scheme. This Government is seeking to reduce taxes in this State to provide incentives, as we have done via the pay-roll tax concessions, which are far more generous—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** That isn't working very well.

*Mr. Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If I am allowed, I will make the point, so that even the honourable member who is interjecting will understand it. We are attempting successfully to make this State far more attractive to industry and capital than anything the Labor Party did while in office. I admit freely that a miracle would be required to bring overnight the sort of changes we want. It did not take long for the people of this country to realise what the Whitlam Administration had done, but it has taken them a bit longer to realise what was happening at the State level. The process was not quite so perceptible in the State sphere but, nonetheless, it was quite as relentless. The fact that we have the highest unemployment is fairly and squarely at the feet of the Party that now occupies the Opposition benches. We are applying conditions and incentives in South Australia which will improve—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** They aren't working.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** As I have said, we cannot expect employment to leap by thousands overnight.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** You said that—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I said that it would require a miracle, and that is beyond the ken of the Opposition. There are signs (and figures have been quoted in the House to show this) of a great upsurge in investment committed to this State, both in mining and in other areas. If the Opposition looks at those figures, it must admit that the signs are far more encouraging, and development will occur in this State that will have a very significant impact on unemployment.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member may say that. The public of this State knows perfectly well that the policies of the former A.L.P. Government of increasing Government expenditure, raising taxes, increasing the public sector at the expense of the private sector, where most employment is to be found, brought this State to the sorry position to which the Deputy Leader has referred. The recent figures show that on a national basis the percentage of the labour force unemployed has held steady at 6·2 per cent over the past year, a very significant achievement on the part of the Federal Government. In South Australia, there has been an increase from 7·3 per cent to 7·7 per cent.

However, the number of unemployed in South Australia during August fell by 439, and this represents a small fall in underlying unemployment. That is an encouraging trend. The Opposition chooses to take a short-sighted view of this matter that overlooks the fact that, while in Government, as I pointed out, it presided over the deterioration of the economy of this State so that it was unattractive to investors. We are now in the sorry position that this Government is setting about righting. That will come about only by investment in the private sector of the economy of this State. The incentives which this Government is providing, the alleviation of the crippling burden of taxes which the Labor Government imposed on the people of this State, will bear fruit. It ill behoves members opposite and their colleagues in Canberra who presided over this sorry state of affairs to question the moves which this Government is taking to see that the State becomes attractive to investment and to keep a tight rein on Government expenditure.

## NATIONAL PARKS

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Will the Minister of Environment say what is the current position regarding the funding for and staffing of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in South Australia? In the latest edition of the *Sunday Mail*, dated 21 September 1980, the Opposition spokesman on the environment claimed that South Australia could have a decimated National Parks and Wildlife Service under sweeping changes proposed by the State Government. The article referred to staff cuts and a $3 600 000 lack of funds which should see the service wound down to a level half of that needed for minimum efficiency. In view of the vast number of South Australians who use our parks daily, I therefore ask the Minister to clarify the position regarding the future of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I would first like to thank the honourable member for his question because I want to take some time today to answer it and to get some facts right about just what is happening in relation to national parks, because there are a number of quite blatant errors in the statement which was made by the Opposition spokesman and which appeared in the article in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend. Once again, that honourable member has chosen to attack the policies of the Government without doing his homework; and he has also relied on information in documents which he has obviously obtained through the back door—

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** What a joke!

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** —and that concerns me, just as it would concern the member for Hartley. It is of particular concern to me that the plain facts of the matter have been grossly misrepresented in the article last Sunday quoting the Opposition spokesman. Therefore, I want to take the opportunity to spell out clearly what is happening to the National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State. First, the article referred to so-called proposed staff cuts within the service. I want to make quite clear that at no time has there ever been any talk of staff cuts for the service, and the assertion made that the present number will drop to 150 is totally unsupported. The current staffing level of the service is 235, including trust employees, not 191 as suggested by the Opposition spokesman. As well, the Government has gone out of its way to try to increase staff numbers in the service. This year I approved the appointment of a senior fauna management officer, and the creation of nine new positions in the law enforcement area of the service.

That makes a total of 10 new positions in the service and, in addition, 15 redundant employees from other departments are being employed in the service. Also, outside assistance is coming from a number of consultative committees which have been or are in the process of being established. Only a fortnight ago, I announced the setting up of the first two of these consultative committees, one for the lower South-East, and one representing Fleurieu Peninsula. These committees are made up of local residents and landholders with an interest in the affairs of

the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and I am sure that their input will provide valuable assistance in the overall management structure of the service.

The previous Government received a recommendation from the Department for the Environment to increase National Parks and Wildlife Service staff numbers to 283. However, in accordance with the previous Government's staff ceiling policy of June 1978, that proposal was not proceeded with by the then Minister, the Hon. Dr. Cornwall, who now has the audacity, by plucking figures out of the air, to accuse this Government of cutting staff numbers.

The next point concerns a suggestion from the same honourable member that the name of the service be changed to the Nature Conservation Service. No doubt the honourable member has obtained this piece of information from a conceptual plan handed to all staff of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. I must stress that the Opposition spokesman has put his own interpretation on a departmental document, which is simply a conceptual structure plan for the new Department of Environment and Planning. The plan has been presented for comment to all departmental officers and to some members of interested community groups. When a prescribed period of time has elapsed and submissions have been received, the plan will be revised and refined, and the structure for the new department will be finalised. At this stage, any suggestion of a name change for the National Parks and Wildlife Service is only a proposal. I believe, and I think the majority of the staff agree, that the present name should be retained in the overall structure of the new department.

The next point concerns the winding up of three trusts referred to by the Opposition spokesman: the Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust, the Cleland Trust, and the General Reserves Trust. All three trusts have had the capacity to borrow $1 200 000 annually for park development since they have been set up. It is not proposed to continue with this form of funding owing to the increasing public debt for semi-government borrowing. I think we all appreciate that. In due course, all three trusts will cease operation, but development works for national parks will continue to be funded and at an increasing level over that of previous years. Park development expenditure will rise by about $5 000 000 in 1980-81, as compared with $3 500 000 in 1979-80. This has been brought about by a special funding package negotiated with the Treasury which provides for a three-year funding for all conservation, open space, and recreation purposes, a requirement of $41 700 000 for the next three-year period from 1980 to 1983. This funding allows an annual increase in the level of expenditure, and particularly provides for the completion of present trust funded projects, including the Thornden Park development and the establishment of an upgraded fauna reserve at Cleland. Rather than there being a short-fall of $3 600 000, as suggested by the Opposition spokesman, there will be an increase in funding for the service over the next three years. It is my intention that, from this point onwards, conservation, open space and recreation purposes funding will be on the basis of a rolling three-year programme.

Finally, the balance remaining in the trust funds for Cleland and general reserves will be applied in this financial year to the National Parks and Wildlife Service development programme. The Black Hill Trust on present estimates will require a further $1 800 000 to complete Black Hill and Thorndon Park up to the end of 1981 or early 1982 (I hope it will be by the end of 1981). Work costing $1 200 000 for development proposed by the Cleland Trust and a $900 000 development proposed and committed by the General Reserve Trust will proceed this year according to priorities that have been determined by the service.

Under the new funding arrangement proposed by the Treasury, I emphasise that over the next three years $41 700 000 is to be made available through the parks and wildlife system management for development works. This includes work at Black Hill and, as I pointed out, many other—

**Mr. KENEALLY:** On a point of order, Sir, would it be appropriate for me to move that the Minister's speech be incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it?

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member may not make facetious comments of that nature under the guise of a point of order. As the honourable member would know, a Minister has the responsibility of answering all questions in the manner that he or she sees best.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I understood that the member for Stuart's point of order was that the Minister was reading the comments that he was making; surely that was implicit in the point of order he made.

**The SPEAKER:** That is not the assumed point of order taken by the member for Stuart, and I do not uphold the point of order taken by the member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It just shows how much interest Opposition members have in this important matter. It is quite obvious that, having heard the one side put forward by their spokesman, they are not happy about getting the true facts in relation to what is going on.

In conclusion, I refer to the suggestion of the Opposition spokesman that the General Reserve Trust is to be replaced by a nature conservation foundation. This matter is being examined by the Government. The New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service has a useful foundation that was established by private individuals. I recently had the opportunity to go to New South Wales to see how well that project is going. The concept seems to me to make good sense, and I would suggest that most people would support the principles of such a foundation and not find it horrifying, as the Opposition spokesman has suggested in the article.

To sum up, Dr. Cornwall's assertions seems to run something like this—with cuts in funding of $3 600 000, there must be cuts in staff; therefore parks cannot be run properly, and that provides a valid reason for disposing of some areas. As the basic premise of cuts in funding is totally wrong, the whole basis of the somewhat weak argument is complete hogwash. I repeat that there will be no staff cuts, nor has it ever been suggested that staff cuts would be made. There will not be a cut in funding; rather there will be an increase in funding over the next three years. There will not be any disposal or selling off of parks to anyone, let alone farmers and mining groups, as has been ridiculously suggested by the Opposition spokesman.

I hope that my lengthy statement today has put the record straight, and that Dr. Cornwall will take note of how foolish his statements now look in light of the facts.

## PRISON SENTENCE

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Chief Secretary explain why it was necessary for a South Australian Supreme Court judge last Thursday to suspend a man's 49-month prison sentence, as the judge believed the Crown could not guarantee that the man could be protected from being sodomised if he was sent to a South Australian prison?

Does the Chief Secretary regard this as a serious indictment of the current situation in our prisons?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It would not be proper for me to comment on what His Honour has done. This Government upholds the decisions of the courts, and the whole concept of the courts in this country.

*The Hon. J. D. Corcoran interjecting:*

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It would be highly improper for me to respond to that interjection, because the judge has, in his wisdom, found this person guilty and has awarded a suspended sentence. It should be pointed out that inmates who have reason to believe that they are endangered if committed to a prison can ask for protection, and the authorities, after examining that request, may give it to them. Furthermore, it is proper for inmates to be shifted to other prisons.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** The Attorney-General gave no such guarantee last week to the judge, hence the judge's decision.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Be that as it may, as a result of requests recently from the Opposition we have seen to it, when there were fears for inmates, that they were shifted from certain prisons. In the case referred to by the honourable member, and that seems to be the issue being raised by the Opposition, the Department of Correctional Services was asked whether, in the event of someone's being committed to prison, measures could be taken to protect that inmate from some of the fears that had been expressed in the case. That information was given to the Crown, but of course, no guarantee can be given. I think that the information relayed was that every precaution is taken to ensure that prisoners who have fears of attacks are segregated or can be transferred to other prisons. I understand that that information was given to the Crown before the sentence was pronounced.

## DINGOES

**Mr. LEWIS:** Does the Minister of Agriculture have further information about whether or not the illegal practice of keeping dingoes as pets is abating?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I have recently received information about this subject, and I can understand the concern of the honourable member. Constituents of his and of mine, as well as those of other country members, are deeply concerned about the attacks on livestock that have been occurring. Before replying to this question about dingoes, I remind members that in the press recently appeared alarming reports of attacks on livestock by dogs in and about the metropolitan area. One of the most recent incidents reported was that of 17 September, when two German shepherd dogs were found attacking stock. Fortunately, one of them was shot. The press report outlined the concern of primary producers and livestock owners and is the sort of concern that is referred to by the member for Mallee. There have been two more recent reports, by officers from the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority, of dingoes within the metropolitan area. In the first instance, the owner of the dog has co-operated (as one would expect), and action is being taken, following the service of a notice on that property owner, for the dog to be disposed of or placed in a prescribed zoo. In the other instance, at this stage the owner is not being so co-operative. In fact, the alleged dingo's being on the premises was brought to the notice of our office because it jumped the fence into a neighbour's property, killed a pet, and then attacked the neighbour.

The matter was hence drawn to the attention of the authority's officers. In due course, a photograph of the dog was taken and, as far as our officers can ascertain, there is no doubt from the details shown in that photograph that the dog is a dingo. We only hope that sensible co-operation will be forthcoming from that owner so that that dog, too, can either be disposed of or placed in an authorised zoo. I point out that, in this case, the Tantanoola zoo authorities have undertaken to take care and control of the dingo (in fact, both of the dingoes to which I referred), and I can only say that we regret that we have not enjoyed co-operation in the latter instance.

I appeal to those people who either have dingoes on their premises inside the dog fence area of South Australia or know of others who are harbouring dingoes as pets to report to the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority in the Department of Agriculture so that steps can be taken to apply the law. Further, I take this opportunity to appeal to those people who have dogs that are not properly cared for in the community to control the dogs' habits in order to protect the very valuable livestock in our State. As I have said, this matter is of great concern not only to the member for Mallee and me but also to all members on this side who represent rural constituents.

## PRISON SENTENCE

**Mr. McRAE:** I direct a question to the Minister of Education or (should the Government consider the matter important enough) to the Acting Premier. Will whichever Minister answers the question explain to the House and to the community the attitude of the Attorney-General in relation to information sought by a Supreme Court judge in a criminal case last week, which information was not supplied by the Crown, and do the Minister and the Government approve of that attitude?

Honourable members may be aware, as this was reported in Friday's *Advertiser,* that a prisoner had pleaded guilty to several very serious charges, among them robbery with violence and armed robbery. The victim was a woman in the Port Adelaide area. The prisoner's counsel had made submissions late the previous week and the judge, who in that instance was the Hon. Mr. Justice Zelling, remanded the prisoner, as is the normal practice, for two or three days to permit mature consideration. In the interim, counsel for the prisoner received a letter from the prisoner in which he (the prisoner) alleged that a person whose name I will not mention at this stage (but whose name appeared in that letter that was subsequently shown to the judge—and I have seen the letter), who was a long-time inmate of Yatala Labour Prison and who is a convicted murderer, had threatened to sodomise the prisoner and also to perform other acts of physical violence on him.

The letter was shown to the judge, who inquired of the Crown's counsel on that day (and I do not say that it was Mr. Jennings who was there) about the truth of the matter, whether or not the allegations were correct and was there any explanation. He further remanded the prisoner for another two days to enable the Crown to be heard. When next the matter was called on, Mr. Justice Zelling inquired of the Crown Law officer then in attendance as to the answers to the questions he had put on the preceding two days. That officer indicated that his instructions were not to provide information. I point out that this is against any precedent known to the criminal justice situation in this State—absolutely without any—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now starting to comment. He will note that I have been taking advice, because it is a delicate matter. It is a case which has been concluded and, therefore, it does not come under the

*sub judice* rule; yet, there is still the possibility of an appeal from either side. I ask the honourable member, because it is so delicate a matter, not to get into the position, as he has just commenced to do, of commenting on precedent, etc. He has been dealing with fact, and I ask him to stay with fact, not with comment.

**Mr. McRAE:** I shall endeavour to stay within your ruling, Mr. Speaker. His Honour Mr. Zelling said that, in those circumstances (that is, that the allegations made by the prisoner were unrebutted by the Crown), he had to give the benefit of the doubt to the prisoner. He said (and this is a matter of fact, not speculation) that he had intended to sentence the prisoner to four years hard labour but that, because of the circumstance before him (that the Crown had not answered the allegations of the prisoner), he now proposed to release him on a bond. He said (and I think that the following are almost the exact words, if the *Advertiser* correctly reported them) that he had no alternative but to do so. Mr. Speaker, when I referred to precedent, I may have strayed a trifle, but perhaps I can say this and still be within your ruling. As I understand the Westminster system, it is the principal duty of the first Law Officer of the Crown to subordinate everything else to the truth. In other words, if information was available which suggested that the prisoner was endangered, then, within the Westminster system, it was the duty of the first Law Officer of the Crown or the Attorney-General to say that the prisoner's security could not be safeguarded. Alternatively—

**Mr. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr. EVANS:** I do not believe that the honourable member is explaining the question. He is debating what is the role of the first Law Officer of the State. I do not believe that that is within the realms of the explanation of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I will accept that debating an explanation is not permitted under Standing Orders. I have closely watched the information which has been put by the honourable member for Playford, and have asked that it be held to fact. He is indicating what is a factual interpretation of the Westminster system. Whilst not upholding the point of order, I point out to him that he sought leave to make a brief explanation, but the explanation is now getting far beyond a brief one. I ask him to come to a conclusion.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am certainly about to do that, Sir. I think I had reached the point of saying, before the point of order was taken, that, as I understand the Westminster system, it was the duty of the first Law Officer of the Crown, if he knew the answer, whether it was pleasant or not, to give the explanation to the court; or, if he knew not the answer, to say that, but it was not his duty, and quite contrary to his duty, to make no statement whatsoever. What I am endeavouring—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe that the honourable member has endeavoured long enough.

**Mr. McRAE:** Are you ordering me to resume my seat, Sir?

**The SPEAKER:** I asked the honourable member previously to come to an early conclusion. He asked to sum up the situation, and he has done so. I believe that he has given sufficient explanation for the answer to be given.

**Mr. McRAE:** Are you asking me to resume my seat, Sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr. McRAE:** I will do so, Sir, but only in response to your request.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member has indeed detailed his concern, and the House notes the gravity with which he views the situation. However, I am in no way familiar with the case; indeed, I have learned far more in the past few minutes than I was already aware of. I shall be pleased to take his request to the Attorney-General and ask that a report be brought down.

**Mr. McRae:** Quickly?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes.

## MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. OSWALD:** Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs confirm that he has become the father of a new son and heir last week and say whether this is an indication of his faith in the future employment prospects in South Australia? Also, will he accept the congratulations of his colleagues?

**Honourable members: Hear, hear!**

**The SPEAKER:** I will allow the question in so far as it pertains to the affairs of the State.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I must point out to the House that we have just set up a manpower forecasting unit. The predictions of the honourable member are quite correct. The answer is "Yes", and I thank him for his congratulations. Both mother and baby are well and bonny.

## ARMY CARGO

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Will the Deputy Premier, as the nominal senior defence person in South Australia (and I put no other meaning on the word "nominal" than is indicated), immediately make approaches to the Minister for Defence, Mr. Killen, to check out what was the cargo of a convoy of vehicles seen on 11 September this year on the highway in Western Australia between Balladonia and Nullarbor? I am informed that on the date that I mentioned, 11 September this year, near Madura, in Western Australia, a convoy of 14 International semi-trailers was proceeding in a westerly direction. The vehicles were painted white and the cargo on each semi-trailer unit was covered by tarpaulins. The drivers were dressed in army uniform and, when one of the drivers at a stop was approached by my informant, he was told that the cargo was nuclear warheads.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I seek your indulgence at least partially, Sir, but I believe I ought to be able to record that I am somewhat surprised at the levity of Government members on a matter which could be as serious as I am trying to outline in my explanation. My reason for putting the question to the Deputy Premier is clear. Certainly, he can be considered to have a responsibility only for the citizens of South Australia, and the incident to which I am referring is suggested to have happened in Western Australia. However, I believe it would be in the interests of everybody concerned if this matter could be investigated (and I believe I have suggested the correct channels) so that it could be cleared up as soon as possible.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member suggesting that the vehicles left South Australian territory to travel into Western Australia?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I find myself in some difficulty in relation to the difficulty that members always face when asking questions because of the interpretation of Standing Orders which apply in the House and so, in an endeavour to comply with my request, which was that I have an opportunity to make a brief explanation, I have purposely limited myself, in trying to give details about the matter on which I am asking for a response from the Deputy

Premier, to the details that I have been able to elucidate at this stage. I thank you for the opportunity to say that, in my endeavour to adhere to Standing Orders, I omitted to say that I understand that the vehicles, at least, came from or went through South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** On the basis that they do have an application to South Australia, I allow the admissibility of the question.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Your intervention, Mr. Speaker, has put a complexion on the question completely different from the way in which it was explained. I thought I detected an interjection, when you asked whether South Australia was involved, prompting the honourable member. The interjection was "No". The whole tenor of the question was predicated on the premise of something happening in Western Australia. There must be a fair element of doubt regarding what the honourable member is on about and where it occurred. There was no mention of South Australia in the explanation he gave to the House. Although there may be some nominal responsibility on me in South Australia in relation to such matters, it is a Federal responsibility. As the whole of the explanation was involved with something alleged to have happened in Western Australia, I would have thought—

**Mr. Keneally:** Nullarbor—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member named the towns in Western Australia. I would have thought that the proper course of events would be for him either to approach his Leader to write to Mr. Killen or to ask his Federal member of Parliament to write to Mr. Killen.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You don't care.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not saying whether I care or whether I do not care. It is not within the purview of my responsibilities if it happened in Western Australia. I suggest that, if the honourable member wants to get the appropriate State authorities worked up about it, he should write to the Premier of Western Australia. To suggest that I, as Minister of Mines and Energy in South Australia—

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** As Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** —or as Acting Premier should approach the Federal Government on something which is alleged to have happened in Western Australia seems to be quite out of order. I would have thought that the honourable member's own knowledge of the Parliamentary institution would have told him that. There is no way in which I can see this as a sensible way to go about it. I believe that, but for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, the question would have been out of order, and I think the honourable member had to hedge his bets on that. His explanation indicated that what he is talking about occurred in Western Australia, in a Federal jurisdiction, and I suggest that he should get his Leader to the barrier to write to the Federal Government or that he goes to a Federal member.

## MOTOR REGISTRATION PAPERS

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Transport inform the House regarding the practicalities of having declared on vehicle registration papers the status of ownership of the vehicle and whether or not a lien or encumbrance is held over that vehicle? Motor vehicle traders have informed me that they have sometimes traded a second-hand vehicle, only to find at a later date that a finance company has a lien over the vehicle. My constituents advise me that, in the case of land transactions, a mortgage or lien has to be noted on the land title, thereby indicating to any prospective buyer the state of ownership. If the registration papers of a vehicle were similarly endorsed, any prospective buyer would be informed of any encumbrance on the vehicle.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The honourable member's question is similar to one asked by the member for Mallee a few days ago relating to the same subject. In reply to the member for Mallee, I said that the Government was in the process of investigating the question of title for motor vehicles. A joint committee has been set up by me and the Minister of Consumer Affairs to look at the question in detail. The proposal contains several advantages, but it also contains disadvantages. When the committee has brought down a report, I shall let the honourable member have further information.

## RADIATION

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will the Minister of Health say when the South Australian Health Commission will acquire proper monitoring equipment to undertake adequately radiation checks where hazards may be suspected? Last week, in reply to a question from the member for Mawson, the Minister said that radiation levels at a uranium core depot at Lonsdale were lower than those found on the steps of Parliament House. However, I have been told that the Minister neglected to mention that the Health Commission does not yet possess the proper equipment to measure radiation, a fact which has been pointed to in reports by South Australian Health Commission scientific officers. This includes Mr. D. J. Hamilton's report, which pointed to the lax safety standards at Amdel's inner city plants, and to Mr. Peter Crouch's report on the B.H.A.S. radiation problem.

I am told that the current South Australian Health Commission equipment cannot quantitatively detect alpha radiation and cannot measure the hazard caused by the radio-active gas radon, which is emitted from time to time from uranium ore. Persons at a public meeting at Christie Downs last Thursday evening, a meeting highly publicised by Liberal Party members in this place, felt that the Minister had set up the member for Mawson who was present but apparently was not aware of the shortcomings of the public briefing she had given him in this Chamber.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I believe I have indicated in the House on previous occasions that the equipment referred to is on order and is expected to be delivered soon. The honourable member will see from the Budget Estimates that provision has been made in the Estimates of Expenditure for the purchase of this equipment.

## *SWEET SWEETBACK'S BAADASSSS SONG*

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Can the Deputy Premier state whether the Government will adhere to its original decision to ban the public showing of the film *Sweet Sweetback's Baadassss Song* and indicate what considerations were taken into account in its deliberations in determining its original decision?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Government supports entirely the actions of the Attorney-General in this matter, as indeed does the Government Party. I was surprised to see that the shadow Attorney-General is condemning the actions of the Attorney-General in relation to this film, because in 1978 the Criminal Law (Prohibition of Child Pornography) Bill, which amended the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, was introduced into

this House and gained unanimous support. As I remember it, the then Premier, among other things, said:

> We on this side of the House do not believe in child pornography, the abuse of children or the supporting of it in the law in any way.

If my memory serves me correctly, the then Premier went on to say that he did not really think that the amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act were necessary, because there was no way in this State that anything involving child pornography would get a classification. So I read with some surprise the public stance of the shadow Attorney-General in relation to this matter.

Perhaps some of the relevant background would be useful to give some balance to the debate so far reported to the media. We made it perfectly clear in this House in 1978 that, in response to great public reaction in relation to child pornography, we believed that in South Australia we should not be party in any way to materials which involved child pornography.

In the first place, this film is not a new film; it was made, I understand, in the early 1970's and it was then refused a classification. I am further informed that the Commonwealth Censorship Board was not unanimous in giving this film a classification but that it was a majority decision, and the attention of the Attorney-General of South Australia was drawn by the Commonwealth Censor to the fact that he believed that this film could contravene the child pornography laws of South Australia. From the reports that I have of this film in its opening sequences it depicts a boy of about 12 years of age having sexual intercourse with a black prostitute.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I understand it is a negro boy, and the clear legal advice that we have is that that scene contravenes—

**An honourable member:** You are a racist lot, you are.

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible comment.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is quite irrelevant to the point I am making.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Well, why did you—

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! I will not warn the member for Napier again.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am trying to outline to the House the detail of the film which puts it into a class which legal opinion tells us, and I would think common sense would tell us, clearly contravenes the law as it was intended by this place in 1978.

**Mr. Bannon:** Have you seen the film?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have not seen the film. However, we have received a description of what is depicted in the film, and I will be quite willing—

**Mr. Bannon:** Disgraceful!

**THE SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Government has had the content of this film described to it by the Attorney-General and other people who have seen the film, and it is quite clear that what I am outlining is an accurate account of what the film depicts in the opening sequences.

The Attorney-General is charged with the responsibility of administering that Act. It has been suggested that in some way or another the responsibility should be spread. Of course, it is spread to the Government, but the Government acts on the advice and information given by the Attorney-General, as it does on other matters on which Ministers give it advice. The Government entirely backs the stance of the Attorney-General in this matter. From the legal advice that we have received the film is clearly in breach of the Act, and the superfluous matters that are brought in that it is a work of art, and so on, are not germane to this question at all. Either that debate in this House in which members of the Opposition were unanimous was a sham or the Attorney-General is doing his duty and upholding the law as was dictated by the passage of the Bill. They are matters which the Government has considered; either that Bill was a sham and we throw it out of the window, or by some devious means we seek to circumvent it, or we uphold the law as it stands.

The Attorney-General has seen the film. The Commonwealth Censor had grave doubts about it in relation to the law in South Australia and drew the attention of the Attorney-General to that fact. If the debate in this House on the Bill was a sham, perhaps others will come out with the shadow Attorney-General and condemn what the Attorney-General has done in this matter. The Government certainly does not—it supports him.

### *H.C. MEYER*

**Mr. PETERSON:** Is the Minister of Marine aware of the rapidly escalating cost of maintaining the *A.D. Victoria*, hired as a replacement dredge for the *H.C. Meyer*? I believe the dredge was contracted as a bare ship, the Department of Marine and Harbors to supply manning and to maintain the vessel for the term of the contract. Since it arrived and has been put into service, I am told that substantial maintenance and replacement have been required to keep the dredge in operation, and this has all been to the cost of the people of South Australia.

I am told that it is quite possible that the *A.D. Victoria* could be returned to its owners in much better condition than when it was hired, and the people of South Australia will still have to finance the purchase of a replacement dredge.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The honourable member canvasses specialist opinion. My advice is that the *A.D. Victoria* has been carrying out its service satisfactorily. The honourable member talked about the high costs of replacements and other matters that I will have to discuss with the Director of Marine and Harbors. I shall be pleased to do so and to bring down a full report for the honourable member.

---

## FORMER POLICE COMMISSIONER SALISBURY

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I lay on the table the report of the Attorney-General to the Premier in relation to additional information concerning the dismissal of former Police Commissioner H. Salisbury. I do this in response to repeated requests from Opposition members that this information be made available.

*At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

## LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Loans to Producers Act, 1927-1962. Read a first time.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I move:

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

It proposes an amendment of the principal Act, the Loans to Producers Act, 1927-1962, relating to the fixing of

interest rates on loans made under the Act. The principal Act empowers the State Bank of South Australia to make loans to assist primary production. The Act also provides that interest is payable on all such loans and that the rate of interest is not to be less than the rate payable by the Treasurer or the State Bank on Loan moneys out of which the loans are made.

These provisions have meant that rates on loans under the principal Act have been tied to the long-term bond rate, which has varied relatively infrequently. However, with the introduction of a new system for issuing Commonwealth bonds, the requirement that the rate of interest on loans to producers be not less than that payable by the Government on its borrowings would probably necessitate fixing new rates too frequently for reasonable administrative convenience. Accordingly, this Bill proposes that the rate of interest on loans under the principal Act be fixed by the Treasurer on a quarterly basis having regard to the rates of interest payable by the Treasurer and the State Bank on Loan moneys out of which the loans are made.

The Bill also proposes that a provision be included in the principal Act designed to remove doubts as to the effect on existing loans of any variation by the Treasurer of the rate of interest fixed under the Act. Under the provision proposed, the rate of interest payable would vary according to the rates fixed by the Treasurer, from time to time, in the case of all loans other than loans made before the commencement of the amending Act that did not, by their terms, make provision for such variation.

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Clauses**

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 9 of the principal Act which provides for the fixing by the Treasurer of interest rates on loans made under the Act. The clause amends this section by requiring that the rates of interest on loans made under the Act be fixed by the Treasurer having regard to the rates of interest payable by the Treasurer and the State Bank on loan moneys out of which the loans are made. The clause also requires that the Treasurer review the rates for the time being fixed under the section on a quarterly basis.

Clause 4 proposes a new section 11a defining the term "fixed rate" for the purposes of sections 10 and 11. The effect of this definition would be that the rate of interest payable on loans would vary according to the rate fixed by the Treasurer, from time to time, in the case of all loans made after the enactment and commencement of this measure and in the case of loans made before that commencement that made provision for variation of the interest rate. In the case of loans made before that commencement that did not make provision for variation of the interest rate, the interest rate fixed at the time the loan was made would continue to apply for the period of the loan.

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

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 944.)

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** Last week, when I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was referring to a paper on the Fraser Government's submission to the national wage case, and I continue those remarks. The Commonwealth has based much of its stance on the wages issue on its contention that some degree of real wage over-hang exists in the economy. It must therefore be presumed that the Commonwealth would have formulated different submissions, possibly allowing a greater degree of indexation, in later periods if its submissions in earlier periods had been wholly or partly implemented. In making its submissions the Commonwealth, like all the parties concerned, can only base its plea on the level of wages and state of the economy actually obtaining at the time of the hearing. The Commonwealth's stance can therefore be looked at only on a wage-case to wage-case basis, not as a cumulative process over time. In this sense, the meaning attached to the figure of $127·95 is therefore difficult to assess.

One possible interpretation of this figure might be gained by looking at the problem from a completely different angle. If the Commonwealth submissions had always been adopted, resulting in this figure being achieved, the general price level in the economy would most likely be somewhat lower than it is now. However, it must remain a matter for conjecture as to what the relationship would be between the resulting real wage and the real wage presently obtaining in the economy.

I have a table setting out the movement in the average minimum wage for the period June 1975 to March 1980, and it relates to the change in c.p.i., the Commonwealth submission, the Commonwealth minimum wage, and the wage decision, and also the wage case minimum wage and the actual minimum wage. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the information purely statistical?

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Yes.

Leave granted.

MOVEMENTS IN THE AVERAGE MINIMUM WAGE

| Period | Change in c.p.i. per cent | Commonwealth Submission | Minimum Wage (C'wealth) $ | Wage Case Decision | Minimum Wage (Wage Case) $ | Minimum Wage (Actual) $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1975 June | | | 112·78 | | 112·78 | 112·78 |
| September | 0·8 | Carried over | | Carried over | | 117·67 |
| December | 5·6 | Full 0·8, 50 per cent of 5·6 | 116·84 | Full 0·8 + 5·6 | 120·00 | 117·95 |
| 1976 March | 3·0 | 50 per cent, plateau on minimum wage | 118·59 | Full to $125 + $3·80 thereafter | 123·60 | 125·78 |
| June | 2·5 | 30 per cent indexation | 119·48 | $2·50 to $166 then 1·5 per cent increase | 126·10 | 129·68 |

MOVEMENTS IN THE AVERAGE MINIMUM WAGE—*continued*

| Period | Change in c.p.i. per cent | Commonwealth Submission | Minimum Wage (C'wealth) $ | Wage Case Decision | Minimum Wage (Wage Case) $ | Minimum Wage (Actual) $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| September | 2·2 | Zero | 119·48 | Full | 128·87 | 132·41 |
| December | 6·0 | $2·90 for Medibank only | 122·38 | $5·70 | 134·57 | 135·29 |
| 1977 March | 2·3 | Zero (0·4 devaluation)* | 122·38 | 1·9 per cent to $200 then $3·80 thereafter | 137·13 | 141·10 |
| June | 2·4 | Zero (0·7 devaluation) | 122·38 | 2 per cent | 139·87 | 143·95 |
| September | 2·0 | Zero (0·5 devaluation) | 122·38 | 1·5 per cent | 141·97 | 146·84 |
| December | 2·3 | Zero (0·19 devaluation and 0·35 oil prices) | 122·38 | 1·5 per cent to $170 + $2·60 thereafter | 144·10 | 149·08 |
| 1978 March | 1·3 | Zero (0·3 oil prices) | 122·38 | 1·3 per cent | 145·97 | 151·39 |
| June | 2·1 | Zero | 122·38 | 4 per cent | 151·81 | 154·55 |
| September | 1·9 | | | | | |
| December | 2·3 | Zero (0·8 oil prices and 1·1 taxes) | 122·38 | 3·2 per cent | 156·67 | 161·16 |
| 1979 March | 1·7 | | | | | |
| June | 2·7 | 5 per cent minus 0·45 for oil prices** | 127·95 | 4·5 per cent | 163·72 | 167·07 |
| September | 2·3 | | | | | |
| December | 3·0 | Zero (due to substantial non-compliance) | 127·95 | 4·1 per cent | 170·43 | 176·33 |
| 1980 March | 2·2 | | | | | |

*Implies that no increase is sought but that if wages are to be indexed the change in the c.p.i. should be adjusted downwards by a certain amount, in this case being ·4 percentage points due to the devaluation component of the increase in prices.

**In the submission relating to the June and September quarters of 1979, the Commonwealth argued that if some sort of social contract could be struck by the Government and the unions, the Government would support some degree of indexation. The c.p.i. figures forming the basis for the indexation would, however, have to be adjusted for the effects of Government policy. In this case the Commonwealth might have allowed indexation of 4·55 per cent which is the figure which has been used in the above Table. It might be argued that since the unions rejected any such arrangements, the Commonwealth might have therefore argued for zero indexation in this period.

Sources: Commonwealth Submissions to the National Wage Cases.
Decisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Commission.
Australian Bureau of Statistics—Wage Rate Indexes.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** It is clear from the paper to which I have referred that the purchasing power has been considerably lowered. One of today's most important problems is rising costs, and people in need of welfare cannot cope with the way in which prices are always rising. Welfare agencies are facing a crisis and can no longer cope with the demands being placed on them. Unemployed persons, pensioners, families with children, and the army of Australians living below the poverty line are growing rapidly. It is a case of the poor getting poorer, and yet this Budget will further disadvantage these unfortunate people. There is no way in which this Government can say, "We are making this State great." What the Government should be doing is hanging its head in shame. I hope that all Government members will read my speech. If they have not already read the speech that I delivered last week in this Chamber—

**An honourable member:** What was that about?

**Mr. ABBOTT:** —then I implore them to do so. That interjection shows clearly how interested Government members are in the welfare of the under-privileged people of this State. I implore the Deputy Premier to direct Government members to read my speech in order to absorb what I have said, and it may give them some feeling for the under-privileged people in the community. I do not think that any Government member has been poor in his lifetime. Government members do not know what it is like to be poor. They should have a lot of feeling for the people to whom I have referred. If the Deputy Premier does not believe that Government members are giving sufficient consideration to these important issues, he should let the members have a day off so that they can read what I have said and do something about it by showing some responsibility toward the under-privileged people of this State. This has not been done in the Budget. The situation will grow worse, and the Government will be in real trouble by not adequately offering the financial assistance necessary to support the people to whom I have referred.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I again raise the issue of the O'Bahn bus system that has been proposed by the Government because it will be a matter that will have a significant effect on the Budget lines of the Minister of Transport and thus deserves the serious attention of the House, because much has been said about the cost of the O'Bahn system compared to that of the l.r.t. system. I first respond to the comments made not only by the Minister but also by the members for Todd and Newland on other occasions. Some weeks ago, when the Minister announced that the O'Bahn bus system would be introduced, he referred in this House and at other places to my comments in the Address in Reply debate. He was referring to comments I made about the ability of the O'Bahn buses to be pushed out of the guideway. He quoted me as a source, saying how favourable I had said this system was in relation to the O'Bahn bus. I know that the Government members are poor in support of the Minister's arguments,

but it must be a record when he has to go to Opposition benches to find such support, an unusual approach in the Westminster system. However, he was not being entirely honest and correct, in that he was not fully summing up the situation that I had summarised in my Address in Reply speech.

I said that it was possible for a bus coming along on the guided busway to push out a fully loaded bus on the O'Bahn system. That is possible. Indeed, we must acknowledge that that is a somewhat impressive feat. Nevertheless, I went on to say (and the Minister has totally ignored this) that this can be done only with time table disruption. The buses cannot be pushed out at the same speed as that at which they ordinarily travel in the course of a journey being undertaken without mishap, and that must mean complications for buses coming along farther down the line. The same cannot be said about the l.r.t. system; as I said in my Address in Reply speech, an l.r.t. vehicle that breaks down can be pushed along the system at a better speed than can an O'Bahn bus. It is a pity that the Minister did not refer to those comments.

Indeed, I would have to concur in the comment made in a report to the Minister of Transport in November 1979 by Messrs. Waite and Miller, who said:

> There could also be industrial and mechanical problems in pushing buses in service which would need to be resolved.

The Minister has given that aspect no attention. I make the point that it is technically possible for a bus to push another bus along the system to a break in that system. I did not go on to refer to the other problems that must, of consequence, come from that type of action, and the Minister's attention had been drawn to that as early as November 1979, but he has given no response to that aspect in this House.

I am pleased to see that the member for Todd has entered the House, because he also commented on a number of occasions on what I said, and he also failed to pay attention to a number of the comments that I went on to make. In listening to the member for Todd, I was surprised that the member for Fisher did not raise a point of order, because in the first session of this Parliament, when I quoted some words of the Deputy Premier, used by the Deputy Premier when he was speaking in the House in that session, the member for Fisher rushed to his feet to raise a point of order that it was not allowed by Standing Orders that a member quote from *Hansard* of the present session. I was duly reminded of that fact by the Speaker, and I accept the Standing Orders and the tradition of this Parliament. Whether the member for Fisher was sleeping in his seat when the member for Todd was speaking, I do not know: however, the member for Fisher failed to raise a similar point of order against the member for Todd on that occasion. I do not for a moment suggest that the member for Fisher was biased in any way; he must have been asleep.

The member for Todd stated that I was not accurate in what I said, and he stated that I was not correct in regard to a particular area. He said that I asked the question, "What about the safety of buses travelling at 80 km/h on a guided way and the pedestrians nearby?"; he said that I obviously had no understanding of the situation, because there will be no pedestrians in the guided section where the buses travel, and the guideway will not go along any suburban roads or streets. The original proposition put by the Minister in this House before his statement was made some weeks ago, which endorsed the principle of the O'Bahn, referred to only one bridge across the Torrens River. The Minister suggested that the Government was considering the O'Bahn going down streets other than the route finally adopted. In the absence of any statement from the Minister that the guideway would be entirely along the Torrens River system, I believe that it was reasonable to assume that the guideway would go along ordinary road systems.

That assumption was reasonable, because the Essen experiment that is so often quoted in this House by Government members involves a system that has guided busways along ordinary roads. Two-thirds of the Essen system, of which much is being made (and honourable members will remember how lengthy it is), runs alongside an ordinary road, and one-third runs in the middle of a road. Is it illogical that I assumed, in the absence of any statement by the Minister to the contrary, and in the presence of a statement by the Minister that supported the fact that it would run along ordinary roads, that the guideway would go along ordinary roads? That is the case in regard to the much quoted Essen system. The Minister has announced that the system will not go along ordinary roads in the Adelaide situation and I accept that, because the Minister made a clear statement to that effect, probably the only clear statement he has made in regard to the O'Bahn system. At the time the statement was made by me, given the facts available, the implication was logical.

We must go a little further in regard to the Essen situation, because, as I say, this system has been quoted as the great proof that O'Bahn works. It has been said that, because the city of Essen is installing this system at great expense, the system has been tried and the authorities are satisfied that it will answer their public transport needs. However, the one point that is not made clear is that this project is not entirely commercial. The Essen project is being sponsored by the German Federal Ministry of Research and Technology; in other words, it is still experimental. It is an on-site experiment in a German city. That situation cannot be compared with the Adelaide situation, unless I am mistaken—perhaps in the Budget papers we will see a subsidy from the German Ministry of Research and Technology, but I have not yet noticed it. The Essen project is not entirely commercial.

**Mr. Ashenden:** What about Hamburg?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The honourable member mentions Hamburg: let us consider that situation. The O'Bahn situation in Hamburg, about which I was told in Rastatt, intrigues me; the system was built two years ago. I thought, "This is fantastic; there has been a system in existence for over two years that has been carrying passengers. Some studies of how well it has worked must have been done." The system was in operation for some months and was nothing more than an experiment. It was shown merely as an exhibit. The system is not operating now.

**Mr. Ashenden:** That is incorrect, and you know it.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is not operating at this time. When I was told that the Hamburg project was no longer operating, I asked myself, "Why is the Hamburg situation raised as a pilot project of significance for us?" The project was used at an international exhibition in order to display the expertise of German transport engineering that even the city of Hamburg has not taken up. One wonders whether the Minister will be a little more factual when he describes the situation that the member for Todd talks about. The project in Regensburg: I would be interested to know whether that project is being subsidised by the German Federal Ministry of Research and Technology. That would change the whole situation. If we could be guaranteed that the Ministry will help pay for our O'Bahn system, it may not be a disaster as serious as we anticipate, because some of the funds would be picked up overseas.

**Mr. Ashenden:** What about Bangkok?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** What about Bangkok?

**Mr. Ashenden:** Are they going to subsidise that one, too?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** When did Bangkok make a decision? How long did it take for them to make a decision? That system has been in the pipeline for three years. They were trying to work out whether it would be of any benefit.

As I mentioned in my Address in Reply speech, there are options other than full O'Bahn, including the installation of kits in existing buses. If the Minister wants to experiment with little toys from Rastatt, he should consider more realistic ways of going about it than through the State purse. I was informed when I was in Rastatt that it is possible to convert ordinary buses that we have presently to the O'Bahn system; it is possible to add a knuckle to buses at a cost of about 7 000 Deutschmarks and reports available to the Minister cite figures of that order. The sum of 7 000 Deutschmarks is about $3 500. If the Minister wants to experiment with this system, why cannot he cut down the cost to merely the installation of guided busways and use buses that are already in the system by converting these buses to the O'Bahn system by adding knuckles?

Buses already serve the north-eastern areas. Buses are on order to service the express routes to the north and south, which surely will liberate buses that could be used in the north-east. That would mean that, if the Minister finally decides that the project does not have the great viability that he hoped, the cost of cutting the losses would not be extreme. The cost would merely be the excess money spent on the guided busways; this would not be a total loss, because they could be converted to l.r.t. rail routes. The only cost would be the knuckles that he had to put on the buses; these could be sold to Simsmetal at the end of it. Instead, he has decided at the outset, on what is still an experiment, to buy the complete bus system and units. That particular aspect was not wise, even if he wanted to go ahead with the O'Bahn experiment.

I come back to converting the track to l.r.t.: I was intrigued when the Minister made this announcement. He was interviewed that night on a current affairs television programme and commented that, indeed, the guided busway for an O'Bahn bus can be narrower than an l.r.t. track. He also said that the guided busway track here would be the same width as the l.r.t. track proposed under the NEAPTR scheme. I suggest that that means he is hedging his bets. He does not want to let the House know that he is doing so, because he wants to ensure that the system is still capable of taking an l.r.t. later. That is a wise decision (if he is insisting on playing around with O'Bahn) not to go to the minimum width but to take it to the width proposed under NEAPTR. He deserves credit in that regard.

When in Rastatt, I was taken around the experimental field in that city (one of the two involving the O'Bahn system), where they let me know the details of the project and showed me films and various documentation, after which I had long discussions with the O'Bahn officers. I was able to ask questions to which, in many regards, the answers were interesting indeed.

**Mr. Keneally:** Had they heard of the member for Todd?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** No. That is a pity, because it might have made life interesting to meet such a person. One of the things that amazed me was that I was not convinced that there was a great level of knowledge at Daimler-Benz about the circumstances dealing with the Adelaide situation and the north-east transport problems. The officers to whom I spoke did not seem to me to have any experience of the particular transport demands we have in this city, of the options we had to meet those demands, or the way in which O'Bahn could answer them. In the limited time I had, and with the limited information I had at my fingertips, I gave them some aspects of it, and thought perhaps that I had met some officers of Daimler-Benz who were not fully *au fait* with the situation. I thought they may be exceptions and that perhaps other officers knew more about the Adelaide situation but had not been available on the day I was there.

When I returned to South Australia, I was interested to read a report by Herr Hubertus Christ, a gentleman from Daimler-Benz, dated 13 June 1980, under the publishing auspices of the Department of Transport, though, it comes from an employee of the Daimler-Benz Company. He made the following comment:

> Considering the limited knowledge of the local problems at this time, only a few fundamental remarks about the various options can be made. Various problems which have arisen in connection with the track-guided buses should be cleared up in further discussions.

That merely endorses the feeling I had, which was that there was limited knowledge of the local problems. He goes on to say that the need is there for further discussions. I hope that the Minister will enlighten the House on what discussions have taken place, if there have been any such discussions, so that we can be satisfied that Daimler-Benz is fully aware of what are the transport demands and of what we are expecting the O'Bahn system to provide so that it can, therefore, take full responsibility for any product it is selling to us as trying to meet all our transport needs. That report was dated 13 June 1980 (some months ago). Only a short time ago, I was in Rastatt myself, and I was exceedingly disappointed that should be the case, namely, that the same feeling should be in a report directed to the Minister by the Department of Transport itself.

In my Address in Reply speech I also referred to and commented on the flexibility of the O'Bahn system. I said that the system was nowhere near as flexible as had been mooted. I had assumed that, when the large articulated buses reached the end of the route, they would follow one principal corridor through the suburbs of the city of Tea Tree Gully, and the other routes would be fed in by feeder buses. The Minister corrected me and said that my assumption was wrong. He said that articulated buses would be feeding off the guided busway all over Tea Tree Gully and that all routes would be fed in by articulated buses. That could happen. The O'Bahn system is flexible to that extent, and to that extent we could have 150 passenger buses romping all over the city of Tea Tree Gully. However, that seems a gross over-capacity of passenger carrying and a gross inefficiency of fuel capacity within that area. I believe that the original l.r.t. proposal of high-capacity vehicles being fed in by low-capacity feeder buses was much more efficient in terms of fuel and passenger capacity, but we are not to have that system.

We are to have these large articulated buses, which must travel empty along large sections of their route, in the city of Tea Tree Gully, or be only minimally loaded, achieving nowhere near a significant loading ratio of their 150-passenger capacity until half way down to the actual entrance to the guided busway. That seems to be a gross misuse of the passenger capacity that could be available. It could be done much more cheaply by the use of feeder buses. We have had evidence quoted of l.r.t. systems using feeder buses all over the world that do not have the traumatic problems, which the member for Todd has suggested, of having people going through the arduous task of changing from a feeder bus to an l.r.t. system, and making better use of the capacity thereby. In my district,

we are used to the concept of feeder buses. Quite a few services are nothing more than feeder buses to the railways—a system that works well. I have not been besieged by the wailings and gnashing of teeth of constituents of mine who find this one of the hardest tasks in life to meet, one of the great hurdles they have to cross in their journey from the cradle to the grave; indeed, they accept it as a means of improving the transport facility available to them. They like it, and they use it. I use it, and I find that it works well.

Among other things which I ask about (and I wonder whether much study has been done on this) is the long-term impact of these articulated buses going up suburban streets in the city of Tea Tree Gully. Has it been proposed by the Minister that the city council of that area will be recompensed in some way for the heavier loading those buses will provide on suburban roads? The present councillors for Tea Tree Gully and those to come in years ahead will have to answer that. They will be coming back to future Ministers, who, we know, will be Labor Ministers, to ask for the funds.

I return now to the comments of the member for Todd, and also to those made by the member for Newland. They have both made some very disparaging comments in recent weeks about the former member for Newland, Mr. John Klunder. The member for Newland went so far as to claim that the former member, Mr. Klunder, had been spreading false and mischievous information about the O'Bahn system. Indeed, the member for Todd said the same, and in an article in the *North-East Leader* he says that the Light Rail Action Group and Mr. Klunder are placing before the public misrepresentations of the facts. We seem to agree on that. It is the most agreement we have had in debate this afternoon between the two sides of the House. I was very interested in that, because I think that any misrepresentation of the facts should be searched out and investigated to find out whether there is any truth in the allegations. I did not have to look very far, because the former member for Newland is a very able person who does his homework and researches things properly. He wrote a letter to the *North-East Leader* which was published in the edition of 17 September 1980. He answered the charge about spreading false and mischievous information, by saying where he got the information from. I will quote from that letter, in which he says:

> I obtained the information from a booklet entitled "Progress Report on a Technical Evaluation of Guided Buses—North-East Corridor". It was published under the direction of Mr. Michael Wilson, the Liberal Minister of Transport.

We are being told by the member for Newland that that is false and mischievous. We are being told by the member for Todd that that is a misrepresentation of facts. Mr. Minister, if I were you I would move further along the bench rather than have those members sit so closely behind your back, if that is what they are suggesting about a report directed to you. I do not think that that is a good way of operating in that regard.

I want to go on to mention one or two examples of light rail transport systems that are in use, because I believe that they have proved themselves to be successful. Indeed, in my trip through Europe I took advantage of l.r.t. systems in quite a few cities and was very impressed by the way they operate. I found the systems in Brussels and Frankfurt and other cities were very impressive and able to meet the needs of transit passengers.

I want to talk about the Denver light rail system that has recently been initiated by that American city. That city has adopted a policy in favour of l.r.t. after an extensive evaluation of the transport options open to that city. I would like to quote from a study that it commissioned and the report that came as a result of that study. There were significant findings, and they are as follows:

> The light rail network likely would more than double the region's transit ridership over that of the bus system alone.

More significantly:

> The cost of carrying the additional passengers would be about 40 per cent of the operating and maintenance cost of an expanded bus fleet necessary to attract these riders. The light rail system can be tailored for compatability with the unique alignment opportunities and constraints presented by these corridors . . .

Like Adelaide, Denver has constraints of adapting a present inhabited area to a new type of transport. I would be interested to know whether officers of the Minister's department have seen that report and what was their analysis of that report and of the Denver situation compared with the Adelaide situation. The Minister may like to think on that for a minute.

I also ask whether he will find out whether officers of his department have investigated the San Diego proposals to go to a light rail transit system in preference to extended busways or O'Bahn busways, and find out how that compares with the situation we have in Adelaide.

There are certain features of the O'Bahn technology which are interesting—certain features which I think are impressive. I found the subway construction system of the O'Bahn a very impressive one. I am told it is 20 per cent cheaper than standard subway systems. For a city that wanted to put in a subway system, perhaps it would have some greater relevance than other transport modes. However, it is not of any particular use to us.

Also, the ability of drivers to drive down these guided busways at 80 kilometres per hour, if they can be guaranteed there will be no nearby pedestrians, holding hands or twiddling thumbs must inspire some sort of amazement. Whether that answers the needs we have, I do not think has been seriously put before this House at this stage. I think that the move into the O'Bahn system at this point by the Minister could be regarded in no wise as being a sound one. We will become the first solely commercial application of O'Bahn. (I have mentioned that the others are being subsidised.) Is that a move that this Parliament, about to vote on the Budget involving transport items, should willingly or lightly take? Should we be prepared to commit funds, committed by people of this State, so lightly on a project of this nature? I feel that the long and lengthy work done by the previous Government into the NEAPTR scheme involving light rail transit has been very sound. The fact that this is only being delayed (and I believe it is only being delayed: I believe in fact we will be seeing l.r.t. in the years to come, as the O'Bahn proves itself not to be successful) cannot serve the interests of the north-east residents at all well.

I think that, finally, some years from now, even the Minister himself and the members for Todd and Newland will be saying in this House that the O'Bahn was nothing more than the ultimate Irish joke.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** The Budget presented by the Premier on behalf of his Government a few weeks ago emphasises quite clearly the economic direction the Government is taking. Most important, of course, are the social consequences which will arise from those economic decisions. The areas of community services, welfare services, health, consumer protection, education, recreation and sport and so on, are in the Budget significantly reduced in funds, and these are all areas that are important to the quality of life of the ordinary citizen in the community.

The Budget, therefore, has a much wider implication than just the economic situations or matters with which it principally deals. It contains, of course, the continuing philosophy of this Government to attack in every way possible community services in the public sector, in the mistaken belief that the private sector will take up the slack and that it is a cure for all our economic ills. Nothing could be further from the truth.

**Mr. Lewis:** How do you know?

**Mr. SLATER:** I will tell you how I know. I make a comparison with the honourable member's Federal counterparts, who have been responsible for the highest unemployment this country has seen since the great depression and thereby creating social injustices and widespread poverty within the community. It might be of interest to the member for Mallee and the House to know that the Catholic church has done a survey which indicates that 2 000 000 Australians are living on or below the poverty line. I believe that this can be laid at the feet of the Federal Government, and the attacks on the public sector which have characterised the Fraser Government are again being perpetrated by the Tonkin Government in this State.

At present, we have a multiplicity of reviews and inquiries into various aspects of the public sector, all designed to reduce the Public Service and its effectiveness wherever possible. Perhaps in the long term the so-called small government of the Tonkin Government will be more costly, in monetary terms and otherwise, to the South Australian community. Recently, we have been treated (and I use the word advisedly) to a full-page advertisement in the press headed, "We are making this State great", and listing the achievements of the Government over the past 12 months. We realise, of course, that this is a political advertisement, paid for by the Liberal Party.

The list of achievements, however, is thin. It emphasises, for instance, that death and gift duties have been abolished. This may be so, but the abolition of those duties will assist mainly the wealthy section of the community. Before the abolition of death duties, figures showed that 85 per cent of duties paid came from less than 15 per cent of the population. In fact, the abolition of duties previously paid has assisted the wealthy. There has been a shift in the tax burden from the wealthy sector to the middle and low income earners.

I well remember the Premier, some 15 or 18 months ago, waxing eloquent in this House and outside on the merits of the Californian proposal, proposition 13, a proposition which has been debunked by many people in California and elsewhere, because it is really a shifting of the tax burden from the wealthy to the middle and low income earners. The Premier was vocal in his support of that proposition, and I believe that his Government has perpetrated a similar proposition on the people of South Australia.

The next so-called achievement of the Liberal Government in its first 12 months in office was the abolition of stamp duty on the first home. That assists, to a limited degree, young people in the community purchasing their first home, but it has had no significant effect on the building industry, which has depreciated quite considerably over the past 12 months.

**Mr. Lewis:** Would it improve if we abolished the rebate?

**Mr. SLATER:** I do not think it would make any significant difference, because the real problem is not the $500 concession on stamp duty but the interest rates and costs involved in the purchase of houses. The tax concession has had no effect whatever in assisting the housing and building industry. In today's press, I read a report headed, "Our housing depression 'to continue' ", quoting a statement by the Chief Executive of the Housing Industry Association. The report states:

> The depression in the State's building industry seems certain to continue, according to the Housing Industry Association. The warning was sounded by H.I.A. chief executive, Mr. Don Cummings, following release of the latest building industry figures. Commencement of new buildings has slowly risen over the past 12 months, but latest approval figures for new works have dropped.

**Mr. Lewis:** There was some improvement.

**Mr. SLATER:** A very minor improvement, but it did not affect the situation over a period of 12 months. The report continues:

> Mr. Cummings said: "It seems the current depressed situation will not alter for some time. There is no real sign of a change on the way and we look like operating at a level of around 8 000 new buildings a year." Four years ago yearly commencements were running at around 14 000. The latest H.I.A. figures show monthly approvals for housing were down by 7·4 per cent in the private sector—

and this is interesting—

> and 94·2 per cent in the Government area, compared with the same time last year.

That is most significant. The report indicates that the Housing Industry Association Chief Executive believes that there does not appear to be any significant improvement in the building industry in South Australia.

While our building industry is at its lowest ebb, many contracts are going to interstate contractors. For instance, work on the Morphettville grandstand, despite competitive tenders by South Australian building firms, was given to a Victorian-based firm. Worse, all of the furniture and fittings are to be contracted interstate. The rebuilding of the Morphettville grandstand is being assisted by a Government guarantee of $4 500 000 but significantly, to me anyway, a Victorian-based building firm has been given the contract.

**Mr. Keneally:** It's our State, mate.

**Mr. SLATER:** The Government is making our State great.

**Mr. Keneally:** Yes—grate!

**Mr. SLATER:** It depends how we interpret the word. The full page advertisement referred to other matters on which the Government claimed achievements, one being special registration rebates for electrically propelled vehicles. I am sure the populace in general will be overwhelmed by that—it is not much of an achievement! Another of the achievements listed states that the Government will halt the costly and environmentally destructive NEAPTR scheme and introduce the O'Bahn north-east transport system. The member for Salisbury dealt well with this matter this afternoon, and I shall add only a few comments to what he has said. The Minister of Transport and the member for Todd have endeavoured to justify the Government's decision in providing the people of the north-east suburbs with the O'Bahn bus system. Among other things, it was said that, with the O'Bahn system there will be significant cost savings in comparison with the l.r.t. system, but in fact the people of the north-east suburbs are being given a bus system which is probably not a great deal different from the system they have already.

**Mr. Lewis:** Safer and faster.

**Mr. SLATER:** That may be so. Time will prove whether I am correct or otherwise, but I believe that the decision was made purely on a political basis, that it was a political decision taken only for political reasons. The statement was made before the 1979 State election, and the Government was stuck with it. It had to make a decision in

favour of the O'Bahn system.

*Dr. Billard interjecting:*

**Mr. SLATER:** For the benefit of the member for Newland, I venture to say that the decision was taken by the Government contrary to all the advice of the Department of Transport and the technical experts.

**Mr. Lewis:** How would you know, Jack?

**Mr. SLATER:** I said that I would venture to say that. I am saying that this could have been the case, and I should like the Minister to say whether or not that is so. I think that the technical experts firmly believed that the l.r.t. system was the better service in the long term.

While I am discussing the Department of Transport, I want to refer to the Recreation and Sport Division. Recreation and sport have always been afforded a low priority by Liberal Governments, both State and Federal, and this Budget follows that pattern. The allocation of funds has been cut by about 25 per cent for the forthcoming year, which is a significant reduction for recreation and sport. The Loan Estimates allocation represents a considerable decrease in the total value of grants to be made available to sporting and recreational bodies in 1980-81. I think it is a sad situation that the Government does not recognise that the leisure time activities of the community are important. As its Federal colleagues have done in the past, it has come up with a rotten deal for sport and recreation. Despite the comments by the Minister of Environment this afternoon in regard to the comments by the Hon. Dr. Cornwall in another place in regard to national parks, I believe the comments made by Dr. Cornwall will eventually prove to be correct. This is another area in which the Government does not pay much attention to the recreation and leisure time of people within the community.

I mentioned a few moments ago the private housing sector, and I want to pay some attention now to the public housing sector. Last week in the other place the Minister of Housing tabled the South Australian Housing Trust annual report. Unfortunately, it is a fairly pessimistic report for the 18 600 applicants awaiting Housing Trust rental accommodation. The trust showed a deficit last year of $4 900 000 on its rental operation and an overall deficit of about $2 200 000, so it seems obvious that because of the deficit on rental operations, there will be a significant increase in Housing Trust rents. The report also stated that 1 408 dwellings were completed in 1979-80, 502 fewer than were completed in 1978-79. The 18 600 applicants awaiting accommodation from the trust will have to wait a considerable time before they will be allocated a Housing Trust rental house.

The report also shows a significant reduction in Commonwealth funds for welfare housing from $36 000 000 in 1976 to $20 800 000 in 1980. That is the major reason why the Housing Trust and other State housing authorities in Australia are facing difficulties in providing welfare housing. Another significant part of the report referred to the fact that the percentage of tenants receiving rental concessions has increased to about 35·6 per cent of all Housing Trust tenants. That places a significant burden on the trust's finances. The total of concessions given last year to persons on welfare benefits and pensions amounted to $7 000 000. I believe that points to the fact that the amount of benefits and pensions that are being paid by the Commonwealth Government is insufficient because the trust is actually subsidising the Federal Government by giving rental concessions to this type of tenant. Significantly, the numbers of that type of tenant are increasing considerably, from 10 per cent in 1973 to 35·6 per cent in 1980. I know from my personal experience as a member of Parliament that most of the people who come to me for assistance in obtaining Housing Trust rental accommodation are in some way socially disadvantaged; they are pensioners, or people on welfare benefits. The number of people applying to the trust is increasing every year and the trust is actually subsidising the Federal Government because of its inadequate welfare payments. This places the trust in an invidious situation, and it is the main reason why the trust had a deficit of $4 900 000 on its operations in this area last year.

It means, of course, that the Commonwealth Government should provide significantly more funds for welfare housing. If it does not, the situation will deteriorate. I was intrigued by a comment from a representative of the Real Estate Institute who commented in the press last week that Adelaide was over-supplied with private flats. The article in the press stated:

> An over-supply of flats for rent exists in the Adelaide metropolitan area, according to the Real Estate Institute of South Australia. An institute spokesman said yesterday a declining population and an economic situation which forced more young people to stay with their parents longer had caused the over-supply.

I disagree with that comment, and I made a statement about it. Unfortunately, the statement I made was only partly reported in the press. My statement, which was headed "Flats too costly", was as follows:

> Rent costs are preventing people taking flats in the metropolitan area. Labor M.P., Mr. Jack Slater, said today flats were too expensive. Mr. Slater, the Opposition spokesman on housing, said that while demand for flats was unquestionable, private landlords charged more than the South Australian Housing Trust for accommodation.

That is only part of the comment I made. I went on to say that those persons looking for accommodation were unable to afford the high cost that was being asked for private flats. The reason for any over-supply of flats is that the rentals being asked for private accommodation are often more than half the income of people receiving unemployment benefits or low incomes. They find it impossible to meet that sort of commitment from benefits of that nature. It might also be interesting to note from the Housing Trust report that half of the persons seeking accommodation with the trust are unemployed when they apply. I cannot agree that the over-supply, if any, of flats in Adelaide is because of a declining population. I think there is plenty of demand; it is just that the people who need the accommodation cannot afford to pay the rents being asked by private landlords in some instances.

I refer finally to the overall aspect of the Budget, and contend that the economic policies of the Tonkin Government have not assisted the ordinary person in the community. This is a Government (as are all Liberal Governments) devoted specifically to those more affluent members of the community. It is not especially interested in the welfare of ordinary citizens, although it may, at times in its propaganda, encourage people to believe that that is so. This Budget proves conclusively that that is the situation. The small government, so called, of the Tonkin Administration will in the long term prove the most costly not only economically for the State but also in relation to public services provided to its citizens. As I said before, I believed that what was contained in the Governor's Speech was a recipe for disaster, and I believe that this Budget is a similar recipe.

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** I believe that it is appropriate in this debate to answer some comments made in the media, especially recent comments about the future of this State. This fits well within the Budget debate, as this is the

first real Budget presented by this Government, bearing in mind that the Budget presented soon after the election was largely a Budget prepared by the former Government. I refer specifically to comments made by a former South Australian, Max Harris. In recent years he has attacked this State in a way that suggests that it had no right to exist. I believe that his arguments have been most unfortunate, and it is unfortunate that he has presented them in a way that sets South Australia against Queensland. Having been born and bred in Queensland, I am in a position to judge his comments critically such that few other people would share. For that reason I refer to his arguments, because I think this is important for the future of the State.

The argument raised from time to time that Australia should have fewer States normally revolves around the traditional approach of taking the number of politicians in Australia and working out the number there are per capita and comparing that with the number in the United Kingdom or in some European country. If we do that, we find that Australia has many more politicians than have other places. However, I believe that that is a shallow argument and misses the point and purpose of Government: that is, the Government should exist to ensure that there is orderly and fair development of the country in a way that preserves the rights of individuals and groups of individuals and to create opportunities for them to express their creativity and freedom. If we wanted the most efficient form of Government (if that were our only criteria) we must opt for a dictatorship; that would indeed be small government. We all recognise that dictatorships are not desirable, because they do not preserve the rights of individuals. It is not possible for one person to be able to make correct decisions in all matters, to be so all-knowing that he or she can decide the needs of people in all parts of the country. For that reason we have developed systems of Government over the centuries that disperse the decision-making process to representatives of different groups of people in the community.

If we consider this process, we find that Australia is in a different situation from those European countries because of the geographic dispersion of its people. It is intolerable for us to think that people who live, for example, in Canberra should make decisions about which of our local roads should be reconstructed first. That is why we have developed a Federal system in which the guiding principle is that those who have to live with the results of the decision should make it. Therefore, we have three tiers of Government in Australia. That is not a nice little extra we have; I believe it is essential, if we are to have good Government, not simply cheap Government, in this country.

If we consider a commercial operation, we would never expect a company starting in Australia to open a small office in, say, Canberra, and expect all Australians to flock to its door. The company would recognise the tyranny of distance in Australia and establish branch offices throughout the nation. The same sort of principle should operate with government. I should think that rather than there being fewer States in Australia there are good arguments for our having more. I believe, for example, that northern Queensland could put forward a good argument for its being created a separate State, and that the northern sector of New South Wales could justify being created a separate State. In time, but perhaps not at present, we will find that people living and working in the Kimberley region of Western Australia will resent decisions being made by people living in Perth and, in the long run, we may find that they would prefer to exist as a separate State.

There are costs to be borne in establishing a State. The taxpayer has to pay more to uphold the establishment of a State, but these costs must be compared to the benefits. People can make their own decisions, with decisions not being made for them by power groups living elsewhere in the country with no knowledge of local conditions. People would have a chance to participate in making decisions. Also, I should think that cash savings are to be made by the taxpayer through avoiding the making of wrong decisions by Governments because of ignorance of local factors.

The argument that is pushed from time to time (and I note that the previous occasion on which this argument was pushed was in a speech by the Leader of the A.C.T.U. and now pretender to the throne of the Federal Labor Party, Bob Hawke), that there should be fewer States in Australia, is false, and the correct argument, if we look at the proper basis of the function of our Governments, is that there is more to be said for creating more, rather than fewer, States.

One of the factors that might have influenced Max Harris in taking the stand that he has is the publicity that has been foisted on the South Australian public during recent years, especially during the latter half of the administration of the Labor Government in the 1970's. That occurred when that Government was casting around for political excuses for its failure to perform. It seemed that the Labor Party was always looking for the magic formula, the great new project, the short cut, or the quick solution that would solve all problems. When, time after time, that Party failed to produce the goods, when Monarto collapsed, when Redcliff, which was so close to fruition in 1973, receded into the distance, and when all other plans failed to succeed in reviving the economy of the State, it cast around for excuses. As is normally the case, if one looks for excuses, one can always find them, that is, if one looks hard enough.

So the Labor Party stated that what had happened was the fault not of the State Government but of the Federal Government. Indeed, in 1975, the Labor Party disowned its Party at the Federal level. More recently, we remember how the Labor Party constantly criticised the Federal Government. It has been a change in the past year not to have the constant carping at the Federal Government in regard to education funding, because that is what we had over the previous three to four years from the former Government—everything was the fault of the Federal Government.

In relation to the employment problem, the Labor Party said, "We can't do anything about it; we inherited an economy that relied on manufacturing industry, which is in decline, and this is happening nationally; therefore, we are not to blame." As I have stated, it is true that manufacturing industry is in decline, although members of the Labor Party fail to mention that the decline in this State was much faster than the national average. Nevertheless, there is a difficulty in regard to manufacturing industry, and, if excuses are being sought, that excuse could be offered.

Next, the Labor Party stated that it could not be blamed for economic problems, because South Australia was bereft of natural resources. It was stated, "We don't have the resources of Queensland, Western Australia and New South Wales and, therefore, we cannot be blamed." Of course, we are now discovering that South Australia has natural resources. Previously, the Administration had hang-ups about looking for them and exploiting them.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** When do you think Roxby Downs was discovered—since the election?

**Dr. BILLARD:** The honourable member implies that Roxby Downs was discovered during the term of the

previous Government, but I wonder what the effect of the previous Government's policy against uranium mining had on the development of that project. The fact is that the Labor Party is in an untenable position in regard to the development of that project. Recently, the Leader of the Opposition stated both that he was in favour of the development of Roxby Downs and that he was opposed to uranium mining. I wonder what developers of that project are meant to understand by that. Are they to believe that the Leader does not realise that Roxby Downs is a large uranium deposit, with perhaps twice as much uranium as the other uranium deposits in Australia combined? Perhaps the Leader believes that there is some other magic formula whereby Roxby Downs can be mined without the uranium being mined?

In addition, the Labor Party left the State with an overloaded bureaucracy, which was out of proportion to the resources that existed in South Australia to pay for that bureaucracy. I mentioned in my Address in Reply speech the small contribution that comes to the State coffers from mining royalties in this State and how, on a per capita basis, we receive less from mining royalties than any other State in Australia. In those circumstances, we could not afford to have more Government employees than any other State in Australia, and that situation contributed to what we all know began to happen in the mid-1970's—a general exodus of people and industry from this State.

I well recognise that, when these conditions are set up, they cannot be changed overnight. The situation can be compared to trying to turn around a fully loaded tanker that is proceeding full-steam in the wrong direction. For a time, the tanker will continue to ride in the wrong direction even though the necessary moves have been made to turn it around. So it is with the economy of this State; the necessary moves are being made by this Government to turn around the economy.

It was most ironic that Max Harris chose Queensland as his point of comparison with South Australia, because I well remember as a boy in Queensland, during the time of a Labor Government in that State, that coalminers were paid by that Government to continue mining coal merely to keep the mines open, not just because the State was getting royalties. In 1957, when a Liberal-Country Party coalition was elected in that State, it began to try to reconstruct the economy. The Government had to do many things and found it could not achieve a turn-around overnight. In fact, it was the best part of 10 years before the economy of that State was properly on the road. Whether or not 10 years will be needed to turn around the economy of South Australia remains to be seen.

It is true that the Queensland Government had difficulty in persuading the Commonwealth Government of that time to support it. I recall that one project sought to upgrade the railway line from Townsville to Mt. Isa, a project that was vitally necessary for the Mt. Isa Mines to greatly expand production, as the company wanted to do. Support was sought from the Commonwealth, but was not forthcoming.

So, their reconstruction of the economy of that State was slow. I believe that it was 10 years before that economy was placed on its feet. South Australia's situation is, therefore, similar in the economic sense, in that this Government has inherited an economy which was in a shambles, and in a psychological sense, in that the former Government had led the people to believe that there was nothing it could do about it and that there must have been something wrong with the State.

At that stage in Queensland (and I believe to a certain extent in South Australia now) there was a branch-office mentality. There was the thought that nothing really could be done locally, that we could not compete with Sydney and Melbourne, so what was the point in trying. I am saddened to see that Max Harris, who has been nurtured in this State, should be conned by those arguments and turn against his State in what he is reported as saying in recent times. I think that the summary of his attitude can be quoted from his first article, in which he says:

> My own regional impressions were unequivocal. Queensland is a working geographic, demographic and economic entity. It just needs a touch of political democracy. There is logic in its reasons for existence, but South Australia, the mendicant State, should be abolished. It is wasteful and barbaric to have too many States, as it is to have too many trade unions. South Australia logically should exist as a distinct extension of Victoria.

And so he goes on. It is sad to see that one who, I believe, owes a lot to this State should turn around and seek its abolition. I believe that his arguments are not rational. I believe also that, if he looked at the history of Queensland, he would find that, only 20 years ago, or slightly more, Queensland was facing exactly the same problems that South Australia faces now. It needed exactly the same attitudes then to bring about the development of Queensland as South Australia needs now. I believe that South Australia has much to offer. This is a State of which we can be proud. It also has many natural resources.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** This State wants visitors.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Yes, indeed. That is an important point, because comparisons can be made on the attitude to the development of tourism as regards development between the two States. I cast my mind back to Queensland when the Mayor of the Gold Coast used to troop around the Southern States advertising the State. It was pushed hard, and Queensland gained a sense of identity. In the same way, we could develop a sense of identity and pride in our State. South Australia has much to offer tourists. It has a lot of magnificent scenery, although I believe that the facilities associated with much of this scenery have not yet been developed. Indeed, this will be one of the major needs over the next 10 years: to provide the basic facilities necessary for the development of these areas for tourism. Tourism is vitally important in developing the whole psychological attitude of the State towards its development. South Australians, if they believe in their own State, and if they believe that they have the wherewithal to venture out into new areas to start new business, will do so. That is what happened in Queensland 20 and 25 years ago, and it could happen in South Australia now.

In summary, I believe that South Australia has many natural resources, although many of them are currently underdeveloped. It has the ability to grow to be a strong State, just as Queensland grew to be a strong economic State over the past 20 years. We need to get away from the mentality of making excuses for our State, of saying, "Perhaps we cannot fight, because we do not have the wherewithal. We are not Queensland, Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria or Tasmania." Indeed, it is easy to look to other people's pastures and say that they are greener. We have the resources and, if we work at it, we can indeed make a great State. There is no easy solution to the economic problems we face. There is no magic formula, and there are no short cuts. There is simply hard work, and putting aside those things which deflect us.

I believe that the Budget this Government has presented on this occasion is a significant first step along that road. I believe also that the achievements of this Government in the past year are, of themselves, a significant first step. Perhaps all problems have not been

solved; like the tanker, it is difficult to turn the economy around. Perhaps in 12 months we cannot turn around the economy or bring down the rate of unemployed, which became the highest in Australia during the life of the previous Administration. However, the moves have been made, and moves are being made in the right direction. These are moves which must be made if growth is to be achieved. If we sit back and look for magic formulas, nothing will be done: we will sink further into the mire, and the Max Harrises of this world will have a field day arguing about which State should claim South Australia for its own.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I will devote my time this afternoon to speaking about one or two matters which I believe to be of serious concern in relation to the Department of Correctional Services and to the Chief Secretary's administration of that department. I want particularly to refer initially to a report which appears in this morning's *Advertiser* on page 1 under the heading "Warders Find Armoury". In that report is listed a large quantity of armaments discovered yesterday in the Yatala Labour Prison. The Director of the department, Mr. Stewart, was quoted as saying that he found the find very worrying. The Chief Secretary's main comment was that he commended the officer who reported the cut wire mesh. Certainly, the officer should have been commended, but for the Chief Secretary to pass it off in that fashion, without expressing his grave concern for safety and security in that prison, was somewhat alarming. The public would have found that all the more alarming if they had known some of the facts of this matter, because I believe that that report by reporter Mark Bruer was, basically, a report which the department and the Minister had released and which had been carefully put together to avoid putting before the people of South Australia the quite alarming facts concerning this whole event.

I want to go into some further details this afternoon. The facts of the matter are that the home-made ·22 pistol and ammunition, found in a cell as reported in the paper, were in the cell of prisoner Sandery, who those who take an interest in these matters will know is probably the State's No. 1 criminal. He was, at the time when this search took place, incarcerated in the so-called security division at Yatala. The security division is the maximum security section of that prison where prisoners are kept separated from the rest of the prison population and are kept in their cells for most of the time, except for a short period of exercise each day. So, for a prisoner in that section of the gaol to have been able to obtain the home-made ·22 pistol should indeed be, as Mr. Stewart says, very worrying, because there is little doubt that a prisoner locked up in that section of the prison must have had very considerable assistance to be able to obtain that pistol.

When one takes into account the fact that this pistol was in the cell of this most dangerous prisoner, and the fact that the other implements were found outside in the yard, the likely nature of any use of these implements becomes far more obvious. It seems that the most likely thing was that prisoner Sandery was intending to hold up a prison officer, ensure that he was released, and then obtain the implements with a view to his and presumably his accomplices escaping from the gaol.

I believe that the fact that, in our maximum security prison, such an armoury or arsenal could be put together is a ringing condemnation of the security that applies in Yatala. I see that the member for Glenelg is taking some interest in what I am saying, and no doubt he agrees with me entirely.

**Mr. Mathwin:** I am just wondering how gullible you are, Peter, that's all.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I believe it is patently obvious that this was a very dangerous plot which has fortunately been foiled at this stage. But it is of grave concern to me, and I am sure to all responsible citizens in this State, that not only could such an arsenal or armoury be got together within the walls of Yatala itself but also that this pistol could be obtained and secreted in one of the maximum security cells, the cell in which probably the State's No. 1 criminal was incarcerated.

**Mr. Mathwin:** It was home-made, though.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Indeed it was.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He probably made it himself.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I have little doubt that it was certainly made within the prison. However, the suggestion that a prisoner in the security division could have made such a weapon is quite untenable, because the equipment necessary to make such a thing would not be available, one would hope, within the security division. Undoubtedly, such things may well be available within the industry section of the prison, but that part of the prison is not available or open to prisoners who are in the security division. I find it very worrying that such a thing has taken place.

I think it is about time that the Chief Secretary started acting with a little more concern than he has been doing about the situation in the South Australian prisons. Every time a matter of this type arises, he immediately announces the appointment of a further inquiry. We are going to have an investigation. We are going to set up a committee of inquiry. I think about seven or eight inquiries are going on at the present time into various aspects of the prison system.

**Mr. Mathwin:** If you were Attorney-General, what would you do?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If I were Attorney-General, I would not have the opportunity to do anything, because unfortunately the Attorney-General does not have the power to undertake any such actions. However, the Chief Secretary does have the power to undertake the action necessary. There is no doubt that the only way of finally, in the long term, overcoming the problems which exist and are deep-seated and deep-rooted in the prison system in South Australia is the appointment of a judicial inquiry, an inquiry independent and separate from the Department of Correctional Services, the Public Service Board and the like. I am very pleased to see that the Chief Secretary has now come into the House. He may learn a little from listening to me than from listening to the senior officers of his department, who seem to keep him firmly imprisoned, at least as far as his mind is concerned.

The situation is, as I have said, quite grave. I understand further that, when a full inspection was made of the cell where the gun was found, it was discovered that some of the bars had been sawn. That has not been announced publicly, and I would like to know why it has not, because that seems very much like an escape attempt which fortunately was foiled, but, nonetheless, such things should not be kept from the people of South Australia, because they directly reflect on the situation which exists within the prison system.

The Chief Secretary has not taken the opportunity to deny that, so I presume from that that my information is correct. The Chief Secretary says that I made lots of accusations. Every time I have given him the opportunity to refute them by producing reports and the proper documents, he denies them and says that such matters are confidential and he does not intend to make them publicly available. Well, that is no doubt his prerogative under the encouragement of his department, but I think he will come

to rue the day he has made decisions of that sort. Having dealt with that matter, I will now deal with another matter which I find particularly objectionable in relation to the way in which this Minister has administered his department. I refer to the question of access to the prisons and other correctional institutions in this State, and in particular to the question of access to the prisons and prisoners by members of Parliament. I want to start my comments by referring to a memorandum to executive officers which was put out by the Acting Director of the Department of Correctional Services on 5 September 1980, as follows:

> Memo to:
>
> Executive Officers
> Keeper, Adelaide Gaol
> Superintendent, Yatala Labour Prison
> Superintendent, Women's Rehabilitation Centre
> Superintendent, Port Augusta Gaol
> Superintendent, Port Lincoln Prison
> Superintendent, Cadell Training Centre
> Keeper, Mount Gambier Gaol
>
> Following recent contact by members of Parliament and in some instances visits to institutions, the Chief Secretary has issued a direction on this matter.

The following, in inverted commas, is the directive:

> "I wish to draw your attention to section 43 of the Prisons Act, which stipulates that judges of the Supreme Court may visit prisons of their wish.
>
> All other visitors are obliged to seek approval of the Director or the Superintendent before visiting inmates. Those persons who are the legal advisers for an inmate on remand may visit their clients at times convenient to the institution. Legal advisers for inmates under sentence are required, under Regulation 90 of the Prisons Act, to seek approval for visits stating their business beforehand.
>
> Members of Parliament are required, under Parliamentary protocol, to arrange visits to any Government Department facility through the Minister in charge of that facility.
>
> Will you please ensure that these procedures are adhered to."
>
> I would appreciate this direction being brought to the attention of your staff together with the Public Service Board Memorandum to Permanent Heads No. 183 (copy attached).
>
> [Signed] Acting Director

What I find quite extraordinary is, first, the fact that the Chief Secretary, in his directive, has not quoted fully section 43 of the Prisons Act and has conveniently forgotten about District Court judges, who are also entitled to visit the prisons; therefore, the memorandum is incorrect to that extent. Further, there is the extraordinary passage stating that members of Parliament are required, under Parliamentary protocol, to arrange visits to any Government department facility through the Minister in charge of that facility. That has never been the protocol of this House, the Legislative Council, or this Parliament. That has been a directive, I have no doubt, which this Government, and probably only this Minister, has introduced in an attempt to try to shore up his crumbling empire. There is no doubt that members of this House, every one of us from time to time, have rung up and visited numerous arms of Government departments.

**Mr. Slater:** In our own electorates.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** In our own electorates and in other electorates throughout the State. I have done it on dozens of occasions, and I have no doubt that members opposite have done it on dozens of occasions. It is completely incorrect and less than the truth to say that there is any such Parliamentary protocol. There may be a Government directive, but it is not a directive or a protocol of this Parliament. For the Chief Secretary to have put that around in his department is to have put less than the truth before his officers. I very much object to that, and I think that all members in this House should be most concerned about it. For a Minister of the Crown to make that allegation is, I believe, a breach of the privilege of this Parliament. To say that there is a protocol when there is no such protocol surely comes very close to breaching the undoubted and traditional privileges of this House. I think this is a very serious such breach.

This document dated 5 September has come into existence only in recent times. However, this is not the first I have heard of attempts to stop members of Parliament visiting the prisons within the State. Since I started taking an interest in the conditions in the prisons, some 10 or 11 months ago, I have been asked to visit numerous prisoners, principally because they have sought my advice as a lawyer on a range of issues in which they believe they have grievances. Whilst prisoners in this State may still be under some disabilities as to their rights as citizens, there is no doubt that they are voting citizens of this State. The law was specifically changed to provide for that. For the Chief Secretary to attempt to deny prisoners, citizens of this State, the right to address themselves to members of Parliament is, I believe, a grave breach of the privileges of this Parliament.

Undoubtedly, if we are able to function effectively as members of this House and as members of Parliament, with our responsibilities to our constituents and our rights as members, we must have full access to citizens of this State. I would have thought that that was a fundamental right which prisoners now have, but certainly it is not a right that the Chief Secretary believes that they have. In fact, members of Parliament, under this directive, have indeed fewer rights than have ordinary citizens to visit prisons, because the only way in which a member of Parliament can visit a prisoner now is by the procedure I have outlined. I have checked this with the Chief Secretary. He mentioned the matter in the House one night, and I sought an interview with him in which he specifically told me that, if I wanted to visit any prisoners within the prison system in South Australia, I was to obtain his approval in advance.

On the occasions when I have sought that approval it has been granted, but that is not the point. This directive has been issued so that the Chief Secretary, for political purposes, can keep an eye on which members of Parliament are visiting what prisoners. It would not be the first time that the message has gone down the line to check with the prisoner to see what has been said as a result of the visit or, alternatively, to warn the prisoner not to say anything to the member of Parliament about conditions in the prison, or to make any comment or criticism of the prison system to the member of Parliament. I believe that this is a grave breach of Parliamentary privilege and of our undoubted rights. I think this memorandum should be withdrawn at the earliest possible time.

Already, it has been responsible for some unfortunate incidents. The incidents I will relate indicate the sort of paranoia that exists within the hierarchy of the prison service at the present time. I want to make it very clear that, in my comments this afternoon, I am not in any way reflecting on the ordinary officers in the prison service who, I think, do a very creditable job, given the quite extraordinary difficulties under which they are operating at present, given the sort of managerial incompetence that they suffer, and given the lacklustre leadership and the lack of effective leadership applying within the prison service at present. They have become disillusioned and rather demoralised and depressed about their future in the service, and I am not surprised at that.

However, to return to the point, on three occasions, to

my knowledge, members of Parliament have had their right to speak to prisoners, voting citizens of this State, interfered with quite seriously. On one occasion, I was visiting Yatala Labour Prison. I cannot deal with the specific circumstances because that would be a breach in relation to a committee, but I was visiting the prison and I spoke to three prisoners, I think in C division. They asked what I was doing there, and I explained. They said, "What do you think?" I said, "If I had my way, I would have this place bulldozed and rebuild smaller prisons elsewhere." After I finished speaking to those prisoners, I left and went about my business, but those prisoners were grilled by prison officers as to what the conversation had entailed, and were forced to sign a document (two of them signed, and one refused) which was not a true record of the conversation. The document that was prepared by the officers said that I had suggested that the prison should be burnt down. That was an outright lie. It was incorrect, and I have taken such steps as I have been able to take to refute it. This is an example of the lengths to which the department will go to try to defend itself.

On another occasion, the member for Stuart sought and was granted permission to visit a prisoner at Port Augusta (and I have the honourable member's permission to raise this matter). He entered the gaol and spoke to the prisoner in the presence of a prison officer—which again, I believe, is a gross breach of the rights of members of Parliament. There should be a right for members of Parliament to have full and frank discussions with any citizens of this State about the conditions of the State, or the conditions of the prison service or whatever else, without those conversations being heard or overheard by other persons.

On his return, the member for Stuart was amazed to find that the Chief Secretary had been told that he had gone there and said he went there as a result of the Chief Secretary's granting him permission. He had not mentioned the Chief Secretary in that context to anybody in the prison. The story came back and, as I understand it, the Chief Secretary was going to be gullible enough to swallow this rubbish from is department and refer to it in the House. Fortunately, wiser heads prevailed.

In these circumstances, it was hardly surprising that when the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, the Hon. Mr. Sumner, sought to visit the prison for a briefing by the department, his request was refused—only, I might say, after a long delay. One would have hardly thought it would take a month or six weeks for the Chief Secretary to make a decision on whether or not he would allow the Leader of the Opposition in another place to visit the prison and have discussions and a briefing, but it took him six weeks. Eventually, he decided against this.

I want to make one thing clear: I believe that all of these actions are actions of the present Chief Secretary, as I said, in a rather plaintive endeavour to shore up this administration that he is heading. As I said earlier, I believe inevitably the prison system in this State will be the subject of a judicial inquiry. It is useless for the Minister to set up inquiries into this, that and the other thing. I think there are about seven inquiries which are either going on at the moment or which have been recently completed. That will not satisfy the people of this State. The people of this State need, want and will demand a full independent judicial inquiry into the whole of the prison service, the direction it is taking, and the purpose of it, and I believe it will not be too long before it comes about.

In case the Chief Secretary or anyone else wants to make any comments in this regard, I want to make clear that I do not suggest that the problems which at the moment wrack the prison service in this State are problems which have been instantly created on the election of a Liberal Government. I have never said that and I do not say that. The problems have been there for some time. I recognise that, and I am not afraid to get up in this House and say so. The tragedy of the matter is that the Chief Secretary has chosen not only to adopt his department and take it to his bosom he has also adopted the very considerable and grave problems that exist in the service, and that is what has put him in the firing line—not the fact that the problems exist but the fact that he has been, in my view, stupid enough to accept the problems and adopt them, in effect, by, as it were, defending them and defending the service that exists at the present time.

A Chief Secretary with a better grasp, shall I say, of the political situation would surely have taken the attitude (which he did take initially) of saying that he would order a complete review of the situation. Unfortunately, all he has done is allow basically for internal departmental reviews and of course that has simply been a case of Caesar appealing to Caesar and we have started to see the results. First, it was thought the situation could be whitewashed by appointing an old and trusted servant, Mr. Cassidy. Unfortunately for this scheme, Mr. Cassidy was at least a man of some integrity, particularly since having the freedom of having left the service, and showed a degree of independence in his assessment. As a result of that he produced a report which, whilst it was lacking in many respects, at least came to grips with some of the problems that exist at Yatala. That was not expected to be a full, frank and wide-ranging review of the whole department; it was only a look into security. I suppose as far as it went it made some useful contribution.

We then had the Stewart Report which, in my view, has only proved that the Director of the department is not really competent to manage a modern penal system, because that report is lacking in many respects. I intend to deal in detail with those aspects of the report at a later time. We have had those two reports, and we have had various other reports into internal matters, so-called within the department. The Chief Secretary announced today another inquiry into the finding yesterday of the arsenal. It would be interesting to know exactly how many reports are in progress of preparation and presentation within this department at the moment because the Chief Secretary will not be able to bury the problems within his department by merely appointing the sorts of inquiry that he has appointed to date.

No-one who is a critic of the service from within would have any confidence in going to Mr. Stewart, or before this Public Service Board and independent consultant inquiry that has now been appointed, to give evidence. No-one would feel that his position would be effectively protected before such an inquiry and the only sort of inquiry that will ensure that such people do come forward will be an independent judicial inquiry. If the Chief Secretary is not prepared to appoint such an inquiry, I believe, finally, the Premier will. The tragedy of it in the meantime is that we are wasting valuable time. The system continues to grind on, the problems getting more complex and more complicated every day. As I have said before, I believe that finally the problems of this department will engulf this Chief Secretary and will be responsible for his removal.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mitchell.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Thank you, Peter!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitchell.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression that you had given me the floor before that interjection came. In addressing my remarks to the Budget, I propose to deal with one or

two matters in a relatively short time, and then develop arguments later at more length relating to the portfolio for which I have the responsibility. In his explanatory speech, the Premier referred to the high level of unemployment in South Australia. I would put the following proposition to Government members who are constantly asserting that the responsibility for the present state of unemployment in South Australia lies with the previous Government. They also constantly assert in a similar way that that is the position in relation to unemployment at the Federal level. The Federal Liberal Government was elected on acclaimed ability in good management and economic control. If that is the case, what sort of performance has it given if, after five years in office, having been elected on the basis of its alleged superior management skill, it has not only been unable to arrest unemployment, but unemployment has increased? Where then does any judgment of its performance stand? Obviously, it can be seen that the promises made by the Federal Government at two elections and by the State Government in 1979 were simply electioneering gimmicks; there is no factual basis behind the claims that were made.

If anyone argued that people claiming special skills in an area have not been able to apply them in five years and have got further behind, what credence could anyone place on such an argument? However, that is what we are asked to swallow in this House and in the media, and I hope that, if Government members consider what I have said, we will not be given that garbage argument any more. One small point directly related to that area and referring to South Australia, is that the Deputy Premier today and also earlier in responding to questions about the failure to create employment said that it would require a miracle to reduce unemployment. My response to that sort of statement is to ask where those words were included in the election policy speeches given to the people of South Australia. Where did the policy speech say that a miracle was to be worked by the Liberal Party if it were elected? That statement was not made. The statement was, "If you put us in we'll fix up the economic scene in South Australia and provide employment." Yet now, the Deputy Premier resorts to reference to a miracle, probably in order to hide an attack of conscience regarding the promises and the reality of that matter.

Another recent argument being put forward and promoted outside is that there will be a new approach to tourism in this State and more expenditure by the present Government on it and that, in a strange way, the previous Government could not achieve what this Government intends to achieve. In concert with my colleagues, I support the effort in that direction, but what is said should be more accurate. I think I heard the Minister say that $500 000 had been added to the amount provided in the previous year for the promotion of tourism. The actual amount is $402 000. If this is an example of the accounting used by the present Government, it is clear we will not know where we are if we are subjected to more than a couple of years of Liberal Government. A $402 000 increase is a hefty one, so why be so inaccurate as to say $500 000? Members can peruse the documents concerned, and they will find that the sum referred to represents the difference between what was spent last year and what is proposed to be spent this year on tourism.

I have been intrigued by certain statements of the Minister of Health: why is the Minister able publicly to support additional expenditure in providing more employment in tourism and to speak with confidence in an area in which additional expenditure is proposed, yet whenever the topic of health expenditure in this State is raised she seems to have a different philosophy? No doubt the Minister thinks tourism is important and needs more money, and she says she will go to Cabinet and get it. Yet, when it comes to a vital and basic facet of the lives of ordinary citizens of this State, that is, the health of their families, every utterance from the Minister is concerned with carping cost cutting and the fact that there must be value for the health dollar.

I cannot detect that sort of statement when the Minister comments about tourism and the proposed expenditure on it. There seems to be almost a split personality in charge of two different areas. I do not quarrel with the approach to tourism. We know it is a gamble and a guesstimate as to the outcome, but I am intrigued by the Minister's approach to these matters. The member for Brighton seems to be displaying much interest in what I am saying: perhaps it may have occurred to him also and I shall be pleased if it has. Whether in response to a question in the House, speaking publicly on the media, or addressing a friendly meeting, the Minister constantly harps on getting value for the dollar in health matters, yet does not find it necessary to say that we should get value for the dollar in the other area. Perhaps the Minister may consider my comments, because she should know that the impression in the community is that the Government could not care less about health problems, whether on the Federal or the State scene. This Government cannot be blamed for the Federal Liberal Government's actions, but it is responsible for health matters in this State.

Recently, we heard that Mr. Fraser was to go overseas to accept a gold medal awarded to him for humanitarian services by a Jewish service organisation. That information was published in the *Advertiser* of 23 July, and now he has received the medal. I would not quarrel with the Prime Minister's receiving it if it were warranted and if the humanitarian services concerned with the presentation of that award could be demonstrated, but I have some grave doubts at least in one area in which the Prime Minister has been vocal and which is directly related to the services for which the medal was given. I refer to services to refugees. I had an individual case brought to my attention in my district. In July this year I was forced to deal with the Prime Minister's representatives, that is the Department of Social Security in Adelaide, and I wrote a letter to the South Australian Director (Mr. Taylor) concerning a young lady whom I shall refer to as Miss X. My letter is dated 18 July this year, and it will become apparent that it concerned a refugee person. I wrote to Mr. Taylor on behalf of Miss X at a certain address.

The letter asked him to consider granting this young Vietnamese lady special benefit entitlement. The circumstances that caused me to make this request were that Miss X, who will be aged 20 this year, arrived in Australia on 4 July 1978 through the auspices of the Immigration Department, having been selected for permanent residency in Australia ex a Malaysian camp. I explained that, in accordance with Commonwealth policy for such immigrants to the age of 18 years, Miss X was paid special benefit as a person of student age. I referred to the fact that I understood a change of policy in December 1979 had taken place. That policy emanated from the Federal Government and has meant that she and similar immigrants from Vietnam were classified as no longer eligible for special benefits.

I pointed out that, despite a number of approaches by this young lady, she would not be able to achieve any assistance, because she wanted to do matriculation year level education. Miss X chose not to enter the unemployment market. She had already done matriculation education in Vietnam, in Vietnamese, but, because she felt that she was not competent to cope at that

educational level in South Australia in English, she very wisely elected to take a similar course. No assistance was available to that young lady until I made representations on her behalf. Members should note what was awarded—secondary education allowance of 10 miserable dollars a week to live on and to do whatever else is necessary in relation to the course. I was glad that I was able to achieve that much for her, but I was certainly not satisfied. In my letter, I pointed out that the Diretor had been kind enough to supply me, as a State member, with a complete manual on the operations of the Department of Social Security, including the conditions and benefits that apply. I further stated:

> My reading of your current Social Security Information Manual, pages 17 and 18, under the heading of "3. Special Benefits. Categories of Special Benefits are:" would seem to indicate that Miss X would fit one or more of the categories listed below:
>
> Refugees;

I have already said that the young lady is a refugee, selected for this country in Malaysia. There is no doubt that she is a refugee. The next category was "Person in need". There is no doubt that an adult with a sole income of $10 a week is in need. Finally, allowing for the fact that my reading of the manual may not reflect the official interpretation, I referred to another heading, "Special or unusual case". I concluded my letter by saying:

> Therefore, may I ask your personal examination of this young lady's need.

Some time went by, not too long in the circumstances, before a reply was forthcoming from the Director. The reply dated 4 August 1980 referred to my representation on behalf of this person and recycled the Commonwealth policy in regard to the Guardianship of Children Immigration Act, which provides original allowances, paid when people first come to Australia. The reply stated, in part:

> The payment of special benefit is a discretionary power vested in the Director-General.

I knew that; that is why I wrote to the Director-General in the first place, asking whether Miss X fitted category A, B or, when all else failed, "Special or unusual case". Quite clearly, I was aware of that. It was further stated:

> To ensure reasonable and consistent treatment of individual cases—

and I ask members to note these words—

> in the exercise of this discretion, broad policy guidelines have been established. The category "Special or unusual case" cited by you was included in the manual to ensure that any cases not specifically covered by the policy are not excluded from consideration.

Apparently, I had been intelligent enough to foresee the way in which the case would be approached because, in my letter to the Director, I had included "Special or unusual case", just in case my reading was not the same as the department's reading. The letter continued:

> Miss X's case is not "special or unusual" in that sense, as her circumstances have been fully considered in the context of refugees. "Person in need" is a category designed to cater specifically for those with a particular employment problem. Miss X does not come within this category.

The final sentence stated:

> There is no benefit available to Miss X from this department at the present time.

I can only say, as I pointed out earlier, that I am not attacking the South Australian Director; I understand that he has to operate within the administrative framework set down as policy in Canberra. However, I point out the humanitarian approach taken by the Federal Government, for which the Prime Minister has received a gold medal for his service to refugees! I can only say that one must question what services are being given to refugees.

Earlier this year, a progress report of the Uranium Enrichment Advisory Committee in South Australia was tabled in this House. A previous report which was tabled in the House on 30 October last year and which was entitled the Third Interim Report contains a vital paragraph on page 19, as follows:

> The early establishment of the proposed enrichment plant in South Australia is dependent on the Urenco interest and on its capability of marketing the enriched uranium that would become available from Australian sources to be processed and sold under an Australian Urenco marketing agreement.

I have endeavoured to do some research in respect of uranium markets and to try to ascertain the capabilities, the backing and the background of the organisation referred to as Urenco-Centec. I found that this was not easy initially. Leaflets were finally obtained from Lucas Heights in New South Wales. The library had little information about Urenco-Centec. However, I eventually obtained a number of publications, every one of which emanates from Urenco-Centec and perhaps needs to be given some due weighting in that respect. I do not suggest that there are no references to Urenco-Centec in other text-books and publications, but they are not voluminous.

**Dr. Billard:** What do you mean by "due weighting"?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member, as an analyst, should know what I mean by "due weighting". I could spell it out in case there is some doubt as to the sense in which I used the words "due weighting".

**Dr. Billard:** Don't you believe them?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I do not believe or disbelieve. I am trying to provide to the House some information on an organisation which might well, with the present Government, get tied in with the future of this State in such a way that enormous sums of money will be involved, and large sums of that money will be money belonging to the people of this State. That is my reason for trying to become better informed myself and also for making available to the House such information as I have been able to glean from the research I have done. I am simply saying to the honourable member and to any other honourable member that this is what I have ascertained. I believe that it bears looking at. I do not think that there is anything unfair in that approach.

I said earlier that the whole of this scene would presumably depend on whether markets for the products of such organisations would be available. I said that I wished to advise what I had discovered about Urenco-Centec. It came into being in 1970, as the result of an agreement entered into at Almello, Holland, between the Governments of the United Kingdom, West Germany, and The Netherlands. It was brought into being, I believe, because of the high costs involved in research in the enrichment of uranium area. It was a rational decision for the three Governments to get together and decide to pool their resources, to adjust their costs, and to share resultant technology developed because of their coming together. A document written by R. E. van Dijk and A. J. Abraham, of Urenco Limited, in 1976 refers to the facilities owned by Urenco-Centec, as follows:

> The three pilot enrichment facilities which were under construction in the national research programme to demonstrate the technologies have been completed, and several years of very successful operation have now been logged up. Their total capacity is of over 60 tonnes of separation work units per annum.

That is a very small quantity in relation to the quantities that might be involved where an enriching group desires to

enter into world markets, if such markets eventuate. What is the situation with respect to those markets? As recently as the *Advertiser* of 9 August, we find that Mr. Kowalick, a lecturer in the School of General Studies at the South Australian Institute of Technology, was making a submission to the Legislative Council Select Committee on this very matter. He said:

> A glut of uranium was expected in the next 10 years, because of this, companies such as Urenco-Centec preferred Governments to risk capital on enrichment plants.

He went on to say:

> In that case, irrespective of whether the project is brought to fruition, profits will be made in the construction of infrastructure.

The report further states:

> He said the nuclear industry could not compete against coal and would soon not be economic against solar power.

Irrespective of those fairly sweeping statements, I introduced that simply to illustrate that there is more than one prognosis in relation to uranium enrichment markets in the near and distant future. Perhaps a better-known authority might be Villani who, in 1979, published in his book that the annual separation work unit demand for the Western world, including Western Europe, the United States of America, Japan, and the rest of the Western world up to 1985, was 38 000 tonnes and, to 1990, between 58 000 and 82 000 tonnes, indicating an increase. However, Villani pointed out that the capacity for enrichment which would be available to the same dates in the same countries was 40 700 tonnes to 1985 (that is, in excess of the demand postulated to 1985) and was estimated to be between 53 900 tonnes and 78 700 tonnes in 1990, indicating a possible short-fall at the high end and also at the low end. These are complex and difficult matters, and I point out that clearly there is more than one school of thought as to whether any markets will ever eventuate.

I close by indicating to the House the safety record of Urenco-Centec. I found that I could not obtain any information anywhere to indicate accidents directly attributable to that group. However, British Nuclear Fuels, which is the British component of Urenco, has been associated with many accidents. At its Windscale plant, 194 accidents have been identified; the authority is the Safety Record of the Nuclear Power Industry, second edition, June 1980, prepared by Senator Ruth Coleman, who is of some note in these matters.

In a recent report in the *London Observer* as late as 3 August 1980, it was stated that British Nuclear Fuels had admitted, in relation to a major leak of radioactive material, errors of judgment by management and departures from safety standards for which it accepted full responsibility. I have tried to indicate that there is a need for caution in this area, irrespective of the policy of my Party, recognising that another Government is in power at present. I do not want to see the finances of this State tied up or destroyed by an organisation that might well bear more examination. That is all I am putting to the House. In the time available to me, I am unable to make as complete an assessment as I would like of the scene. Clearly, that is a warning sign that the Government ought to be careful about any steps it takes in the direction I have indicated.

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

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** After one year of the Tonkin Government, Michael Jacobs, writing in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 13 September, had the following to say:

> There is a touch of Presbyterianism about it [the Tonkin Government]. The sturdy faith in the inherent virtue of hard work and long views, an unshakeable confidence that the world will provide its own rewards for this commitment.

He went on to describe the Premier as follows:

> Mr. Tonkin has even developed a trace of cheerful arrogance, particularly in his Parliamentary performance.

Apart from that insult to the Presbyterian Church, nothing could be further from the truth. The Tonkin Government is extremely dangerous. It is committed unashamedly to a policy of representing the wealthy minority in this State. It shows scant regard for the ordinary South Australian people. The Budget does literally nothing for these ordinary people. In areas where people are involved, once again this Government has highlighted its intention to reduce standards in the public hospital sector, in community welfare, and in education. It is achieving this by systematically starving public hospitals of money on the grounds of efficiency. I quote from the Premier's speech of October last when delivering his Financial Statement. In dealing with health, he had the following to say:

> Emphasis on resource reallocation and efficient management will be essential. Budgets for individual health units will be tightened and a great responsibility lies in the hands of those responsible for the operation of those units to ensure the continuation of service of high quality.

Let us compare what he said this year, again in relation to health, as follows:

> The South Australian Health Commission has continued to place emphasis on careful resource management and to seek further efficiency in the provision of health services. This is reflected in the allocation for the Commission of $175 400 000, which takes into account the balance of $3 600 000 in the Commission's Trust Account as at 30 June 1980. Close co-operation between the health units and the Health Commission will be needed to ensure the continued provision of high standard services at an appropriate cost.

Basically, the speeches are identical. When one looks at the definition of the word "efficient", we come up with "competent, proficient, businesslike"; in other words, by continually referring in this Budget, especially in relation to health, to increased efficiency, the implication is that our present administrators in the public hospitals and their boards of management are incompetent, unbusinesslike and non-proficient.

Is the Premier saying that the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and its board of management are inefficient and incompetent? Is he saying that about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the Modbury Hospital, and all the other recognised hospitals? That is all we get. We have these cuts in health services on the grounds of increased efficiency. This Government has an obsession, not only in health but also in community welfare and education, that the previous Government literally went unchecked and did not bother about the efficiency or the proper management of the public hospitals.

A similar situation applies with the Premier's Budget statement. We hear that, with increased efficiency, this Government will be able to cut costs but maintain a high standard of care. Let us look at that rather infamous advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* on Monday 15 September. I know that some of my colleagues have referred to that advertisement, but I shall make a few comments about it. Under the heading "We are making this State great", we read that the Liberal Government has kept its election promises, that it has proven its ability to act fast and efficiently, and, through the Liberal Government initiatives, a renewed positive attitude towards our State by the private sector has already

brought about positive changes for the future of South Australia. That is the view of the Liberal Party.

Going back to the article by Michael Jacobs, which I referred to earlier, let us hear what he has to say about this Liberal Government, bearing in mind that this is a fairly charitable appraisal. Michael Jacobs states:

> But there is a persistent tendency not to think things through. Some of this derives from the more sweeping policy statements made before the election and before there was much real expectation of having to make them work. The airy confidence of the plan to hand over Government building work to private enterprise, for example, has been replaced by a slow and piecemeal struggle to begin to make it happen. And the breezy dogma about keeping out of the way of private enterprise must seem less than funny to the speculators caught holding South Australian Gas Company shares for which they paid $7 . . .
>
> After crashing into the pack on the West Lakes lights issue, the new Government fumbled the ball, sought the free for the push in the back, and found instead it had copped a 15-metre penalty for time-wasting.
>
> On the S.G.I.C. purchase of John Martin shares last week, the Premier began the day claiming credit for this responsible decision to strengthen Johnnies, and ended it saying the purchase was only an ordinary commercial decision and there was no question of there being any need to bolster the company.

Towards the end of the article, Michael Jacobs, referring to the Ministers, states:

> Among those who have to deal with this Government, there is a sense of being up against a certain skittishness and unpredictability. If the way they conduct their working relations with the Press—the preliminary approaches, the negotiations about arrangements, the undertakings given—are any indication of the way they conduct all their negotiations, it can only be a matter of time before there is a big explosion when someone important is made angry. Quite apart from the simple foul-ups, which happen in the best of worlds, there has been too much shiftiness, too many transparent untruths about things that are not worth the bother, and a couple of tricks that were too clever by half.

Obviously, Michael Jacobs and the Liberal Party have different views about this Government's performance. The *Advertiser* goes on to list the achievements of this Government over the past 12 months. I shall deal with only three of those achievements, as listed: the abolition of death and gift duties, the abolition of land tax, and the abolition of stamp duty on the first home up to $30 000. At what cost are these taxes abolished?

In his Budget speech, the Premier tells us that in 1980-81 the abolition of these three duties will cost the State $28 000 000. Very few South Australians will have benefited from that policy decision, but the vast majority of them will have to pay for it. Let us look at health matters, where we see a reduction of $4 800 000 this year as compared with last year's figures. I suppose that would help towards paying the cost of the $28 000 000. Despite the Minister's assurances last year, and despite the Premier's statement in the House the other day, we can, as usual, glean little from the Budget papers in relation to health. It is the same old one-line allocation. We have little idea how individual hospitals will fare, how institutions will fare, or how domiciliary care or community health facilities will fare in this Budget. That has been hidden in one line. No doubt, during the sessions of the Estimates Committees, we will be able to get that information from the Minister.

If we look at Appendix I of the Estimates of Expenditure, we can get an idea of what is happening in health in the coming financial year. It is rather important that, in two areas particularly, there have been no cuts at all: in the office of the Minister and in the central office. However, there has been a reduction of about $4 000 000 for the recognised hospitals. For the Mental Health Services, there is a slight increase of $400 000, which would not nearly cover inflation.

There is no allocation this year for Aboriginal health services, although last year $250 000 was allocated for that purpose. Is it any wonder that nothing has been allocated this year? From what I understand, the Minister has little regard for Aboriginal health. The Minister has not paid even one visit to the Aboriginal Health Unit in Norwood. The Minister told us earlier this year that she would take a trip, which was much publicised, to look at the Aboriginal communities in this State, to find out what was going wrong and put it right.

We all know what that trip amounted to. It was a trip to Port Augusta, a trip to the Oodnadatta Picnic Races, a trip to a couple of stations for afternoon tea and, at the last minute, there was a change in the itinerary and the Minister was forced to go to Mimili to talk to the people there concerning the radio-active waste that possibly resulted from the Maralinga tests.

Honourable members also know of the number of mistakes that the Minister has made in answering Questions on Notice in this House concerning Aboriginal health workers. The Minister must be the only Minister of Health to my knowledge who provided an answer in this House that there were no Aboriginal health workers in this State, that they were all white people, and then the Minister had to come back two or three months later and say in this Chamber that it was all a mistake, that there were about 43 Aboriginal people working in the Aboriginal Health Unit. Now we find that Aboriginal people are getting nothing as far as this State is concerned.

The Minister said a lot in this House in claiming credit for dental health services in South Australia, conveniently forgetting that that programme was started by the previous Labor Administration and the Whitlam Government. The Minister was quick to take advantage by claiming credit for that scheme. In the appendix to this document the Minister stated:

> There is going to be a slight decrease of about $12 000. That is based on an estimated $3 900 000 coming from the Federal Government.

If the Minister had read the Federal Budget she would have seen that only $3 470 000 was coming from the Federal Government. That is another area where the young kids of South Australia will suffer as a result of the abolition of succession and gift duties.

The Premier could not have chosen a better Minister of Health to carry out the cuts and the systematic destruction of health services in this State. He has chosen a Minister who cheerfully presides over the downgrading of health care delivery services in this State. I refer to the make-up and background of the Minister of Health, in order to obtain a fair idea of the pleasure that she gains from continually cutting back on health services.

The Minister comes from a fairly comfortable middle class background and holds middle class values. In fact, she epitomises the current middle class attitude that prevails in this State presently. It is this middle class background and the corresponding ideas that she holds that largely dictate her attitude to her portfolio, especially regarding decisions that she makes on the grounds of rationalisation.

The Minister sees nothing wrong in relocating essential services in this State without any regard to what ordinary people would feel about such rationalisation. She sees no problem in, say, relocating the renal unit from Royal

Adelaide Hospital to Flinders Medical Centre although, if that ever happened, it would in effect completely disbar ordinary people in the northern or north-eastern suburbs from attending that facility.

The Minister goes to great lengths to lecture this House and the people of South Australia that the cost of the health dollar is higher here than in any other State and, thereafter, these economies and rationalisations have to take place. The Minister is also quick to tack on that the health care delivery service and the high standards will not suffer. These areas are suffering and are continuing to suffer. The Minister knows that but will not admit it. I have continually passed on allegations about matters in hospitals for investigation by the Minister. However, every time I obtain a reply from the Minister saying that the problem is not the result of cuts in the health budget and, in most cases, the Minister claims that the patient involved was the cause of all the problems. The Minister cannot even resist lecturing people who write to her concerning problems that they have experienced in hospitals.

I refer to a classic letter in respect of the declining standards of health care and the Minister's reply to it. For obvious reasons, I cannot give the name of the lady concerned, but the Minister knows that the letter to which I am referring is true, because she received an identical letter, which states:

> Dear Minister,
>
> Today I had the great misfortune to spend seven hours at the Royal Adelaide Hospital where I was transported from a private hospital for a bone scan. I wish you could experience, first hand, the kind of non-treatment I experienced, but of course if you were a patient you would get V.I.P. treatment all the way. Therefore, you cannot understand fully what thousands of people go through each year. I would like to itemise some of the facts relative to my personal situation.

The writer then goes on to detail all the problems she experienced at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and finishes the letter by saying:

> I would like you to know that I interpret this impersonal, humiliating and dehumanising lack of service to be directly related to the current political practice to reduce the funding of service-delivery areas. With insufficient numbers of staff, their inattentive treatment of the public must follow as a natural consequence.
>
> I don't know if this letter will ever get to you personally, but I wish to make a plea for some humanity from the system (not individuals within it) for the poor, sick, frightened, helpless people who have nowhere else to go but the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I shudder to think what it must be like for those who have no other alternatives.

The Minister's reply was quite alarming, and I imagine that the lady concerned would have no faith in the Minister after she received the following reply:

> I am extremely concerned that the situation you have described has occurred, and I have asked for an immediate investigation of the matter.

The Minister then makes this amazing statement:

> The present economic policies of the State have been introduced to rationalise health expenditure in South Australia which is recognised as proportionately one of the largest in Australia and represents a large part of the State Budget. You will, of course, be aware that an ever-increasing spiral of spending in health will eventually be reflected in either increased personal tax or a revenue raising policy by the Government in some other area.

What the Minister is saying is, "O.K., you have suffered at the R.A.H. I will have the matter investigated," but then she goes on to say that we have to do this to reduce the health dollar in this State.

There are some of us who maintain that, whilst there should be responsibility in the costing of health in this State, it should not be at the expense of the individual patients who attend public hospitals. Obviously, the Minister does not particularly agree with that premise.

I turn now to the situation at Queen Victoria Hospital. The Minister has lectured me many times in this House about my so-called lack of understanding of health planning, but she has continually evaded giving direct answers about what was going to happen to that hospital, although we all really know that the decision has been made that obstetric and gynaecological services will be relocated at Royal Adelaide Hospital at some future date.

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

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** As I was saying before the dinner adjournment, it is fairly obvious that the Queen Victoria Hospital will close and its facilities will be relocated at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are some points which have not been canvassed in this House or in other areas and which have obviously not been considered by the Minister or the Health Commission. I understand that the Queen Victoria Hospital Board of Management has made a submission to the Government on these particular points.

I wish to deal with the number of private patients presently using the Queen Victoria Hospital and the number of students and other people taking advantage of the teaching facilities at that hospital. The report of the task force at page 44, paragraph 420, deals with the number of private deliveries performed at the Queen Victoria Hospital; at present 1 700 private deliveries per annum are undertaken at the Queen Victoria Hospital. There is some real doubt, if the Queen Victoria Hospital closes, whether those people will go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. They will be dispersed among the smaller community hospitals throughout the State. That, in effect, goes against the idea of confining obstetrics and gynaecological services to a certain area.

If one looks at the number of private patients going through the Queen Victoria Hospital and recognises, as the Queen Victoria Hospital Board of Management does, that these private patients are incorporated into teaching programmes, one sees that a significant loss of these patients from the teaching system will be to the disadvantage of the training of medical students, medical staff, midwifery students and allied health professional students. This is recognised in the report. If one looks at the number of people undertaking training at the hospital one finds a surprising figure: there are 162 people a year, plus those members of the medical profession who wish to further their professional expertise in that area.

Last year 60 midwifery trainees, 10 neo-natal intensive-care trainees, 19 medical students, one pharmacy trainee and one social worker trainee went through the Queen Victoria Hospital. If the Queen Victoria Hospital were closed, those 162 people a year will not be able to get any training in this State. There is also the situation of private patients not wishing to go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The task force accepts that proposition, as does the Board of Management of the hospital. It is fairly obvious that the Minister has not considered this aspect.

If the Queen Victoria Hospital closes and its services are relocated at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, there is no way that people will want to use that facility. Where will those 1 700 people who wish to use the facility of the Queen Victoria Hospital go? The Minister has not answered that question. The final submission from the Queen Victoria Hospital made those pertinent points. So far as I know, the Minister has not said what will happen.

I turn to the matter of pregnancy terminations. In no way does the Opposition, or the Board of Management of the Queen Victoria Hospital, maintain that the Queen Victoria Hospital should be a place where abortions are welcomed. However, the facts speak for themselves. Of all the major hospitals that carry out abortions, the Royal Adelaide Hospital performs the fewest. In 1977-78, of the 2 971 recorded abortions only 5 per cent were carried out at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The highest number of 37 per cent of abortions was recorded at the Queen Victoria Hospital. It is fairly well recognised that, in cases where abortions are necessary (and we all know that in many cases local doctors determine that a pregnancy should be terminated), if the services are relocated at the Royal Adelaide Hospital there could be a real problem. That is why it is necessary to retain the Queen Victoria Hospital, because in areas such as this, even though it might be a bit distasteful to the Minister, the Queen Victoria Hospital provides a service. There does not necessarily need—

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

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I support the Budget, which I believe is a good and responsible Budget; it is, in fact, the best Budget that has been brought into this Chamber in the 10½ years since I have been here. One can remember the fiasco in regard to the previous Government's Budgets. This Government has been in office for only 12 months, yet it has so much to be proud of and the people of South Australia have so much to be thankful for. I was concerned about some of the remarks made by the member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What about the member for Napier?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I will deal with him later. The contribution of the member for Elizabeth was a cowardly attack. The honourable member said that he was concerned that a pistol had been made and found at Yatala. With his experience in the field of criminology, in which he terms himself a sort of expert, a legal eagle, a man who knows all the answers, who can make the answers if he does not have them, the honourable member would know that these things happen in prisons, and he would also know that the gun that was to be fired by an elastic band was made of bits and pieces from the gaol. The honourable member also stated that he was concerned about the fact that, when he wanted to visit a gaol, he had to obtain permission. I point out that that has always been the case. When I visited institutions in the past, I always informed the department of my intention.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** He doesn't realise that he's no longer Attorney-General.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** The now removed Attorney-General obviously still thinks that he is in the Government. I was interested to hear him say that staff morale in the Department of Correctional Services is very low, particularly at Yatala. Whom could we blame for that? Obviously, we could blame the honourable member, as a member of the previous Cabinet, for allowing the situation to run down in the way in which it has run down. During 10 years of socialism, the Labor Government had time to do something about the problems that the honourable member now says are a disgrace.

The honourable member was obviously a member of some authority of the previous Labor Cabinet because, as Attorney-General, he was one of the main advisers to the Premier and to his colleagues. The member for Elizabeth and the previous Chief Secretary (Hon. D. W. Simmons) were very close, yet the honourable member was unable to convince that Chief Secretary that some improvement was needed at Yatala. It rings very hollow when the honourable member weeps crocodile tears on his notes about the state of the institutions, particularly Yatala, and the problems faced by the inmates and the staff. The honourable member, as Attorney-General (a powerful position), considered the criminals only, those who broke the law, and gave little thought to people who obey the law, and I have no doubt that he still does this. His Government failed, during the 10 years in which it was in power, to do anything about the situation.

I also noted that the honourable member said that, after speaking to prisoners, he would like to bulldoze Yatala. The honourable gentleman is a little late; he had his opportunity for 10 long years, 10 very long years for the people of this State, who became sick and tired of the socialist Government. He had an opportunity to do something about the situation at Yatala, yet he, his Cabinet, his Chief Secretary and his Premier did absolutely nothing about the state of Yatala and the people in it. Perhaps the present Chief Secretary could tell me how many times the previous Attorney, as keeper of the law in this State, visited Yatala or other prisons to inspect the situation at first hand, during the 10 years in which the Labor Government was in power. That is an interesting question, and perhaps my friend and colleague the Chief Secretary may be able to supply that information.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. MATHWIN:** He might have seen some friends there; there is no doubt about that. The member for Elizabeth has claimed that the security of Yatala Labour Prison and the Adelaide Gaol has been allowed to run down and that a major review is long overdue. They were his words, and yet he knows only too well that the Labor Government had 10 years in which to do something about the situation. His Government took no action, yet, during the short period since our coming to office in this State, the Chief Secretary has instituted a departmental inquiry and has also approved the installation of television and surveillance equipment at both Yatala Labour Prison and the Adelaide Gaol. The Chief Secretary of the Liberal Government has also approved the appointment of an additional 21 prison officers. This fact is most interesting. Perhaps the member for Elizabeth, who is not here at present because he apparently does not think that the debate is important enough for him to stay, will read *Hansard* and learn of this fact. Only last week the Chief Secretary indicated that the No. 1 priority would be sufficient accommodation for maximum security rated prisoners.

In our short time in Government, we have already provided an additional 21 prison officers, something the previous Government refused to do. I point out that, during the time in which the previous Government was in office, several approaches were made by the department to increase the staffing level within the institutions; these requests were refused on several occasions.

**Mr. Evans:** Or ignored.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Refused or ignored. The member for Elizabeth now has the audacity to stand up in this Chamber and utter the rubbish he has uttered when he knows his Government, under his command as Attorney-General (the man responsible for the law in this State) allowed the situation to deteriorate when it was in full charge of the operation for 10 long, wearying years.

**Mr. Evans:** In fact, it is being rebuilt.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Indeed, they could have rebuilt the whole Yatala concept if they had had a mind to do that, but at least they could have improved the lot of the prison officers and helped the staff situation. That would have helped the prisoners, in turn. So much for the hollow ring

of what the member for Elizabeth said! That member has also stated that he has a number of points and some information. If he has solid information, he should tell the authorities.

If he has any information that could be brought forward to enable charges to be laid against persons involved in stand-over tactics as he claims to have, that information should be turned over to the authorities for action to be taken. The former Attorney would know that, as a man well versed in the law. If he is so concerned about the situation in Yatala, he should readily come forward with that information so that action can be taken about it.

Another matter to which the honourable gentleman referred about a week ago and which I think needs some clarification is the matter of the number of prison deaths in our institutions over the past few years. I am pleased that the member for Stuart is present, because he, too, can learn something if he is quiet and pays attention. The member for Elizabeth asked a question in this House about the death of some prisoners. He questioned the Chief Secretary about a month ago, not a week ago, and asked that the reports be made available to him of the death of the following prisoners: Cocking, Mogorov, Bowman, Essa, O'Sullivan, Ash, Alchin, Brown, and Lattis.

It is interesting to note that prisoner Alchin is very much alive and is working in the sheet metal shop at Yatala, yet the member for Elizabeth claims that he is dead. That man has been working in the shop for some time and is quite happy and healthy. It would be interesting if the member for Elizabeth, on his next visit to Yatala, spoke to this gentleman who, he claims, is dead, and found out whether he was a ghost or whether he was really there working hard in the sheet metal shop.

It is all very well for the recently removed Attorney-General, now the plain member for Elizabeth and back-bencher in the Opposition, to come up with these accusations, but he ought to get his facts straight, particularly if he is talking about dead men. We know the situation with some organisations that have dead men on the books and on the pay sheet, but this is a different proposition as far as the now removed Attorney-General is concerned.

Let us look at another gentleman mentioned on the list given by the member for Elizabeth. We have a gentleman by the name of Essa. There is no prisoner of that name in any of our prisons in South Australia, and there never has been. We have never had a prisoner of that name, and it is ridiculous for the member for Elizabeth to claim that the man is dead.

**Mr. Keneally:** When did he mention these names?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** These names were mentioned about a month ago by the member for Elizabeth in a question to the Chief Secretary.

**Mr. Keneally:** Could you give me the *Hansard* reference?

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Yes, the page.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** *Hansard* is available if the member for Baudin, who, we know, now is the removed Minister of Education but who has been elevated, because he is on the front-bench of the Opposition, and the member for Stuart would like to look it up. I do not want to do their work for them. I am sure they can read and it would not be hard for them to see it. It is ridiculous for the member for Elizabeth to give the name "Essa" regarding a dead prisoner, a man who, the member for Elizabeth claims, could either have committed suicide or been murdered in the gaol when he was an inmate of Yatala. We have never had a man of that name in the prisons of South Australia.

How on earth can a man die in prison if we have never had him there? We have two. The member for Stuart is dead but will not lie down. I suggest that the former Minister, the member for Elizabeth, should get his facts straight before he shoots off here with fictitious names of fictitious people who do not exist within the system. In relation to the other man, Mr. Alchin, the honourable member had better check the gentleman, feel his pulse, and see whether he is breathing before coming here and suggesting that the man is dead.

**Mr. Keneally:** You could be in a lot of trouble over this, because you have not got the facts right.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** The only time the member for Stuart was in trouble was when his mother made a misdemeanor.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I rise on a point of order. The member for Glenelg says that the only time the member for Stuart was in trouble was when his mother made a misdemeanor. I take extreme exception to that. My mother, of whom I was extremely fond, has been dead for some years, and I think that the reflection nevertheless is most abhorrent. I ask that you, Sir, require the member to withdraw and apologise to both me and my departed mother. I take great exception to that remark.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to both withdraw and apologise to the honourable member for Stuart.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Yes, indeed, Sir, I am happy to do that. I do apologise to the honourable member. I should not have taken his mother's name in vain. I apologise for that and to him and his family and say that the honourable member ought to have been drowned when he was a pup.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I rise on another point of order. The honourable member ought to have had the good grace to withdraw unconditionally, because it was a most abhorrent statement that he made. Now he has made a further remark that I ought to have been drowned when I was a pup. I find that offensive and ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule that that also is unparliamentary and to ask the member to withdraw that remark and apologise, unconditionally.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The honourable member was asked to withdraw and apologise in an unqualified way. The use of further terms by the honourable member has put a qualification to the earlier withdrawal, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise to the honourable member for Stuart.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Very good, I am quite happy to withdraw and apologise for the hurt to the member for Stuart. I will now continue. Otherwise, I will be going through my speech with points of order, and I would not want that to happen. I will now refer to another subject, because obviously the Opposition is fairly hurt about the situation and very tender.

**Mr. Keneally:** I'm absolutely tender about references to my family.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I withdrew that. The reference about your being the other does not really reflect on your family.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Let's raise the standard.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That is a great thing, coming from the Opposition. I should like to deal with other matters that I was speaking about in a previous debate. They relate to some things that I saw when I was overseas on my study trip. I found difficulty in getting all the information into my report.

I will now explain to members an area of correctional services in which, I believe, we can extend here. It would be of great advantage to this State because, no doubt, the standard of education of young criminals is low, and there is an obvious link between miseducation and the young delinquents of any country. Vancouver, Canada, has a scheme which is called the Step-Up School, which is

worked in conjunction with a probation system in which the ratio of probation officers is as low as about one to one. The people who need this extra boost in education are selected, and the scheme has been tremendously successful. The schooling is for two hours a day, five days a week. The morning programme begins at 9 o'clock and the afternoon programme starts at noon. The student must be seated and ready to start on time, in order to receive full points for the day. Each has his own particular carrel and tutor. Most students are seated and instructed on a one-to-one basis. Some who are capable of coping in a small group are seated together, but instructed individually.

At the beginning of each day, the student does four timed one-minute tests in mathematics, spelling, reference, and oral reading. She or he aims to beat targets set slightly above previous performance scores, and the tutors gear the targets so that the student can attain success with a reasonable amount of effort. In actual teaching of the subjects, each day the students do 45 minutes of mathematics, 30 minutes of language, and 45 minutes of reading work. The programme is entirely individualised and based on the student's needs.

I draw members' attention to the philosophy behind this scheme. Learning disabilities are one of the major causes of juvenile delinquency. That has been proved time and time again throughout my investigations in different countries overseas. All behaviour is learned. Kids repeat what they get attention for. Little time is spent dwelling on a student's background and history. Every day and every moment is a new one, a fresh start without recrimination. Approval should be immediate, sincere and appropriate. To be a good teacher is of prime importance. Once a student is accepted, he or she cannot be asked to leave the course for any reason. Each student is accepted and taught at her or his own level of emotional, mental and physical functioning.

When training schools were discontinued in British Columbia in 1969, Step-Up was designed by involved community members who could not find a school that hard-core juvenile delinquents could regularly and willingly attend. Step-Up is a programme instituted for the development of the basic academic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic for Vancouver youth, between the ages of 13 and 17, who have been adjudged delinquent. Referred by probation officers, the students must be on probation, school drop-outs, and residents of Vancouver; 51 students are registered at Step-Up, and they attend for two hours a day. That is a brief explanation of the scheme.

The goals of the scheme are to reduce the number of times the participants are adjudged delinquent on further offences; to encourage appropriate social development; to demonstrate that, even at adolescence, a remedial school programme can successfully rehabilitate students; and to provide a positive learning experience for a wide variety of university students whose careers involve working with youth. In the scheme are volunteers from the university who provide some of the courses and who teach young delinquents. The objectives are to instruct each student in basic academic skills to the equivalency of grade 10. It has been found through my experience that some of the young people are well below the grade normally appropriate at their age. The objectives of the scheme are to provide work experience within the Step-Up programme (office duties, clean-up, etc.); to develop the motivation to learn; to find suitable work; and to remain employed.

Another aspect of the scheme is to measure daily (and this is an important factor as far as the organisers of the scheme are concerned) the progress of each student and to interpret that progress to the student as a further impetus to learning; to set up the academic programme in such a manner that volunteers can successfully tutor students; and to demonstrate, by example, the accepted social behaviour necessary to get along in society. The whole scheme is most successful, and I was most interested in seeing it. Some of the statistics, in brief, are as follows: the average age of these students is 15 years and 10 months. Only 12 of these students currently live at home with both parents. Of 25 students tested, three failed standard hearing tests. Of 31 students tested, seven failed standard vision tests; 23 per cent of the students enrolled had failed three grades at regular school; and 45 per cent of the students were placed in special classes in regular schools.

The average student attended five schools before entering Step-Up; 78 per cent of the students repeated one or more grades in regular schools; and 96 per cent of the students enrolled are learning disabled. That is a most interesting fact. Adjudged delinquency of the students currently enrolled dropped from 146 before entry to 34 during enrolment. Of the 51 students registered in 1980, 33 did not commit any further offences after enrolment; 65 per cent of the students enrolled this year have not committed a further offence. The average cost a day for each student in 1980 was $20·09. The students achieved a total of 38 grades this year.

That is a brief outline of the way in which that scheme is successful. I believe that, as a State, we could do well to copy that scheme. In keeping with every other country, we are trying to get more success, in the treatment of juvenile offenders, and success is hard to find in this field. We want to achieve a result in which recidivists, the repeaters of crime, are not repeating any further, and are back in society as responsible citizens.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I am disappointed, frustrated and annoyed about this Budget. All I can say is that, if the member for Glenelg regards this as the best Budget he has seen in 10 years in this place, he is either extremely easily pleased or else, to be a little more accurate, his policies and mine are very far apart, indeed. One of the things I find so particularly annoying about it is that its general thrust is so much in line with the thrust of Fraser Commonwealth Budgets of the past four or five years.

However, that is something to which I will return a little later in my remarks. I suppose when one addresses oneself to a State Budget the first thing that one should ask is what, after all, is the function of these peculiar things called State Governments based as they are on boundaries that are historical accidents and on constitutional footings which are, in some ways in legal terms, more secure than the Commonwealth but, in financial terms, far less secure.

Standing, as we are, in a position where we have seen an evolution over a period of 80 years where the Commonwealth, under Governments of whatever political colouration, has expanded its powers at the expense of the States, we must take all of those matters into account in evaluating the State Budget, because we are concerned not only with what the Government is trying to do but also with what it is appropriate for it to do and, further, what it is possible for it to do, given the constraints that I have just referred to and the evolving position in which all of the States find themselves. The State Premiers have certain hopes from the present Prime Minister in relation to State revenue. They stand in very little different position from State Premiers of five, 10 or 15 years ago, or indeed back in the 1920's, but that is not something into which I want to move right now.

The States have important responsibilities in the general field of the law and the maintenance of community order, the Commonwealth having been a late entrant into that

field. Beyond that, the States have important responsibilities in the critical fields of education, community welfare and health, although the State Budgets are constrained in a way that the Commonwealth is not. Although the States in many cases can only nibble at the edges, and although State efforts can affect the employment position only at the margin (as this Government is finding despite the heady rhetoric of its first few months in office), nonetheless the States can have an impact in these areas—areas affecting what is increasingly coming to be regarded as the social wage.

Let me come to grips with this concept of the social wage. First, there are those people in the community who say that the major determinant of the individual's living standard—and, indeed, the major determinant of living standards generally—is what we get in our pay packets. It is very difficult to argue with that viewpoint. However, the sort of impact that State Governments can have on that is very marginal indeed. Their institutional capacities, as we are set up at present, either to encourage a wages hike or to dampen it down, are very limited. Furthermore, any encouragement of the evolution or the development of wages—the movement to higher wages—would of course be against the conservative rhetoric which is beloved of this particular Government. Therefore, it would be expecting far too much to suggest that this Government would see a development of the standard of living as arising out of a growth in individual pay packets beyond whatever tends to be happening nationwide. But the social wage is coming to be seen as increasingly important as a determinant of standards of living, and this is something which Governments can affect quite materially; indeed, I see it as being one of the basic justifications for having government and as one of the areas where State Government can be effective despite the controls that operate on it.

The standard of provision of basic infrastructure in society, the standard of provision of education and the direct costs that are borne by parents as a result of having to send their children to school, what it costs to be able to get a reasonable standard of health care, our access to recreational facilities and what it costs us as individuals to move ourselves around the huge modern metropolises in which we live, are all aspects of the social wage. They are all part of the goods which are delivered in more or less extent by Budgets such as this Budget. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that we should look at this Budget in terms of the impact that it has on the social wage, because it is largely irrelevant to the impact that it has on direct wages, those being things which are determined quite properly in other areas.

It is in this area that my disappointment, my frustration and my annoyance come to the fore because, in line with the sorts of thing that have been happening federally in this country for five years, this Budget seeks to dampen and depress the social wage. We have had all of the rhetoric and know all of the Friedmanite reasons why this Government is doing it, and we have seen the results around the world of the imposition of Friedmanite policies. The general pattern in the developed industrial Western world of the late 1960's and the early 1970's was the coming into office of the middle-of-the-road or slightly left-of-centre Governments in most of the Western industrial societies pledged to do something about the social wage, given what had happened and the stagnation that had occurred during the conservative 1950's and early 1960's.

Contemporaneous with that development was the upsurge of problems related, for example, to the energy crisis and the policies of the OPEC nations, and the effect of these sorts of thing, which are now recognised by conservative Governments in office that are looking for excuses for lack of performance, was that most of these centre-of-the-road Governments lost office and were replaced by conservative Governments committed to Friedmanite policies. What since then have we seen? We have seen an intensification of those very problems which these conservative Governments said they would be able to fix up. How embarrassing it is these days for supporters of the conservative side of politics to be reminded of the very specific commitments that the Prime Minister of Australia made in relation to employment and inflation in 1975. How embarrassing it is for supporters of the right-of-centre Party in South Australia to be reminded of the specific commitments which the Premier of this State made as Leader of the Opposition less than 12 months ago. How embarrassing it is for people in the United Kingdom to think of the sort of things which the current Prime Minister of that country was going to do and to look at the disastrous situation in which that country finds itself. In every case there has been an intensification of the problems.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That's not true.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I rather thought that I would draw the member for Glenelg on this matter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Glenelg will not assist the member for Baudin. I suggest that the honourable member not reply to interjections.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will not, Sir, but I would like to say a few things about the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and I imagine that I am in order in doing so, because it relates to my central thesis of the disasters of the Friedmanite policies. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the heroine, the Brittania of the member for Glenelg and others of his ilk, is in trouble with her own Party, and her back bench is panicking because of the disastrous situation that has occurred in the economic situation in that country as revealed by unemployment statistics. That situation is bound to get worse until such time as the conservative Government in the United Kingdom comes to its senses or is replaced by some other sort of Government. This is the sort of situation that we face on a much more limited scale in relation to this Budget.

In those areas that impact directly on the social wage, we see a deterioration in performance, and nowhere is this more marked, relative to the commitments that were made by this Government, than it is in the education field. It is not so very long ago that I stood up in this place during the Address in Reply debate and made certain predictions as to what the outcome of this Budget might be for education. I said sincerely at the time that I hoped that I was wrong in those predictions. Of course, one can quibble with the details of some of those predictions. One could quibble that I was wrong in the prediction that I made as to what would happen to the school building programme. However, generally, I was correct.

I believe that I said that the school building programme would have to get by with about $33 000 000 this year compared to the $37 500 000 that it had to spend last year. I may have said $32 000 000; I cannot quite remember. In any event, it was fairly certain that I would not be right to the exact $100 000. In fact, we are being asked to vote only $33 100 000 in the school building programme, compared to the $37 500 000 last year.

**Dr. Billard:** Education has done a lot better in this Budget than it did in your Budget.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Of course, that is not true, as is well known. The last Budget that I introduced in this place provided $40 000 000 for the school building

programme. However, we can get into that sort of detail later.

I do not know what the member for Newland is calling out across the Chamber. If he is talking about the state of the preparation of the 1979 Budget when the Government came into office, I can state that I dealt effectively with that in my Budget speech last year. I need merely to direct the honourable member's attention to the remarks that I made in that speech. I will not waste any more time on that matter.

What does this Budget do in specific terms of education employment and of the school building programme? It would appear that we are going to see a reduction of 306 teaching positions in the Education Department, 120 in the primary area and 51 in the secondary area. There will be 90 fewer release-time scholarships than we had last year, and we will lose 45 metropolitan seconded and advisory positions. We will also lose 85 ancillary staff and Public Service positions and, of that 85, the closest that I can get is that probably 64 of the positions that will be lost will be ancillary staffing positions.

I believe it is recommended that Parliament should vote $305 000 off the provision for hourly paid instructors. Also, there is $692 000 generally off non-salaried programmes. They are some of the reductions that the Education Department faces as a result of this Budget and what is to happen because of it. The Minister of Education had an opportunity to make himself a hero and to earn some kudos for the Government in his performance in the Cabinet room. Some people said to me some time ago that they thought that the Government was playing the sort of game that we have seen played elsewhere: frighten everyone by talk of huge reductions, and then come out with something that is reasonable, and everyone wipes the sweat off his brow and says, "They are not so bad after all."

However, the ball has been fumbled in terms of the figures to which I have referred. If those figures are incorrect, let honourable members opposite get up and deny them. Let them also deny that the general thrust of their commitments to the people of this State at the 1979 election was for expansion in education, and, furthermore, that they said they would do better than the Labor Party did during its 10 years in office. What has happened to all that rhetoric? Was there some fine print in those promises? Were there things that others of us did not read, or was there a direct and dishonest attempt to fool the electors of this State?

I have said one or two things in general about the recurrent provision for Education Department spending. I should also like to say one or two things about the capital programme. I have already referred to a couple of figures. The Minister's Loan programme allowed for an expenditure up to $37 500 000. This year, we are being asked to vote $33 100 000.

So, first, there is that reduction on the school building programme. However, there is also something as serious as that, namely, the money that was not spent last year. Parliament duly voted the Government $37 500 000, although the Government spent only $33 600 000. How are we to interpret that? Are we to see that as responsible management of the State's resources, given that the needs were not really there for $37 500 000 worth of school building expenditure, or are we to see it as an inefficiency? Are we to see it as a callous indifference to the needs of those schools that badly need refurbishing, or a callous indifference in terms of trying to establish a phoney Budget position? That additional money that was approved for expenditure last year could and should have been spent.

I do not believe for one moment that the Government was faced with an unfortunate or an unfavourable tendering climate. I do not believe for one moment that it could not have got the work done in the time available had it wanted to. There was no shortage of materials or contractors looking for work in this State. In fact, one wonders generally why Liberal Governments around this country seem to want to hammer the larger-scale building industry, because the general drift of the Loan programme from Canberra in recent years has, of course, been a reduction, and that is reflected in the State Loan programmes as well. That, in turn, must be reflected in the disastrous situation of the building industry.

One of my colleagues, namely, the member for Gilles, referred this afternoon to private home building. My immediate concern is more with the larger-scale areas of the building industry which build schools and colleges for the Department of Further Education. Perhaps we should have been warned, as the present Minister is on record in this place a year or so ago as saying that I, as Minister, seemed to have a mania for wanting to build lavish palaces (I believe that was the term he used) for the Department of Further Education. I hope that he has now moderated that attitude and that he sees, for example, Regency Park as being a struture that is entirely appropriate to the training of young apprentices in our community, and that he sees what his department, with a mixture of Commonwealth and State funds, is doing at the Noarlunga Regional Centre as being entirely appropriate to the needs of the southern areas, part of which I represent in this place. One wonders whether this attitude is not showing through in the very poor performance of education and the Department of Further Education in terms of this Budget.

**Mr. Keneally:** It will be disastrous for Port Pirie.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** It will be disastrous not only for Port Pirie. I know the member for Stuart is very concerned about the situation at Port Pirie and that he has represented extremely well to the requisite authorities the needs of that city in terms of further education. However, Port Adelaide is another area that badly needs an upgrading of further education facilities.

I cannot see, for the life of me, how Port Adelaide will get those facilities in terms of the sort of trend we see in this Budget for expenditure in the Loan area of the D.F.E. I remind the Minister again, while we are talking about this capital area, as I will remind him in the Committee stages of this debate, that he has this on-going problem of the holding schools and the necessity for the Government of the day to fulfil the commitment made by the Government of which I was a part (indeed, Minister of Education) that those holding schools should be replaced by permanent structures just as soon as the enrolments firmed. I do not want to retrace what I said, I think in the Address in Reply debate, except to remind honourable members opposite, one or two of whom are looking puzzled by these remarks, that there are these so-called holding schools around the State that were built of demountables, because of the problem that could have arisen with enrolments not firming up, and the department's not wanting to get into a situation of finding itself with a brand new school in solid construction and a small enrolment in the first year.

Part of the whole deal was that, as soon as the enrolment situation was clarified, a permanent school would be built. One of the advantages of the deal was that there would be a school community already there which would have some direct input into the nature of the permanent school which would be constructed, rather than having that decision imposed on it by the bureaucrats and the politicians at the centre. That philosophy, I believed at

the time, was entirely appropriate, provided there was an ongoing commitment to do the job when the objective situation warranted it, and I fear that, in terms of this Budget, and the sort of trend we see in Loan financing, that is not going to happen, and the commitment that I made will be dishonoured by my successor. I am afraid that this is the general trend revealed in this Budget, not simply in the school-building programme, but in many other areas of education expenditure. That is what makes me disappointed, frustrated and annoyed.

**Mr. Keneally:** There is no Minister in the House.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I notice that there is no Minister in the House, and one wonders why there is not a Minister on hand from time to time when he is needed generally in the community for comments. It is important that the Minister of Education be a champion of the profession, and there have been times when the Minister very much should have come out and defended the profession, when misguided and unfair attacks were made on it. Earlier in this session, I referred to the attacks made on the profession by Mr. Stewart Cockburn, in the *Advertiser*, and also by the obviously fictitious F. S. Adams, in the *News*. These people were on about things such as overpayments which had been made to teachers from time to time, and it seemed to them that the teachers had almost acted dishonestly in not immediately paying back the money, and all this sort of nonsense that they were going on about. Not only did the Minister not come out and defend teachers from such attacks when he should have, but he was entirely silent when the boot was on the other foot. Let me share with the House a letter written by the Director, Management and School Services, to Mrs. McNaughton, who at that time was Acting President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Dated 26 August 1980, the letter states:

> Dear Mrs. McNaughton,
>
> I regret to advise that an error occurred in the processing of the pay cheques for teachers which cover the period of the forthcoming school vacation.
>
> As you know, teachers who have rental deducted from their pay do not have deductions made during school holiday periods. Unfortunately, this did not occur in connection with the pay covering the period 29 August to 11 September.
>
> Arrangements are being made for this suppression to be made in the pay period ending 25 September 1980 instead.

That was after the school holidays, not before, when the teachers should have got it. The letter continues:

> When the problem was detected, and because it was not appropriate to rerun the pay, we decided to send a note to principals in each of the pay envelopes explaining the situation. A copy of that memorandum is enclosed.
>
> I thought I should let you know the situation in case inquiries or complaints are directed to your office. Although it might appear at first sight that it was caused by a human error, that is, a person or persons merely forgot to suppress the rental, I am assured that this was not the case. An investigation is being undertaken to ensure that this problem does not recur.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> T. M. Barr

I am not complaining about the circumstances behind that letter. Mr. Barr is an excellent officer of the department and has excellent people working under his direction and control. From time to time, of course, and with the best will in the world, mistakes are made. This simply illustrates that the boot can be on the other foot. If teachers can be overpaid in error, they can also be underpaid in error; they can be out of pocket for significant periods of time, but little is made of that. But, of course, when evidence comes forward of significant overpayments they are blasted in the press without any sort of defence from their champion, the Minister of Education.

I think that, if this Government wants to be seen as retaining the confidence of teachers in this State, it must get up and do a few things. It has to show that it is concerned for the health and welfare of the profession, that it is concerned for the situation in the schools, because the health and the welfare of the profession impact directly on our youngsters in the schools and the quality of care and education that they are receiving. What this Government fails to understand, of course, is the relationship between private and public sector expenditure. It believes that it should suppress the social wage in order somehow to get the private sector going again, and yet I was given evidence earlier today of the way in which the gross national product, the total resources in the public sector, has risen since 1975 in the whole of Australia, even though there is in Canberra a Government that said that it would clip the wings of the public sector in order to give the private sector room to grow. Of course, it has not happened, because the private sector has continued to wither, and although there has been some curtailment of growth in the public sector, in percentage terms it is greater than it was in 1975 over the whole of this country because of the continuing deterioration in the position of the private sector.

What this Government and Friedmanites and conservatives generally fail to understand is that the health of the one tends to move along in the same direction as the health of the other. We cannot cut back expenditure in the Housing Trust in the hope that somehow, magically, that will release money for private sector building. It does not work that way. I invite honourable members opposite to look at the situation with housing start-ups, applications, and the rest, over a 20-year or 30-year period in the State. The pattern is clear that, where there has been greater activity in the public sector, so there has been greater activity in the private sector. If the Government wants to get employment moving again in this State, it can best start in its own backyard. It is the steward of the public sector and of the social wage. Let it look critically at its performance in that area and no doubt, as a result of taking the right policies in the public area, so private sector confidence will begin to revive. That is not happening under the policies so far followed by this Government and embodied in this unfortunate document.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** In supporting the Bill, I am pleased to note that some major projects within my electorate will be reaching a conclusion and, more importantly, some will commence operations during the coming financial year. This is pleasing to me, as it is to my constituents, who will be the beneficiaries of such actions. However, I wish to take the time available to me to discuss further an issue which I have raised in this House on numerous occasions. I refer to my concern regarding the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical project.

I raise this matter because it is probably the most significant Government venture that has occurred and because of the effects, as it is planned, that it could have on the city of Port Lincoln. I say that because the project places in jeopardy the future of the prawn industry, which presently has a wharf value of about $9 000 000. Through processing, that $9 000 000 fish component becomes a $30 000 000 asset. As a large proportion of prawn processing is undertaken at Port Lincoln, that $30 000 000 is most important to the economic viability of the city of Port Lincoln.

A fair assessment would be that at least $25 000 000

from that industry goes through the city of Port Lincoln, and naturally enough the people of Port Lincoln, the fishermen, the processors, and people engaged in the commerce of the town, are the beneficiaries of that project.

Having said that, I refer to an editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times* on Friday 8 August, headed "Big deals for Spencer Gulf". The editorial states:

> Premier Tonkin seems reasonably certain that a uranium enrichment plant will be established at one of the Spencer Gulf cities some time in the future.
>
> The Government also seems still confident that the petrochemical plant will be built at Redcliff.
>
> People concerned about the Redcliff project are still waiting for evidence of a thorough and independent investigation of the environmental effects of such a plant.
>
> There are now fears that the investigation in relation to the proposed uranium enrichment plant will also be left mainly to those with a vested interest in seeing it established.
>
> The people of South Australia are also entitled to be told if one consideration favouring the enrichment plant on Spencer Gulf is the proximity of "suitable" areas for dumping nuclear waste from customer companies.
>
> Making anouncements in relation to developments in the Spencer Gulf area have been greatly favoured by both Labor and Liberal Governments in times of State and Federal elections.
>
> After all, environmental hazards mean little to the majority of South Australia's voters who have Yorke Peninsula between them and any likely ill-effects.

Those are rather solemn thoughts. However, the last time I spoke in this House about the Redcliff project was on 12 August in the Address in Reply debate. I referred then to the fact that no-one had made reference in the press or media to the release issued by the Australian Fishing Industry Council.

I said at the time that AFIC had released its report to Dow Chemical Company on 26 June, yet by 12 August not one word had been printed. However, the very next day a feature article by Barry Hailstone in the health section of the *Advertiser* made reference to AFIC's concern about the likely effects of the Dow Chemical Company project on the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf.

The day after that the *Advertiser* editorial took up the cudgels and raised the fears of the fishermen at that time. Since then and after the initial environmental effects statement as put out by Dow Chemical Company, a subsequent report has been released. I do not know the exact date of its release, but it was about 20 August. The front part of the report was a virtual replica of the original draft environmental effects statement, but the latter part of the document gave an outline of the summary of the submissions that were received, and it gave some of the answers to those submissions.

The report indicated that 57 submissions were presented to Dow Chemical Company. I do not know whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, but I was the only member of Parliament or representative of a political Party to lodge a submission to the company. I suggest that that is a reflection upon the apathy of the leaders of our State and our community that there were not many more submissions by members of Parliament and by political Parties in relation to this venture.

This is a serious document. We are dealing with many millions of dollars in this venture. Indeed, we could be placing in jeopardy the livelihood of many existing workers in the fishing and other subsequent industries.

It is estimated that there are 760 jobs derived directly from the fishing industry in Upper Spencer Gulf. That is more than just fishermen and takes in processors and subsequent workers who are directly employed as a result of that industry. On a job-for-job basis, are we through this development placing at risk 760 jobs with the potential of replacing them with 460 jobs?

I would like to think that both can operate and maintain their viability in their own right. Unfortunately, the evidence presented to date does not indicate that that is possible. Of the 57 submissions made to the company, only one Government department of note was represented.

This made headlines on Saturday 6 September when, on the Saturday prior to the announcement by the Government on the Wednesday, it made considerable headlines that the Fisheries Department had condemned the site and wanted a further two-year study into the likely environmental effects and wanted greater precautions to be undertaken.

At that time other M.P.'s were running around the countryside saying that the Minister of Fisheries should be condemned for allowing his department to make such comments. Others called for the resignation of the Minister of Fisheries. However, I adopted a totally different tack in this instance because, if there is to be any comment made in relation to the Minister of Fisheries, he should be praised. He was the only Minister who allowed his department to put forward an unvetted report in relation to the Dow environmental effects statement.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** He did not know about it.

**Mr. BLACKER:** The member for Mitchell says that the Minister did not know about it, but I do not believe that to be the case. I believe that the Fisheries Department report was submitted with the full knowledge of the Minister. He did not indicate to his department that he in any way wanted to vet, alter or influence the report presented by the department.

If other Ministers had allowd their departments to do exactly the same thing, I am confident that the assessment of the environmental effect of the Dow project would not be the same as we have had presented to us.

Another issue that I wish to take up concerns the right of Dow Chemical Company to make public and, more importantly, hand over those submissions. In writing to the company I addressed my letter to the General Manager and expected that that communication was a letter between me and the company, but it was only a few weeks later that I found that all the information I had submitted to the company cropped up in a Government report.

I seriously question how closely the Government and the company have been working on this project, and how hand-in-glove they have been in the preparation of the respective submissions. The second environmental effects statement by the company went through and listed every submission made. It gave a precis of those submissions and then later in general terms attempted to deal with the particular requirements.

I received a copy of that report on approximately 20 August. On Saturday 6 September an article by Kirsty Cockburn appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* headed "Raised doubts circulated by Fisheries Department". I was surprised at the way in which the media, Government and Opposition members responded to that report. I received a copy of that report more than a fortnight before. The only reason I had a copy was that I had lodged a submission, so one can assume that every person who lodged a submission was paid the courtesy by Dow Chemical (and I compliment the company on that) of being posted a copy of the environmental effects statement. That is to Dow's credit. If other members of Parliament and other political Parties had presented a

submission to Dow they, in turn, would have been in possession of a copy of the report which made headlines some fortnight or three weeks after it was released.

The very principle involved in Dow Chemical's handing over those submissions to the Government is of concern to me. Is it a question of credibility? I wrote to the General Manager of Dow Chemical in response to Dow's draft environmental effects statement, but to have that letter referred to in a Government document does question the credibility of the report.

On 10 September a meeting was called at Port Augusta which was ably chaired by the member for Stuart. I give him full credit for the way in which he chaired that meeting because it had the potential of being a highly volatile meeting. That meeting was called for the express purpose of the Government's announcing to the public its intention to proceed with the Redcliff project. At 4.30 that afternoon, the Deputy Premier, accompanied by some of his officers and the Minister of Environment, met with members of the Australian Fisheries Industry Council (AFIC). Those delegates were advised of the Government's intention, and I believe were given a copy of the assessment. They were then sworn to secrecy, which was only fair, until after the embargo on the release of the assessment.

That night at the community college at Port Augusta a public meeting was held. I am not sure of the capacity of the hall in which the meeting was held, but I believe it holds about 300 people. That hall was packed and people were standing at the back. The Deputy Premier, the Minister of Environment, and eight of their colleagues were on stage. The Deputy Premier and the Minister of Environment made statements about the Government's recognition and acceptance of the environmental effects statement proposed by Dow Chemical.

There was then a long series of questions. It was at that time that I believe we gained the full impact of the intent of the audience present. I was concerned to note that, on the following day, it was announced on radio that it was believed that the meeting was divided 50-50 on the acceptance or otherwise of the Redcliff project. I believe that to be a biased report, because I thought that the meeting was more like 80-20 against the project. I do not believe that anyone left that meeting with any opinion other than that that meeting was against the Redcliff petro-chemical project.

**Mr. McRAE:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. BLACKER:** The assessment of the environmental effects statement having been presented, I have had time since then to peruse that document. Having read that document, I am still not satisfied that any assurances are given in it. I quote, for example, from page 9 of the assessment by the South Australian Government, under the heading "Recommendations for inclusion in the Indenture Act". Paragraph 1 *(b)* states:

> The following standards for liquid waste discharge should apply:
>
> + Under normal operating conditions there shall be no liquid waste discharge to the Gulf.
> + Under all conditions, liquid waste discharges shall meet the following standards:

Having on one hand said that there shall be no liquid waste discharges into the gulf, the report immediately sets standards for discharges. This is the anomaly of the report and the recommendations presented. Furthermore, a matter which is of concern, and which I believe the bulk of the community has accepted for some time, is that the decision was made months, if not years ago, to proceed with this project, because on page 72 of the same report we find, under the heading, "Impact on Port Augusta", the following:

> The South Australian Housing Trust is currently engaged in a large construction programme to cater for the expected Redcliff population influx.

We are not about to sign an indenture to start a project; the project was started months, if not years, ago. What worries me is that the Government is so heavily committed financially and through all its departments, with planning and financial commitments for the development of Housing Trust houses, schools and other public projects, that it is almost impossible to back off.

Many times people have raised the question, "Why should the project be at Redcliff Point?" It further concerns me that this document says that the question of choice of site has been raised again only since the Dow Chemical environmental effects statement has been produced. That is definitely not the case; questions have always been raised about the site. The first time questions were raised about the site was in 1973. Every year, month by month, questions have been raised about this matter. We know (and it is stated in the documents presented to us) that the site was chosen by the Government. No petro-chemical company or consortium was ever given a choice as to where the site for a petro-chemical project should be. The decision was made on political grounds from the point of view of employment and political advantage to be gained from a site in that location, bearing in mind that it was a highly industrialised area. In submissions presented many queries were raised about air environment, health, and marine environment. Some 63 per cent of submissions received made reference to chemical spillages into the gulf, either from a shipping accident or loading operations. I wonder where responsibility does lie in the event of such an accident's happening.

The wharf is owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors so, if a spill occurs, can any liability be placed on the company? The wharf is not only owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors but is also operated by that department, as are most of the grain handling facilities. Where does the responsibility lie? Perhaps this is the reason why the Government is not prepared to write restitution clauses into the indenture Act. There has been no indication that the Government will do this. I believe that there is no way in which responsibility could lie with the company if such a shipping accident occurred, because the facilities of the Department of Marine and Harbors would be involved in the accident, and that is the problem.

If an accident occurs, the fishing industry would be placed in jeopardy, not necessarily because of the permanent damage (and permanent damage may occur—we do not know) but because even a small quantity of e.d.c. spilling into the gulf will be sufficient reason for overseas markets to cut the price of our fishery commodities. We all know what happened to the Sydney rock oyster industry: immediately there was a rumour of contamination (and, in fact, there were a couple of proven cases of contamination), the industry collapsed. It can be foreseen that a rumour about a spill in the gulf could mean that our overseas markets would consider that the fish from that area were polluted, and they could drop the price accordingly. Instead of a $9 000 000 ex-wharf industry, we could have a $2 000 000 ex-wharf industry overnight. If that occurred, it would take many years to re-establish the credibility of the prawn industry and other scale fishing industries in South Australia—all because of a rumour. That is the volatile situation in which we find ourselves, a condition that the State cannot absorb.

We cannot allow the fishing industry or the jobs of the

760 people who are currently employed by the fishing industry, either directly as fishermen or as processors who handle the fish, to be placed in jeopardy. These people may be replaced by a smaller number of workers and a larger capital investment, not only company investment but State Government investment, in an enterprise that we know has a limited life. On the other hand, the fishing industry, with proper management, could go on indefinitely. Can we jeopardise that industry? I believe that an editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times* of last Friday adequately sums up the situation. Under the heading "A test of sincerity", it states:

> Premier Tonkin's rush trip to the United States to talk to Dow Chemical chiefs must give rise to a great deal of speculation amongst those for and against the Redcliff petro-chemical plant proposal. Those in favour must fear that the Premier had it on something stronger than the grapevine that Dow were going to give the project the thumbs down. They will be hoping he will be able to talk them back into the picture.
>
> Those who are against the project must fear for what may be "thrown in" by Premier Tonkin to bring about a change of heart. Dow had already let it be known that the two year marine biology investigation asked for by the Department of Fisheries and agreed to by the Government would delay the project. Will that investigation be shortened—or dropped—if it is an obstacle?
>
> There is no doubt that environmental protection, and possible compensation payments should that be inadequate, are major financial considerations for the project. In the Government's obvious desperate eagerness, will they compromise in any way on the required safeguards in order to win Dow over? This could be the supreme test of the Government's contention that they would not agree to the project if it put the environment in jeopardy.

I believe that that adequately sums up the situation, and I can assure members that my constituents, the fishermen and the processors of Port Lincoln, who are so heavily dependent on the large economic wealth that lower Eyre Peninsula and the city of Port Lincoln derive as a direct result of the fishing industry and, more particularly, the prawn industry, are concerned. My remarks have mainly related to the prawn industry, but I am sure that other members could give an identical account of the scale fishing industry in the northern areas of Spencer Gulf.

For that reason, I view with very great concern the Government's quite determined attitude in its quest for the Redcliff petro-chemical project. The Government knows that, once the indenture Act is signed, there is no possible way in which to reverse the decision. The sum committed and the planning that has been done, and all other aspects of the scheme, would preclude a reversal of the decision once Dow Chemical started committing money, and the Government started committing even more money than it has committed already.

I support the Budget, but I express my grave reservations about the Government's determination to proceed headlong into the Dow/Redcliff petro-chemical project. I raise one other point: if Dow decides not to proceed, the Premier has already foreshadowed in this place that another petro-chemical consortium may be interested in the project. Once again, the problem is in relation not to the company involved but to the site, which was chosen by the previous Government seven years ago. The present Government is saddled with this problem. I support the Budget.

**Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore):** I have grave reservations about some sections of the Budget, and I will canvass the matter of education cuts, to which the member for Baudin referred. The points raised by that honourable member are valid and were supported, in a funny way, by the member for Glenelg, who commented about the need for education in the prevention of delinquency. There was a common thread in what those two members said. I refer now to transitional education. The funding for the school-to-work transition programme was outlined in the Auditor-General's Report of 1979-80. The report stated:

> The Commonwealth Government provided funds for a programme aimed at providing all people in the 15 to 19 age group with options in education, training and employment or any combination of these either part-time or full-time, so that unemployment becomes the least acceptable alternative. An advance of $105 000 was transferred in June 1980 from the Education Purposes Treasury Trust Account; there was no expenditure in 1979-80.

The problem in regard to transitional education has been brought to my attention by a school in my district. The easiest way for me to highlight the problem faced by people undertaking this educational programme is to relate their experiences.

The particular course about which I was talking to the people undertaking the course was the retail sales skills course, arranged under transitional education to provide these young people with a better chance of obtaining employment in the work force today. The advertisement outlining the course states:

> If you are between 15-19 years old and not employed you can enrol in our free retail sales course for 10 weeks designed to help you in your search for a job as a sales or shop assistant.
>
> Some of the subjects you will be covering are applying for a job, operating cash registers and handling cash, stock control, grooming and deportment, driving instruction, and first aid.
>
> The course will run for 10 weeks from 9-4 p.m. Monday to Friday and commences 4 August 1980. Students will be issued with a statement from the college noting that they have attended and successfully completed the course. TEAS allowance can be applied for.

I wonder how many members are aware of how significant the statement "TEAS allowance can be applied for" is in this context. I also wonder whether many members realise what a vicious imposition it is to these young people to have to relinquish unemployment benefits and go on to this TEAS allowance. They are trying their hardest to break out of a demoralising world of unemployment. I wonder whether anyone here cares enough to do anything about the position, and that is why I am raising the matter this evening.

After speaking to people involved in the course, it is apparent to me that they feel neglected and feel that the form of education is not worth it. They have been treated very badly by Commonwealth department officers dealing with TEAS and unemployment payments. While I realise that the State has no direct control over the departments responsible for administering these two functions of unemployment and TEAS, I think that, while the courses are under the State education system, the State should ensure that people are not treated as badly as they are under the scheme.

When the course was first advertised at this college, there was a fairly significant response. Some 70 to 100 people inquired about the course. However, once they found out about the requirements, that they had to forgo unemployment benefits and apply for TEAS allowances, I think only about 10 made a fairly hard decision and undertook the course.

These people came from far afield in relation to my district. One was from Morphett Vale, another was from

North Adelaide, and others were from all parts between. Obviously, they were interested in the course and wanted to get into it and get some chance to obtain employment. To take the TEAS allowance, they had to go below the unemployment benefits level. In some cases they dropped from about $51·40 a week to $45·15, a loss of about $6·25 for the benefit of undertaking free education.

**Mr. Randall:** They get travel allowance, too, don't they?

**Mr. PETERSON:** No, they do not, and I raised that matter the other night with the Minister of Transport. I wanted him to look at the possibility of their obtaining free travel, and he has promised to look at that. They do not get anything. They pay, in real terms, about $6 a week for the benefit of undertaking free courses when they are trying to benefit the community by making themselves more employable.

The maximum that they can get under TEAS is $45·15 a week. If there is any way that the Commonwealth Government can get out of paying, it does, because from my information it seems that only about 12 per cent of the Australian population eligible for TEAS gets the full amount. The amount usually is means-tested down below that. A recent report in a newspaper stated that the poverty line for a single person was $77·80 a week, and only $45·15 is paid to people undertaking free education.

**Mr. Randall:** Straight out from school?

**Mr. PETERSON:** Most of them, yes. They are 15 years to 19 years of age, so they have not been out too long. When I spoke to the people undertaking the course, they all had a different story, so I got each to write a letter to me. I will not read all of the letters, but I think the most graphic way to explain is to read from the letters. One states:

> My problem is that I have been told that I have to wait 6-8 weeks till I receive the TEAS money. I need the money to rely on myself, not anyone else.

Apparently, she is living with someone. She goes on:

> They can't keep on supporting me. I only get $3·00 a week for smokes, fares, etc., and I try my hardest to get by. The back pay since I have been doing the course, the money will help me a lot. I would like to know when I will be getting the money.

She obviously has to rely on the support of someone else to be able to take further education. Another letter states:

> I am being assessed at the "at home" rate but I live away from home. I have already provided documentary evidence in support of my application. I will be having trouble with my rent and supporting myself. My rent is $39 a week and I also will have to take money out for food.

Obviously, she has to live. Another states:

> I wrote to TEAS one week before my "Sales and Retail Skills" course began, and I was sent an application form. I completed my application and went personally to the TEAS offices in North Terrace, Adelaide. This was on Wednesday 30 July 1980. The gentleman who attended me in the office went through my application and he informed me that it was all in order. I asked him if he was certain and he informed me that he was.
>
> I received yesterday a letter from TEAS stating that I had not placed sufficient information on my application form. I could not understand this, because the gentleman from TEAS had told me that my application was satisfactory and complete.
>
> In the second week of my course I am very rapidly running out of funds!
>
> I sincerely hope that something can be done quickly, because it is creating real personal hardship and a tremendous inconvenience.

Another letter, from a girl from Morphett Vale, dealing with the TEAS office, states:

> I spoke to a lady there and she told me to fill out some forms. I filled them out and then she gave me some other forms that she told me to get my parents to fill out . . . I said to her, "I don't live at home and I can't see my parents." She said, "Bad luck, you'll have to get in contact with them one way or another". She also said I had to get my parents' income. Then, half an hour later, she said that I didn't have to fill any of the forms out. The lady said, "That's fine: you'll get your first cheque in about three weeks." So I was happy. Then about a week later I got a letter from you saying that I had to get my parents' income again. I finally got in contact with my parents and they said as I wasn't living at home they don't want anything to do with it. So what am I supposed to do? I am in need of money, I haven't got one cent. I am living away from home with friends. I am not paying anything but they can't keep me forever. I am doing the course so it will help me to get a job. I was even more happier when I was told that I get paid for it. But there are so many hassles it's not funny. There's about 5 or 6 of us with problems. By the time we receive the money the course will be over. The teacher is trying to teach us about retail sales skills but, with these hassles with TEAS, we're doing most of our work worrying about our problems.

Here are young people who have no-one to turn to, and no help, obviously being thrown around by the system. They cannot get any assistance at all. They are trying to better themselves but are being treated fairly badly.

All these problems are being imposed under a system of transitional education. Under the system, they are forced to live on a reduced income. They can go from the dole on to the TEAS allowance, which is always below the unemployment benefit. Secondly, they are forced, in already reduced circumstances, to wait in some cases for a considerable time before these payments come through. Thirdly, when they finish the course, they have to wait to go back on unemployment benefits until they are eligible. I think that a serious problem that must be dealt with by the Government is why the Government allows young South Australians to be treated in this manner. Surely it is the responsibility of the Government to make sure that anyone undertaking education gets a good go. Secondly, seeing that it is a scheme administered by the Commonwealth, there is a responsibility to ensure that those concerned are treated as well as they can be. These people are trying to acquire skills so as to better themselves. If you like, it is a retraining scheme. A lot has been said about retraining schemes and what is going to be done for people.

These people are trying to acquire skills, and the Government is allowing them to be treated in this fashion. I really cannot understand that it should happen. If it has come about because the Government is unaware of it, that is disgraceful to State Ministers. If it has come about because the Government knows of it and has done nothing about it, that is even worse.

When I was talking to the students, I asked them what were their problems. If the Government intends to continue with this system of education, it should take notice of this list, which has been raised by students undertaking this education. The list has been compiled in the form of headings and comments, under the general heading "Summary of Difficulties Experienced with Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme". I will read the summary, because this is what the kids who are doing the course think and what they want the Government to know. They say that the form of application needs to be simplified so that students can fully understand it; this would help prevent a waiting period which the correction to forms necessitates. Regarding equality, all students

believe that payment should be equal for all, as is the case with the unemployment benefit. Tension between students is very strong due to inequality. That refers to the difference in the rate of payment made to students. Regarding instalments, students believe that more frequent payments should be made, as budgeting is very difficult when paid monthly. There is delay in the payment of allowances under the TEAS scheme; I believe it is paid monthly. It is possible that one can apply for TEAS, and wait four weeks for the payment. The book allowance is paid with the first cheque, which is usually after books have been purchased. This assumes that all students have funds for books initially, whereas most of them do not. Obviously not, because they are on the dole. They have to borrow money or, if unable to do so, they do not undertake the course. This deprives some people, because they cannot afford to buy the initial books.

The assessment for TEAS eligibility takes too long. Students are often forced to leave the course before payment is made, because they cannot survive without payment. It is believed that this waiting time encourages students to retain unemployment benefits illegally. This happens as well. If members were to speak to these kids, they would realise they are more aware of the lurks and perks of the system than are officers of the Government.

Financial dependence on parents causes strain in many cases, and students tend to leave courses due to this. In some cases, parents refuse to support their children because they are of working age. In other cases, students are not prepared to be dependent on parents after having had independence, and consequently do not continue with studying. This problem arises in the family itself, and this affects the youths. Being assessed on the parent's income when the parent is no longer supporting the student seems unfair. The student is not living with the parent or is separated from the family. Why that should have any bearing on the TEAS allowance has me and these kids beaten. Having to supply details of spouse's income is difficult in many cases, as after-separation co-operation is often impossible. This is often required by the TEAS authorities in order to get details of the total income for an assessment of the allowance.

Regarding change in the financial situation, students are unable to do the course when they are assessed on the spouse's previous income, when the situation has changed and the spouse may be unemployed at the time of application. What happens in this regard is that, if they have been married, and if the spouse has worked in the past 12 months, apparently that precludes the person who is trying to undertake the course from getting the TEAS allowance, even if the spouse is unemployed at that time.

Regarding co-operation, parents and guardians will not always supply the necessary financial details or signature for students to make application; thus, the students may not be able to undertake courses or receive payment. This is a common problem for families when the youth leaves the family home, goes out into the community, but is still under age, because the parents' signatures are required. At times, it is often difficult for them to obtain the signatures. Regarding independent allowance, verification of employment may take months due to companies closing or not making statements available. This happens when they have been employed previously and need a statement from an ex-employer.

Once eligibility has been assessed, the TEAS authority will make an emergency payment to people with financial problems, but this still takes a minimum of two weeks, and this is unsatisfactory. The students on the course to whom I spoke and I do not believe that the system is reasonable or that it does justice to people trying to obtain training in order better to prepare themselves for the present very competitive work force.

There was a report from a conference recently which, I think, outlines what should be done—certainly as far as I am concerned. It is not a new idea, but I draw members' attention to it. It appears in the *Advertiser* of 6 September under the heading "Let Young Jobless Study—Council" and states:

> Jobless school-leavers should be able to undertake further education without losing unemployment benefits, it was claimed yesterday.
>
> This was recommended by the Australian Council for Education Administration's national conference in Adelaide, attended by about 300 members.
>
> The conference voted to ask its executive to urge the Federal Government to alter dole payment conditions to encourage school-leavers to continue their education.
>
> [The Department of Social Security has said people getting the dole are permitted a maximum of eight "contact hours" of study a week.]

If you have more than eight "contact hours" you lose the dole. The report continues:

> A South Australian delegate to the conference, Mr. John Halsey, said present arrangements inhibited unemployed school-leavers.
>
> Under a revised system, students could continue their education while looking for jobs and receiving some income.
>
> "In the extreme, we are creating a huge pool of disaffected members of society," he said.
>
> "If they could continue their education, it would give them a greater sense of purpose."

I do not consider that the current system is reasonable. I realise that the administration of payments under the unemployment and TEAS schemes are Commonwealth, but I believe that the State Government has a direct responsibility to ensure that South Australians are not put at a serious disadvantage by undertaking such courses. If the Minister of Education could speak to these students, I think that he would see that there is a real spirit in these people. They have undertaken study. They have disadvantaged themselves in personal and financial terms. They are seriously dislocated by undertaking the training, all with the intent of bettering themselves and doing what they can. I believe that the Government has a real responsibility to these people to ensure that they are looked after. Their attitude, when I have spoken to them, is that they are full of spirit. They are game, and they are having a go. This is the sort of attitude that we need in this hard employment field at present. I urge the Government seriously to look into this whole matter of transitional education. I ask that it investigate the situation and urge its Federal counterparts to ensure that better payments are made to these students and that transitional education is investigated and upgraded.

**Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach):** I will raise a couple of issues this evening, and I hope that I will have an opportunity to raise a few more than I expect to raise. I am willing to attack problems as they come. The Budget allocates money for the health area and, in so doing, it raises a new era. The Minister has promoted preventive health measures. One matter I raise this evening is of concern to me, and I flag this issue, because it will become an ongoing concern of mine for the future years in which I will be in this Parliament.

In an article in the *Advertiser* of 23 September, entitled "The A.B.C. of How to Kill Yourself", a Professor Antony Flew conceives the idea of a "how-to-do-it manual for suicide". When I saw this I was not surprised, because I believe that a general trend towards which our

community is headed is a disrespect for human life and a movement to certain other areas that are of concern. In raising this issue tonight, it is of community concern which again will rear its head because, as I indicated earlier today, the tenth annual report of the committee considering all aspects of abortion has been laid on the table of this House for members to consider. It is now over 10 years since the abortion legislation was introduced in this House and since abortions have been able to be performed in South Australia.

Professor Flew, who was visiting the Australian National University, has apparently played a prominent part in the International Voluntary Euthanasia Society, now called Exit—Society for the Right to Die. The article on Professor Flew states, in part:

> Some people say it will be a bad thing for the book to get into the hands of adolescents who may be contemplating suicide as an attempt to draw attention to themselves, Professor Flew said. "But I believe the book will discourage them from such action." Professor Flew said public opinion polls in Australia and the United Kingdom showed overwhelming support for euthanasia. "Polls show that in Australia three people to one approve of the idea that people facing death through illness, and who want to die, should be assisted to do so," he said.

Professor Flew is saying that if people want to die they should learn how to do so. In some cases, I believe that young immature people in a state of depression who may say that they want to die could pick up the manual and be given instructions on how to do so virtually in three easy steps. That matter concerns me, and if our society resorts to such a thing it will have far-reaching consequences. I believe, however, that this is the inevitable result of the step taken over 10 years ago when as a community we began to kill babies. Abortions became legal, and since then some 30 000 babies have been killed in this State in a legal way.

The tenth annual report of the committee considering abortion statistics provides an over-view of this situation over the past 10 years and needs to be highlighted to the community. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it the following table appearing in the report.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that the table is of a purely statistical nature?

**Mr. RANDALL:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

The Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia

Tenth Annual Report, 1979

The Committee met on three occasions during the year and subsequently to prepare this report. Again, it was considered a suitable time to compare the statistics pertaining to the 10 years during which the Act has been in existence.

| | 1970 | Per cent | 1974 | Per cent | 1979 | Per cent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age of patient— | | | | | | |
| Under 20 years | 200 | (15) | 806 | (28) | 1 235 | (32) |
| 20-29 years | 547 | (41) | 1 234 | (43) | 1 785 | (46) |
| Marital status— | | | | | | |
| Single | 510 | (38) | 1 408 | (49·4) | 2 245 | (57·5) |
| Married | 704 | (53) | 1 149 | (40·3) | 1 145 | (29·3) |
| Widowed/divorced, etc. | 116 | (9) | 295 | (10·3) | 516 | (13·2) |
| Reason for abortion— | | | | | | |
| Special medical disorders and risk to foetus | 203 | (15·3) | 242 | (8·5) | 120 | (3·1) |
| Psychiatric and psycho-social | 1 116 | (83·9) | 2 605 | (91·3) | 3 786 | (96·9) |
| Status of doctor— | | | | | | |
| Specialist/specialist in training | 1 040 | (78·2) | 2 128 | (74·6) | 3 654 | (93·5) |
| Others | 290 | (21·8) | 724 | (25·4) | 252 | (6·5) |
| Complications/per cent— | | | | | | |
| None | | 94 | | 87·5 | | 64·85 |
| Some | | 6 | | 6·5 | | 2·03 |
| Not stated | | — | | 6 | | 33·13 |

**Mr. RANDALL:** One of the indicators that needs to be clarified is that listed under "Complications per cent". In 1970 the entire form was filled in; doctors performing the abortion had to fill in the relevant information in the squares provided. In 1970 the doctors did the right thing. In 1979, however, 33 per cent of the forms had a blank space in relation to this category. The inference there is that maybe some complications did occur but some doctors were not prepared to fill in that form and indicate that all was well. One becomes concerned when one sees and hears what sort of actions take place during these abortion operations.

I have indicated to the House that I acknowledge that women have rights to choose, but the unborn child of a woman also has a right. It is that right for which I intend to fight strongly in the years to come. In 10 years, 29 656 fewer children have been born in South Australia because of this abortion legislation. It is time that we became concerned and did something about this matter. I accept that there is an argument for an abortion operation if it can be demonstrated that it is necessary, but it is this abuse that concerns me, when one considers that more than 96 per cent of the operations are classified as having been performed for psychiatric reasons. It is that unknown factor—psychiatric reasons—that must be analysed and explored to see whether, in fact, there are legitimate reasons for performing the operation.

The figures in the table I have had inserted in *Hansard* have been neatly drawn up and divided into two groups—the under-20-years group and the 20-to-29-years group. However, I believe that those figures have been drawn up in such a way that they are misleading and do not give the real picture. I have recalculated some figures and I would like to read them out so that people will see that, in 1970, in the under-25-years group there were 529 abortions, that is, 39·7 per cent of the total. In 1979, the

trend shifted to 2 373 abortions in this age group, which is 60·7 per cent of the total number of abortions performed. A clear indication exists that many young people of this community have adopted a form of contraception that may be acceptable to them but not necessarily acceptable to others.

The figures do not indicate how many of those younger people who are single people (a total of 2 245) went back a second time. From what I have been told by the clinics, however, there is an increasing trend among young people to accept abortion as a form of contraception and to go back a second time. That is the concern that I have, and here again there is this indicator in our community that something is wrong and that the respect for life is changing among our young people. Bearing in mind this concern, we need now to look as a community at the sort of operations that take place. Before doing so I would like to remind the House of the Hippocratic oath taken by doctors. In earlier years part of the oath said, "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception." However, we have seen a gradual decline over the years, to the stage where, in 1971, in Geneva the students deleted the words "from the time of conception", so that the sentence now reads, "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life."

I believe that that deletion has occurred because it is the philosophy of some people not to acknowledge that at the time of conception human life comes into being. That is the dilemma that faces our community, although I firmly believe that at the time of conception human life does come into being. Therefore, abortion to me is a clear-cut issue. I expect that, quite rightly, if this issue was to come before the House it would be a conscience issue in which individual members can follow their conscience and state their viewpoint.

However, I believe when I canvass the issue in the community that it is becoming aware that a new tide is turning. Our legislation was based on the 1967 legislation that was enacted in England. It is clearly recognised in Great Britain today that abortion on demand is now a fact of life. I will almost go so far as to say that not abortion on demand but abortion on request is a clear fact of life in South Australia, because we have a clear indication from the figures of the increase in the number of abortions, particularly when 57·5 per cent of abortions are performed on single people, and when we break down the figures and see the trend amongst the 15 to 19-year-old age group. The figures are listed in the report, so honourable members can examine them. A total of 41 abortions were performed on persons under 15 years of age; 1 194 abortions were performed on persons in the 15 to 19-year age group; and 1 138 were performed on persons betwen the ages of 20 and 24 years. As I said earlier, 60 per cent of abortions are carried out on persons under the age of 25 years.

The problem with abortion is that this legislation came in 10 years ago. Since then, we have had a recognition by the community that it is possible to conceive life outside the womb in a test tube. Great play is made of and publicity given to the test tube baby. This is a clear dilemma for the community, as recognition is clearly defined in life being created in the test tube. On the one hand, we see a recognition that life is created in the test tube, and on the other hand it is said that life is not created in the womb, because abortion is permitted, as the infant is not recognised until it reaches a certain number of weeks old.

While we have supportive care units in hospitals looking after prematurely born babies, we have another section of our hospitals killing those babies, which are in some cases almost of the same age group. However, let us look at the technique involved. These techniques need to be spelt out. The first is called D and C, which is dilation and curettage. I should like to read the technique to the House, as follows:

> In this procedure, usually carried out before the twelfth or thirteenth week of pregenancy, the uterus is approached through the vagina. The cervix is stretched to permit the insertion of a curette, a tiny hoe-like instrument. The surgeon then scrapes the wall of the uterus, cutting the baby's body to pieces and scraping the placenta from its attachments on the uterine wall. Bleeding is considerable.

Because bleeding is considerable, other methods are chosen. However, the mere fact that a surgeon can use his skill and ability to put the knife-like instrument into a mother's womb and carve up the baby surely is of concern to the community and to the woman who is having this done to her.

Another method, which is the most common one chosen in South Australia by our hospitals, both public and private (of which 86·9 per cent are performed), is known as the suction abortion. The principle is the same as in the D and C. However, a powerful suction tube is inserted through the dilated cervix into the uterus. This tears apart the body of the developing baby and the placenta, sucking the pieces into a jar. The smaller parts of the body are recognisable as arms, legs, head, and so on. More than two-thirds of all abortions performed in the United States and Britain apparently are done by this method. As I indicated, the figure is 86 per cent in South Australia.

Another area is the saline abortion, or "salting out". This method is usually carried out after 16 weeks of pregnancy, when enough amniotic fluid has accumulated in the sac around the baby. A long needle is inserted through the mother's abdomen directly into the sac, and a solution of concentrated salt is injected into the amniotic fluid. The salt solution is absorbed both through the lungs and the gastrointestinal tract, producing changes in the osmotic pressure. The outer layer of skin is burned off by the high concentration of salt. It takes about an hour to kill the baby by this slow method. The mother usually goes into labour about a day later and delivers a dead, shrivelled baby. If abortion is decided on too late to be accomplished by either a D and C, suction, or saline procedure, physicians resort to a final technique called hysterotomy.

This accounts for ·4 per cent, and is very similar to the caesarian section that is carried out in our hospitals today. So, these techniques are used. As has been indicated, in some cases, these techniques fail. Indeed, in some cases the salt technique fails. Nothing is more embarrassing to an abortionist than to deliver a live baby.

I do not know what happens in South Australia, as it is hard to get this information. However, from what I have read in certain magazines and heard from the International Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, I know that in November 1974 the following was stated:

> At the time of delivery it has been our policy to wrap the foetus in a towel. The foetus is then moved to another room while our attention is turned to the care of the gravida (the former mother-to-be). She is examined to determine whether placenta expulsion has occurred and the extent of vaginal bleeding. Once we are sure her condition is stable, the foetus is evaluated. Almost invariably all signs of life have ceased.

So, it is quite clearly demonstrated that they have their priorities right. Certainly, they look after the mother but, because this is an abortion operation,they forget all about the foetus until it is too late. Had it been a premature birth, priority would have been given to the baby. The baby would have received V.I.P. treatment, been put into a humid crib and given all the latest hospital technology in

order to keep it alive.

All sorts of problems are occurring in the period in which we recognise abortion operations. Out of 607 abortion operations carried out in an American hospital, 45 resulted in live births, including one set of twins. All 45 babies were taken to the neonatal nursery for active resuscitation. There, the physicians decide what to do with them.

The live birth problem after abortion is not so evident in Britain, just as it is not so evident in South Australia. This is because of under-reporting, which arises out of obvious embarrassment, and also since its legality is dubious. As a result, the pressure to make sure, as in America, that the foetus is dead on delivery causes these unknown figures to be hidden.

In some cases, doctors overseas make sure that the baby is dead on arrival, especially when they use the prostaglandin method, which requires an injection that brings on the delivery of the baby. But, to make sure that the baby is dead on arrival, they add poison to the mixture. A leading abortionist has said that, if one has agreed to carry out an abortion for a woman, one's object is that the baby is born dead, and that this is in the best interests of everyone.

As I said earlier, having received the tenth annual report, which was tabled today, this attitude has crept throughout the community. It involves a disrespect for human life in a day and age when technology has advanced and we have the ability to keep people alive.

Finally, in this area, I would like to indicate one of the problems that has occurred overseas and refer to one case history in the hope that it will spur some people into action and that we may be prepared to debate the matter again in this House. I do not hesitate flagging my inclination, as I believe that this is a social issue on which my electorate needs to know where I stand. To put the record straight, I tried to raise this issue during the previous election campaign, when I stood as a candidate.

I tried to get the other candidate to raise the issue so that the electorate would know where we stood, but it was most difficult, because no-one wanted to hear what a potential candidate for a political Party had to say on this issue; it was an embarrassment. One of the case histories reported in a publication of Nurses Concerned for Life, Inc., states:

> A 26-year-old woman requested an abortion of her 5 month foetus, claiming that she had been raped. The woman was first turned down by Magee Women's Hospital because it was thought the pregnancy was too far advanced. The staff physician estimated the gestational age to be about 25 weeks. It was later established that she had not been raped.
>
> The abortion was then performed by Dr. Leonard Laufe of West Penn Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, who decided to use the prostaglandin method. Prostaglandin is an abortifacient drug whose primary effect is stimulation of the uterine contractions. Its use frequently leads to a live birth. Nurse Monica Bright testified that the child gasped for breath for at least 15 minutes following the abortion and no attempts were made to help the child in any way. Ms. Bright is a circulating nurse in Labour and Delivery. She further testified that she observed a pulse in the upper chest, left neck area. Ms. Shirley Foust, R.N., testified she had seen the baby move and that one of the foreign residents, who was observing, baptised the child. The Head Nurse, Carol Totton, testified that the baby was gasping and a pulse was visible. Both the nurse anaesthetist and Ms. Totton refused to administer a lethal dose of morphine to the baby despite the fact that "someone in the room had ordered it".
>
> The nurse anaesthetist, Nancy Gaskey, testified that the abortion was performed in a room where there were no resuscitative measures available if the child was born alive.
>
> The entire procedure was filmed for educational purposes and the film showed the baby moving. Dr. Jules Rivkind, Chairman, Department of OB and Gyn, at Mercy Hospital, testified that this was indeed "a live birth"!
>
> The original birth records indicate the baby girl weighed 3 lb 1 ounce and listed the length as 45 centimetres. Dr. Laufe later changed the hospital records to read as follows: weight 2 lb 9 oz, length 29 centimetres. Lois Cleary, a staff nurse, witnessed this change, and testified that in the 3 000 to 4 000 births she had assisted with there had never been such changes made on original records to her knowledge. This change was also verified by an OB technician who was present. Estimated gestational age 29 to 32 weeks.
>
> John Kenny, a young medical student, testified that he had been threatened by Dr. Laufe's attorney if he testified in court against Dr. Laufe. The young man was told that he would be unable to get an internship in any hospital in Pennsylvania if he testified. He was also told he would be unable to get a licence to practise medicine.

That case was documented in America. The evidence was there, as were the implications and the innuendoes. I wonder what is happening in South Australia. I have heard all sorts of stories, but as yet I have been unable to gather any facts. Now, 10 years has elapsed since the abortion legislation was introduced, and it is time for a change and an evaluation—

**Mr. Crafter:** So your Government was wrong?

**Mr. RANDALL:** I am not saying that it was wrong, but that it is time for a change. Surely, it would have been a conscience vote. I warn members opposite that they should be careful if they are quoting politics, because I will read the names of those who were involved in the legislation and in the Select Committee.

**Mr. Crafter:** Who introduced it?

**Mr. RANDALL:** I am not worried about that. I know who introduced it—the honourable member who is now in this House representing the Australian Democrats. He was Chairman of the Committee.

**Mr. O'Neill:** He was Attorney-General in a Liberal Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. RANDALL:** That is a debate for another day. I have indicated clearly where I stand on this issue, and I will be interested to hear from members opposite where they stand and what are their viewpoints. Do they believe that we should be killing babies in South Australia? Do they support that? Should we be killing our older people? Do they support that? Is that necessary?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. RANDALL:** There must be clarification on this point, and that is why I ask these questions. When we refer to the A.B.C. of how to kill yourself, is that a necessary document or a necessary manual? Do we need it in South Australia? Do we need it to direct our young people, when they get depressed after having a bad time, how to kill themselves?

*Mr. O'Neill interjecting:*

**Mr. RANDALL:** The member for Florey keeps interjecting. I ask where he stands on the abortion issue.

**Mr. O'Neill:** I ask where you stand on conscription.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. CRAFTER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

## COMPANY TAKE-OVERS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION

This Bill regulates the conduct of company take-overs in South Australia. The proposed legislation is interim legislation, intended to cover the period between now and the date when similar legislation under the auspices of the co-operative scheme on companies and securities comes into effect. It is quite possible that there will be a delay of several months before the Commonwealth and each State which is a party to the co-operative scheme is ready to bring the scheme take-over legislation into force.

The Government has formed the view that this delay is a matter of serious concern to South Australia in the light of current circumstances and conditions. The Bill which is before the House is considered to be the most effective remedial action.

### THE NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION

For some years it has been apparent that the reform of the law regulating company take-overs is desirable. Concern at abuses and malpractices in the Australian securities market played a major role in the establishment of the co-operative scheme on companies and securities. This scheme was formally established by an agreement signed in December 1978 by the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. An essential part of the scheme is the establishment of a National Companies and Securities Commission to administer uniform companies and securities law throughout the participating States and Territories.

One important piece of legislation which will be administered by the National Companies and Securities Commission is the Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Code. A Commonwealth Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Act, 1980, has been passed. Some amendments to the Commonwealth legislation are being effected. When this is done, each of the six States can proceed to pass and bring into force legislation applying the Commonwealth provisions.

On 28 August 1980 my colleague the Attorney-General introduced four Bills required to implement the Scheme legislation in South Australia. These Bills are:

1. The National Companies and Securities (State Provisions) Bill, 1980;
2. The Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws) Bill, 1980;
3. The Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Bill, 1980;
4. The Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Application of Laws) Bill, 1980.

Unfortunately, no other State has yet introduced all these Bills, although the other five States have agreed to do so. As the co-operative scheme is presently structured, no State can bring its legislation into force until the Commonwealth and each of the other States is ready to do so. For some time the parties to the scheme have been working to a time table which would see this legislation in force no later than 1 January 1981. It now appears that this target date cannot be met. One State has reported that it will definitely be unable to pass its legislation before the end of 1980. The position in some other States is, at present, uncertain.

This delay is a significant and serious matter for a number of reasons. First, it takes place against the backdrop of intensive take-over activity in the Australian securities market. According to the Australian *Financial Review*, at 8 September 1980 there were 38 take-overs pending. This upsurge in activity can no doubt be attributed to a variety of factors. But it seems reasonable to assume that it is at least partly actuated by the widespread knowledge in the commercial community that new take-overs legislation is on the way.

Secondly, the existing law on take-overs (which is found in Part VIB of the Companies Act, 1962-1980) has not proved to be as effective as hoped. In particular, it has failed to prevent what is commonly called the "market raid". This is a lightning take-over which gives the shareholders of the target company inadequate time to assess their position. Often, the raider succeeds in buying the shares in the target company for less than their true value. Sometimes, raiders anxious for a quick return break up the business and sell off the assets.

Thirdly, the States of Queensland and Western Australia already have new take-overs legislation in place. These States announced their intention to legislate late in 1979 because they were concerned at the increasing tempo of take-over activity. The Queensland and Western Australian legislation is similar in form to the proposed scheme legislation. Inevitably, as a result of Queensland and Western Australia having more stringent legislation and tighter controls on take-overs, more attention has been focused on South Australian companies as potential targets.

Fourthly, the Australian Associated Stock Exchanges have amended their listing rules as a response to the Queensland and Western Australian legislation. This was done to bring the rules into a form consistent with the new take-over legislation. However, these new rules do not combine well with the law in South Australia, which enforces the old take-over rules. Introduction of this legislation will remove that anomaly in South Australia.

The Government has concluded that further delay in the implementation of the new take-over legislation is not in the public interest. The date of commencement of the new scheme take-over legislation is uncertain. The Attorney-General has initiated some discussions with the Commonwealth and other States about the possibility of the scheme legislation being introduced in some States but not others. However, so far these talks have not come to fruition. A phased introduction for the scheme legislation might require some amendment to other legislation and would require the agreement of all parties to the co-operative scheme. Therefore, the Government cannot say whether a phased introduction is possible. In these circumstances, the Government considers that it has no option other than to introduce this legislation on the clear understanding that it will have effect only for an interim period. It is intended that this legislation should be repealed when the scheme legislation is ready to come into force.

### PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED COMPANY TAKE-OVERS ACT

For some time there has been a strong consensus in the business community that reform of the laws governing company take-overs is necessary. This legislation is

designed to achieve that and to promote fair play and equitable conduct in the securities market. There are five guiding principles underlying the policy behind this legislation.

First, an acquisition of shares which has the practical or potential effect of altering the balance of control within a company must be treated as distinct from an everyday acquisition of shares. Secondly, if a person wishes to gain control of a company, he should be obliged to disclose his identity to the shareholders and directors of that company. Thirdly, the shareholders and directors of a target company should have a reasonable time in which to consider any offer to take over the company. Fourthly, the shareholders of a target company should have sufficient information before them to enable them to arrive at a reasonably informed decision on the merits of any offer. Fifthly, each shareholder in a target company should have an equal opportunity to participate in any benefits offered under a take-over bid.

Although the existing take-over legislation was designed to give effect to those guiding principles, it has not been entirely successful. Abuses have been widespread, including:

*(a)* The misuse of confidential information which is not freely available to the public or to shareholders;
*(b)* The publication of material which is false or misleading;
*(c)* The use of selective offers to the benefit of some shareholders and the detriment of others; and
*(d)* The "lightning raid" accompanied by rapid buying on the Stock Exchange floor which allows shareholders inadequate time to consider the merits of an offer.

This legislation is designed to curb these abuses without interfering with legitimate commercial bargains. It should be emphasised that all the abuses are not always on the side of the offeror. Sometimes directors of target companies are unscrupulous in the manner in which they conduct their defence. The legislation imposes controls in this area.

The Company Take-overs Bill also gives consideration to the rights of employees. Whenever a take-over bid is made, the offeror must set out his intentions regarding the continuation of the business of the target company, any major changes to be made to the business of the target company and the future employment of the target company's employees. This should encourage shareholders to consider the social and employment implications of any take-over.

## SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED COMPANY TAKE-OVERS ACT

I now propose to outline some of the major features of this legislation. A more detailed examination may be found in the clause notes prepared by Parliamentary Counsel which have been distributed to members.

The Company Take-overs Bill is based on the provisions of the Commonwealth Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Act 1980. It takes into account proposed amendments to this Act which are now before the Commonwealth Parliament. Before the existing Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Act was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, it was twice exposed for public comment. In addition, for several years officers from the Commonwealth and each of the six States have been working on the take-overs legislation. Thus, a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to settling the form of this legislation.

The legislation is concerned with the acquisition of controlling interests (or potential controlling interests) in companies. It deals with any acquisition of shares which has the effect of a party gaining control of 20 per cent or more of the voting shares in a company (or in a particular class of shares). The Bill is not concerned with transactions involving small proprietary companies with less than 15 members.

However, where it does apply it permits a stake of more than 20 per cent to be acquired in one of three ways:

1. The acquisition can proceed by way of a "creeping take-over". That is, the person acquiring the shares must acquire no more than 3 per cent of the shares in the company (or in a relevant class of shares) every six months;
2. The acquisition may proceed through a formal bid. This procedure is superficially similar to that laid down in the existing legislation. However, there has been a general tightening of controls and shareholders must be provided with more information than the law requires at present; and,
3. The acquisition may proceed by way of a take-over announcement. This will be made on the floor of the Stock Exchange. The person wishing to acquire the shares makes a public announcement that he offers to purchase all the shares in the company (or in a relevant class) for cash consideration.

## THE FORMAL BID PROCEDURE

The formal bid procedure necessarily entails the dispatch of written offers to all shareholders, accompanied by detailed information. Upon receipt of the written offers, the shareholders have a reasonable time to consider their position. In addition, the target company is obliged to provide them with further information, along with the opinions of all the directors on the bid.

The formal bid procedure must be used if an offeror wishes to acquire less than 100 per cent of the shares in the company (or in a relevant class). It is also the procedure which is required if the offeror wishes to buy shares outside the course of the Stock Exchange trading or to offer non-cash consideration (for example, an exchange of shares in the offeror company).

There are three basic stages in a formal take-over bid:

1. The offeror dispatches a written offer to all shareholders of the target company (or in the target class). Detailed material concerning the financial position of the offeror and the forms of the offer must accompany the written offers;
2. The directors of the target company prepare a statement detailing the financial position of the target company and supplying any recommendation that the directors wish to make in relation to the bid. This statement is despatched to the shareholders by the target company; and,
3. The shareholders have at least one month to consider the material provided by the offeror and the target company. They can make a considered decision to accept or reject the offer.

The new legislation introduces a number of additional controls over formal take-over bids. Two are particularly significant. First, if the offeror is bidding for less than 100 per cent of the shares in the target company (or in the target class) the situation may arise where the number of acceptances exceeds the number of shares which the offeror wishes to acquire. In this event, the offeror must acquire an appropriate proportion of the shares offered by

each accepting shareholder. This means that the benefits of the takeover bid will be shared on a *pro rata* basis amongst accepting shareholders; and, secondly, where the offeror is related in any way to the target company, the directors of the target company are obliged to obtain a report from an independent expert in relation to the bid. This report must be circulated to the shareholders in the target company.

## PROCEDURE FOR A TAKE-OVER ANNOUNCEMENT

This procedure can only be used if the offeror is willing to acquire 100 per cent of the shares in the target company (or class) for cash consideration. In addition, an offeror cannot make a take-over announcement if he holds more than 30 per cent of the shares in the target company. This is designed to giver the shareholders a reasonable time to consider the bid before the offeror acquires more than 50 per cent.

A bid by way of a take-over announcement will normally proceed as follows:

1. The offeror's broker will make an announcement on the floor of the target company's home stock exchange. The announcement will be to the effect that for a specified period (at least six weeks) the offeror's broker will be prepared to purchase any shares in the target company or in the target class for a specified cash price;
2. The offeror will prepare a statement containing detailed material about the terms of the bid and the offeror. The statement must be despatched to all shareholders in the target company or the target class;
3. In response, the directors of the target company will prepare a statement containing information about the target company and the directors' recommendations. This statement must be despatched to all shareholders;
4. All share transactions pursuant to the take-over bid must be effected at official meetings of a stock exchange; and
5. The take-over offer can only be withdrawn in the limited circumstances specified in the legislation unless the Commission consents to the withdrawal.

## GENERAL SAFEGUARDS

There are a number of other important provisions in this legislation which apply to both formal take-over bids and take-over announcements:

1. The Bill extends many of the controls over the conduct of the offeror to "associates" of the offeror. The term "associate" is very broadly defined. The idea is to prevent the use of nominees and trustees to frustrate the operation of the legislation;
2. Restrictions are placed on parties associated with the take-over bid who wish to make profit forecasts or statements as to the valuation of assets which might affect the decision of target company shareholders. Forecasts or statements of this kind may only be disseminated with the approval of the Commission (Clauses 37 and 38).
3. Where a take-over bid for a listed public company is in progress any parties holding 5 per cent or more of the shares subject to the bid are obliged to provide the Stock Exchange with daily details of their dealings in the target company shares (Clause 39);
4. Where there are significant mis-statements or omissions in material despatched or published in connection with take-over bids both civil and criminal sanctions are imposed (Clauses 44 and 45); and,
5. The Minister is empowered to declare an acquisition of shares made whilst a take-over bid is pending to be an "unacceptable acquisition". The Minister can also declare any conduct that occurs in the course of a take-over bid to be "unacceptable conduct". These declarations can be made where the Minister is satisfied that the shareholders or directors of the target company were not aware of the identity of an offeror, did not have sufficient time to consider a take-over bid, or were not supplied with sufficient information to assess a take-over bid. In addition, declarations can also be made where the shareholders of a target company did not have equal opportunities to participate in any benefits flowing from a take-over bid. Once such a declaration is made, the Commission or any interested party may apply to the Supreme Court for relief.

## OPERATION OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislation will be administered by the Corporate Affairs Commission for South Australia, not the National Companies and Securities Commission. Although the form of the proposed scheme legislation on take-overs has been followed very closely, not all the powers which will be exercised by the National Companies and Securities Commission under the scheme legislation will be vested in the Corporate Affairs Commission.

Although it might be appropriate to vest some of the more important powers and discretions under the take-overs legislation in a unique body such as the National Companies and Securities Commission (which is supervised by a Ministerial council composed of Ministers representing seven Governments), it is not considered appropriate to vest all those powers in the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission in the narrower context of this legislation. Some of the powers under the legislation have been vested in the responsible Minister, because he is a person directly responsible to the Parliament. Examples of powers which have been vested in the Minister are the power to declare an acquisition or conduct in the course of a take-over bid to be "unacceptable", and the power to exempt persons from compliance with the legislation.

The proposed Company Take-overs Act will be deemed to have commenced on the day that the Government first made public its intention to proceed with this legislation. The transitional provisions of this Bill have been drafted to allow any take-overs under Part VIB of the Companies Act, 1962-1980, which are pending at the date of commencement of the legislation, to proceed along their normal course. Whilst these provisions are necessary, they leave open the risk of abuse if take-overs are commenced after the public announcement of the Government's intention but before the passage of the legislation. The "deemed" commencement date solves this problem. It should be noted that similar measures were taken by both the Queensland and Western Australian Governments when they introduced their company take-overs legislation last year.

## CONCLUSION

This legislation is intended to have a limited life. However, it is nonetheless important legislation which fills

a significant gap. It is designed to promote fairness and orderly trading in the securities market. Because it has been drafted to adhere as closely as possible to the terms of the proposed co-operative scheme legislation, the transition from this legislation to the scheme legislation should be relatively smooth. The Government considers the Company Take-overs Bill, 1980, to be vital to the interests of South Australia. I commend it to the House.

**Explanation of Clauses**

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Bill will have effect from 16 September 1980. Clause 3 provides that the Act operates to the exclusion of Part VIB of and the tenth schedule to the Companies Act, 1962-1980, which are the provisions which currently regulate take-overs. The clause also provides that this Act and the Companies Act, 1962-1980, will be read as one Act. Therefore, provisions of the Companies Act that are relevant in the take-overs legislation (such as some definitions) will apply to this Act.

Clause 4 provides consequential amendments to the Companies Act, 1962-1980. Clause 5 is a transitional provision that will exclude from the operation of the Act certain take-overs commenced before the commencement of section 11 of the Act. Clause 6 provides definitions for certain terms used in the Bill.

Clause 7 provides a number of important conceptual definitions that are necessary for the operation of clause 11. Clause 11 restricts the ability of a person to acquire shares in a company if the result of the acquisition is to increase the shares to which he is entitled in that company. Clause 7 (1) provides that the acquisition of a relevant interest in shares constitutes an acquisition of the shares. Clause 9 defines "relevant interest". Subclause (3) provides that a person is entitled to shares in which he has a relevant interest and shares in which a person who is his associate has a relevant interest. Subclause (4) defines what is meant by "an associate" when determining the shares to which a person is entitled. Subclause (5) defines the concept of association between persons for other purposes in the Bill.

Clause 8 brings together a number of unrelated provisions required for the interpretation of the Bill. Clause 9 defines in detail the concept of "relevant interest". Clause 10 provides for the application of the Act. Although the clause is drawn in the widest terms it must be remembered that the Bill regulates the acquisition of shares in companies as opposed to corporations. "Company" is defined by the Companies Act, 1962-1980, as a company incorporated pursuant to that Act—that is, a company that has been incorporated in South Australia. "Corporation" includes all companies wherever they have been incorporated and "body corporate" has an even wider connotation.

Clause 11 is the key provision of the Bill. Subclause (1) prohibits the acquisition of shares to a level above the prescribed percentage which is set at 20 per cent by subclause (7). Subclause (2) prohibits a person who holds between 20 per cent and 90 per cent from increasing his holding except as allowed by other clauses of the Bill. Clause 42 allows a shareholder who has 90 per cent of the shares in a company in certain circumstances to compulsorily acquire the remaining shares and clause 43 enables the holders of the remaining 10 per cent to require the 90 per cent shareholder in certain circumstances to purchase their shares. Except for necessary local changes, the Bill is identical to the Commonwealth Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Act 1980. The Commonwealth Act has been amended recently by *inter alia* striking out clause 11 (6). As this Bill is a forerunner of national legislation that will be based on the Commonwealth Act and will be uniform, the original Commonwealth numbering is used with the result that there is no subclause (6) in this clause.

Clauses 12 and 13 provide that clause 11 does not apply to acquisition of shares in certain circumstances. Clause 14 enables shareholders to acquire shares by reason of *pari passu* allotments in accordance with the clause without being in breach of clause 11. Clause 15 enables a shareholder to increase his holding, if it is 19 per cent or more of the shares in the company, by not more than 3 per cent every six months.

Clause 16 allows the acquisition of shares under a take-over scheme that complies with the requirements of that clause. Identical offers must be made to all holders of shares of the class to be acquired and information in the form of a Part A statement must be given to the company the shares of which are to be acquired (the target company) as well as to the shareholders. Clause 17 allows shares to be acquired by purchase on the stock exchange. An announcement (called a take-over announcement) is made on behalf of the offeror on the market of the target company's home exchange. Only a person who holds less than 30 per cent of the shares in the target company can acquire shares in this way. The clause requires information in the form of a Part C statement to be given to the target company, the stock exchange and the commission.

Clause 18 regulates the service of a Part A statement on the target company and its lodgment with the commission. Clause 19 enables an offeror under a scheme, with the consent of the Commissioner, to extend the time for payment of the price of shares purchased under the scheme. Clause 20 prohibits certain conditions being attached by the offeror to the acceptance of offers to purchase shares under a scheme. Clause 21 regulates the withdrawal of offers under a scheme. If one offer is withdrawn, all the others must also be withdrawn and a contract created by the previous acceptance of an offer becomes voidable at the option of the offeree.

Clause 22 requires the target company to supply certain information in the form of a Part B statement to the offeror and the holder of shares subject to the offer. Clause 23 requires a report from an independent expert to accompany the Part B statement where the offeror is connected with the target company. Clause 24 requires notice of the dispatch of offers to be given to the target company, the commission and where the target company is a public company, to the stock exchange.

Clause 25 provides for the situation where there is a change in ownership of shares during the time that they are subject to an offer under a take-over scheme. Clause 26, provides for the situation where the offeror offers to acquire part only of the shares in a class of shares. Clause 27 enables an offeror in some circumstances to vary his offer. The variation must increase the benefit to the offeree or give him a choice of two or more alternative considerations. Offerees who have already accepted an offer are entitled to the extra benefits or choice of other forms of consideration.

Clause 28 restricts the reliance that an offeror may place on a condition in an offer that he may rescind a contract resulting from its acceptance in specified circumstances. Clause 29 provides that, where an offer is subject to a condition the the offeror obtains more than 50 per cent of the voting shares in a company, he cannot free the offer from the condition unless he is entitled to more than 50 per cent of the shares. This protects a person who decides to sell his shares because he fears the offeror will obtain

control of the company but who wants to retain his holding if the offeror does not acquire a controlling interest.

Clause 30 provides the effect of acquisition of shares outside a scheme on certain conditions included in offers made under the scheme. Clause 31 deals with the general effect of acquisition of shares outside a scheme on scheme offers and contracts arising from acceptance of offers. The clause provides that shareholders accepting scheme offers will obtain all the benefits that shareholders dealing with the offeror outside the scheme will have. Clause 32 provides for information in the form of a Part D statement to be given by a target company that is subject to a take-over announcement to the commission, the stock exchange and the on-market offeror.

Clause 33 provides for withdrawal of on-market offers. Clause 34 enables the commission to suspend any on-market offers. Clause 35 prevents an offeror from disposing of shares during the time that his offer is open except to a rival takeover offeror. Clause 36 provides for certain information to be given by a target company to an offeror or on-market offeror. Clause 37 restricts forecasts of profits of a target company that may be made by an offeror or the company itself.

Clause 38 restricts the power of the target company to publish statements of its assets as this may detrimentally affect the attitude of offerees to a take-over offer. Clause 39 requires the offeror and any shareholder who has 5 per cent or more of a company's shares to inform the stock exchange of any change in the numbers of shares to which they are entitled during the currency of a take-over offer of shares of that company. Clause 40 prohibits special deals between an offeror or an on-market offeror and selected shareholders of the target company whereby the shareholder would receive additional benefits. Clause 41 preserves the rights of directors of the target company to their expenses incurred in the interests of members.

Clause 42 enables an offeror who has obtained 90 per cent of the shares of the company or of a particular class to compulsorily acquire the remaining 10 per cent. Clause 43 enables a remaining shareholder, where an offeror has acquired 90 per cent of the shares to require him to purchase his shares on the best terms available under the offer. Clause 44 is an extensive provision providing both criminal and civil liability for mis-statements by people who are required by the Bill to provide information. The clause allows a person who suffers loss or damage as the result of a mis-statement to recover damages from the person who is responsible for the mis-statement.

Clause 45 allows the Supreme Court on the application of the commission, the target company, a member of that company or a person from whom shares were acquired to make certain orders where an acquisition in contravention of the Act has occurred. Clause 46 provides for orders to be made by the court where shares are acquired after a Part A statement has been served but offers under a take-over scheme have not been sent to shareholders. Clause 47 enables the court to make orders during the currency of an offer protecting the rights of interested parties where provisions of the Act have been contravened.

Clause 48 allows the court to excuse a non-compliance with or contravention of the Act that is due to inadvertence, mistake or circumstances beyond the control of the person concerned. Clause 49 makes provisions relating to orders that the Supreme Court may make under the Act. Clause 49a saves the Bill from the restrictions on reduction of capital provided by section 64 of the Companies Act, 1962-1980.

Clause 50 empowers the court to make certain orders relating to agreements, benefits or payments given by a corporation to a director, secretary or executive officer of the corporation either before or after a take-over scheme or announcement has been made. The court may declare such agreement to be void or direct a person who has received a payment or other benefit to repay the corporation. Clause 51 requires certain information to be recorded by the person recording the minutes of a resolution passed for the purposes of the Act. Clause 52 prohibits the public announcement of a proposal to make a take-over offer or a take-over announcement if the person concerned has no intention of proceeding with the take-over.

Clause 53 provides that a person who contravenes or fails to comply with a provision of the Bill is guilty of an offence punishable by a fine not exceeding $2 500 or imprisonment or both. Clause 54 provides a penalty of $50 per day for continuing offences. Clause 55 provides for liability of responsible officers where an offence has been committed by a corporation. Clause 56 provides for service of documents. Clause 57 enables the Minister to exempt a person from compliance with the Act.

Clause 58 allows the Minister to modify the manner in which the Act will apply to specified persons. Clause 59 provides the guidelines on which the Minister should exercise his power under clauses 57 and 58. Clause 60 enables the Minister to declare conduct to be unacceptable in which case the commission will be able to apply for an order under clause 45. The court has power to overrule the Minister's declaration. Clause 61 enables the commission to intervene in proceedings relating to matters arising under the Act. Clause 62 provides for the making of regulations. Clause 63 is a transitional provision. Clause 64 provides for the payment of fees.

**Mr. BANNON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** In the time at my disposal, I want to deal with a matter that concerns me greatly, a matter in which I have been heavily involved for some time. It is a problem that seems to have stayed with us for some years. Candidly, it does not seem to be getting any better. I refer to the problems of the fishing industry. I have said it before and I say it again tonight that whether we like it or not the fishing industry is a fragmented industry and, within that fragmentation, it is unfortunately an industry of individualists. I said in a grievance debate some time ago that the Government, through its Minister, had failed to honour a decision at the time to have meaningful discussions with the industry before next month. It appears that some decision is to be made in respect of the possible closure of certain areas of Spencer Gulf in respect to net fishing.

More importantly, with that proposed closure, there will be in the main a penalty because of the possible fishing within that closed area. I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 27 June 1980 headed "Government tightens fishing laws", which states:

> Tough new controls over all fishing in South Australia are planned by the State Government. Fishing areas will be zoned, all netting will be banned in nursery areas, and fishermen will be restricted to catching certain species.

First, I question whether that meant the beginning of a decision made recently to proclaim areas of Spencer Gulf as areas banned in respect of net fishing. I refer to an area near my own district, although it is not in my district. This area is substantially fished by professional net fishermen who are my constituents.

Further, I wish to explain that, in my experience, attempts by the Government to stop net fishing in areas of the gulf simply move fishermen from one fishing ground to another and in fact slowly deprive people in the industry of a proper and reasonable living wage. The *Advertiser* report continues:

> South Australia's new Director of Fisheries, Mr. R. A. Stevens, said yesterday: "Stocks of scale fish in South Australian waters are being depleted very rapidly. If we don't take some corrective action now, we might as well kiss the industry goodbye. We have to take very tough measures.
>
> New laws, which give the director wider powers to control fishing in South Australia, were proclaimed yesterday. Mr. Stevens said the additional powers were vital to preserve fish stocks and prevent decline in the $25 000 000 industry. "We are going to have to specify where people can fish, what gear they can use, and what species they can catch. Scale fish may have to become seasonal, and zoned. Certainly, there will have to be more closed areas."

I have no quarrel with corrective action being taken. What I do quarrel with is the correction being made in an attack on the livelihood of people dependent on the industry for an income for themselves and their families. It seems logical to begin this exercise with the easing out of the B-class licence fishermen who, I point out, have more sophisticated equipment and larger boats and who are not at all dependent on fishing for a living, and who do not even have to supplement their income as a means of livelihood. The article continues:

> "Responsible fishermen recognise the need for new restrictions," Mr. Stevens said. "There has been close consultation with the industry. We won't do things arbitrarily."

I pause there and say to the Government that that is exactly what is being done, because no meaningful discussions have taken place between the industry and the Government or the department, so how the Director can make that statement I cannot understand. The article continues:

> But in scale fishing particularly, the industry agrees that tough action will have to be taken.

I would question that statement, too. The aritcle continues:

> He warned, however that fishermen who resisted new controls would risk losing their licences. "We will move to suspend the licence of any fisherman who persistently abuses the law—in some cases, we will act on a second offence," Mr. Stevens said.

Whether we like it or not the one law has, in fact, a different penalty for two types of people. For example, a fisherman with a B-class licence is not dependent on fishing for his livelihood and may have an income of perhaps more than $20 000 a year. Moreover, he has sophisticated equipment that can be used to out-fish even a professional fisherman. To deprive him of his licence does not mean a great deal to him. If the law is invoked on the holder of that B-class licence he can still go back to his $20 000 a year income. However, if the law is invoked against a professional fisherman, he and his family are deprived of a decent standard of living, so that the law in that case imposes a severe penalty, indeed, on him. Therefore, I question seriously whether there has been close consultation with the industry. I received a deputation of professional fishermen recently, and I understand from them that they are completely bewildered by the proposed Government decision.

I also point out that, in respect of the proposed tough action described in the article, it is obvious that depriving a person who depends wholly on net fishing for his living of his licence is a much severer penalty than is depriving the holder of a B class licence of that licence, which really gives a person the right to a pleasurable hunt to increase his already large income. I ask the Minister at least to have the decency to have meaningful discussions with the professional fishermen before any decision is made. Next week we will reach October and, so far, no meaningful discussions have taken place, to my knowledge. I wait with bated breath, shall I say, for next week and for meaningful discussions to take place between the Minister and members of the industry.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** In my speech tonight I will refer to the Auditor-General's Report and the spending of people in this prosperous society in which we live. One could consider essential items, such as food for sustenance, clothing to keep us warm and to create a sense of decency, rent or mortgage payments to keep a roof over our head, payments for the health of our family, welfare and maintenance payments, money for transport to and from work or school, and furniture to make life a little more comfortable. Then if we turn to luxury items, such as one or two cars, a colour television, overseas travel, interstate trips, swimming pools, and some recreational activities that may be regarded as luxurious, particularly some sporting events and allied events that may be regarded as sporting.

My attention was drawn to two items in the report: one item was the Lotteries Commission. I discovered that, in 1977-78, the administration cost of the Lotteries Commission was $1 785 488, which represented 7·2 per cent of the commission's revenue. In 1979-80, the figure decreased to 5·8 per cent, a decrease of 1·6 per cent, with an expenditure of $2 796 511. Prizes in 1977-78 went from $15 309 389 to $29 128 833.

The surplus available for hospital funds had increased from 1977 to 1979 from $7 860 514 to $16 307 593, which represented 33·4 per cent of total revenue of the lotteries. The total sales by the Lotteries Commission in 1977-78 were $24 995 391, compared to $47 946 611 in 1979-80, or an increase of almost 100 per cent in two years.

If we look at the next listing further on in the report, we come to the Totalizator Agency Board. There we find that the turnover for 1979-80 was $111 963 000, an increase of $14 933 000 from the figure for the previous year of about $97 000 000, and the profit available for distribution was up by $1 753 000 to $2 455 000 for that year. It is interesting also to note in the report that the staffing cuts had decreased the costs last year by $960 000, which is a drop from about $5 900 000 to $5 000 000, owing to computers and more modern techniques.

If we go a little further in the report, we find that there is a report on on-course betting. For that betting we find some staggering figures, because last year punters punted $192 862 000 on our racecourses in South Australia, which means that on the three systems (the T.A.B., the Lotteries Commission, and on-course betting) a total of $352 771 611 was spent by South Australians on the various forms of chance. This means that South Australians spent $966 000 per day, or the equivalent of 97c per person per day, on gambling in one form or another.

Of course, this would not include all the other various lotteries that are going on continuously, and perhaps a number of S.P. bookmakers around the place, and this makes one wonder about the effect that this has on spending in the shops, because a few retailers who have shops around the lotteries offices and agencies have drawn to my attention the fact that there has been a remarkable fall-off in their sales of the smaller items. That is quite

understandable when we find that, on lotteries alone, in the past two years there has been a 100 per cent increase in the value of sales transacted.

For instance, we can quite understand the small delicatessen next to the lotteries office or agency, where once the individual walking past the shop would have an impulse, perhaps, to go in and get a milk shake or some chocolates. It may be that a husband walking past a florist's shop suddenly decided that he would buy his wife some flowers. Now those people walk past a lotteries office or agency and see the opportunity to win something on a game of chance.

**Mr. Slater:** You won't be supporting soccer pools when they come in?

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** I did not say that. I point out the effect on other forms of trade, because if we withdraw from trade, in the case of the Lotteries Commission, an amount of $24 000 000 (because the figure for the Commission increased by $24 000 000), that is an amount that normally would have been circulating in small business, and so on.

Suddenly, we find that that $24 000 000 has gone into another form of retail sales in lotteries or games of chance. I am not against people taking this opportunity, if they feel that they wish to invest their money in that way. I merely point out to members that, perhaps in a time of the unemployment problems we have, we still find that, as a society, we have the opportunity to spend so much money: the equivalent of $1 000 000 a day on games of chance.

It makes you think that, perhaps, we are not such a bad society economically, because we seem to have the dollar or two in our pockets to be able to spend on these games of chance.

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

**Mr. LANGLEY (Unley):** I hope to confine my remarks to two subjects, one of which is unemployment, which is now the highest in this State for well over 11 years, and the other subject is the bread industry. If anything is a shemozzle, it is the bread industry in South Australia, and it is related to the Minister of Community Affairs and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. There is no doubt that they do not agree. The promises as regards the bread industry are not being carried out by the Government of the day. There is no doubt about that. The Government promises things it knows it never will be able to do. Opie Bros., in my district, had at one stage at least 100 on its pay-roll. Opies will close down next Thursday. When we were in Government, Opie Bros. were considered to be the firm in connection with which we should judge the price of bread, because it was the only South Australian-owned bakery in the State. Gradually, every bakery in South Australia has reached the stage of not knowning where it is going, because monopolies are taking the bakeries over. These monopolies do not have South Australian or Australian owners, but international owners, and the Government should know that.

Even now, in a Liberal district in the country I noticed the other day that a baker was selling bread below the price at which supermarkets sold it, and could not sell the bread. What is it all coming to? No-one knows. There will not be any bread deliveries in most areas, resulting in a loss of employment, at a time when unemployment is becoming worse. It is all right for the Government to say, as the member for Newland said today, that it will take 10 years; the Liberal Government will not be in office in 10 years time. When door-knocking in connection with the forthcoming Federal election, one finds that the Liberal Government in this State is going down strongly, and the opinion polls bear this out. The Government makes promises, but never carries them out. It said that anyone who discounted the price of bread by more than 5 cents a loaf would be investigated.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What did you do about it?

**Mr. LANGLEY:** We had price control, and that achieved something for the people of the State. The Government's attitude is that it does not matter what it does, as long as it looks after the big people. The Government does not care about the little people. The day when it cares about the little people I will say, "Good luck to you." The Government knows what will happen in the bread industry: it will become a monopoly. I know of several cases in my own district where the price of bread is being discounted by more than 5 cents a loaf. In one place, it is discounted by 8 cents a loaf, plus a scribbling pad. What is the scribbling paid for? Perhaps it is there to write the next day's order on.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The member for Henley Beach has been here five minutes and he reckons he knows everything. There is 35 per cent discount on bread, which the people in question have to put on the racks and advertise, etc. If people go down to the little corner shopkeeper to get bread, they pay the full price, and he is not getting 35 per cent discount on his bread. It is only a matter of time before this Government, which purports to be the great protector of small business, will find that these people involved in small business will not sell a loaf of bread at all.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The honourable member has been here for only five minutes, but he will learn. He will have every opportunity to speak, if he so desires, on another occasion.

*The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** I thought that the Minister was going to take three weeks to make a speech today. He used to complain about Question Time when in Opposition; he is worse than anyone on this side when we were in Government. We are getting answers to about five questions a day, and that is all. The Minister used to get up and go crook about us! If members opposite did not have Dorothy Dix questions to ask, they would not know how to ask any questions at all.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The Premier was the greatest knocker of all time when he was in Opposition. I wrote him a letter, and virtually all he said in reply was, "We do not know what to do." That is what is happening as far as the bread industry is concerned. Members opposite know only too well that few little grocers are left and that the monopolies are dictating the prices. Housewives will find that every week prices are rising, when in many cases there is no need for them to rise. The monopolies are making prodigious profits.

**Mr. Randall:** The supermarkets?

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Have you ever heard of Coles or Woolworths? Are they going bad? I hope that the honourable member supports small business in his district.

**Mr. Randall:** I do.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Do you ever go to the supermarket —Coles or Woolworths?

**Mr. Randall:** I go to the local butcher and local grocer.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** If that is so, I give the honourable member credit. However, I would like to know the names of those people later so that I can guarantee that he is correct. Members opposite will pay dearly for this type of thing, and they will find out during the Federal election that the people that they are supposed to be representing

will not be supporting them. That will definitely apply regarding bread. Many country bakeries are going to the wall. Many people are becoming unemployed in this industry. It has happened at Opie's. D. and J. Fowler staged a take-over, and that company is noted for buying people out and then getting rid of them. There is no doubt about it—it has happened here and in Victoria. The big business of the bakeries now means that it will not be long before there will be no home deliveries.

Also, there is no doubt that, as people get more and more money and discounts, they will move around. I do not know whether the businesses concerned will move into Flinders District, but in many areas of this State one will not be able to answer these people. I thought that country people would support their own, but it does not look like that is the case, because these big magnates have moved in.

Bakeries in South Australia are more controlled by overseas money than they are by anything else. The Government of the day is selling them out. I refer briefly to Westons, and the people who have taken over Opie Bros. They are controlled internationally.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** If the honourable member wants to refute what I am saying, he can do so. I have already referred to Westons, and I am sure that a Canadian group was involved.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 September at 2 p.m.

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 23 September 1980

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### YATALA LABOUR PRISON

5. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:—

1. In relation to the escape of Mr. J. A. Tognolini from the Yatala Labour Prison:

*(a)* whose fault was it that he was able to escape and what action, if any, has been taken against such person or persons;

*(b)* has he been recaptured; and

*(c)* how much has it cost the Government so far to recapture him and how is such amount made up?

2. Which prisoners have escaped from Yatala Labour Prison in the last 18 months, how, on what date, and which of them have been recaptured?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* An investigation into the escape failed to establish that any particular person or persons were responsible.

*(b)* No.

*(c)* Not available.

2. A. L. Brennan—ex Modbury Hospital—2/8/79—Re-admitted Adelaide Gaol 3/8/79.

Cyril Joseph Lindsay—from garden area—15/8/79—Re-admitted Adelaide Gaol 16/8/79.

J. D. Jones, P. J. Saunders, D. S. Hyndman, K. J. Crabb—over the main prison wall—24/8/79—Re-admitted Adelaide Gaol 25/8/79.

A. D. Gilbert—escaped in rubbish bin through the back gate—1/9/79—Re-admitted Yatala Labour Prison 3/9/79.

E. Heuston—ex Modbury Hospital—17/9/79—Arrested in N.S.W. and serving sentence in that State.

W. Thrun—possibly by means of uncompleted new tower—12/11/79—Still at large.

A. T. Davis and P. C. Harris—over "C" Division fence and then compound wall—27/3/80—both still at large.

R. M. Rofe, K. L. Kitchen and M. J. Smythe—from "C" top of "A" Division 24/4/80—Rofe arrested in Northern Territory; Kitchen and Smythe re-admitted Adelaide Gaol 5/5/80.

J. A. Tognolini—from "D" top "B" Division with assistance from outside—28/6/80—Still at large.

### RESTRICTIVE CONTROLS

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

1. What response, if any, has there been to the Premier's request for submissions concerning restrictive controls which apply to business and community activities?

2. To whom was such request made?

3. What action, if any, is to be taken as a result of such response, by whom will it be taken, and when?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Refer to the report "Deregulation: A Plan of Action to Rationalise South Australian Legislation", tabled in the House on 16 September 1980.

### MR. D. GERSCHWITZ

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

1. On what terms has Mr. Dennis Gerschwitz been employed by the State Government Insurance Commission?

2. What salary is he being paid?

3. What arrangements, if any, have been made for his superannuation and at what cost:

*(a)* to the Government; and

*(b)* to him?

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

Mr. Gerschwitz is employed as an officer of the commission under the provision of section 12(1)C of the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1970.

2. $40 182

3. Mr. Gerschwitz is a contributor to the South Australian Superannuation Fund; he will be entitled to a pension of 60 per cent of salary on retirement at the age of 60.

*(a)* The State Government Insurance Commission will ultimately be responsible for bearing the cost of 78 per cent of the total benefits to which Mr. Gerschwitz is entitled.

*(b)* Mr. Gerschwitz paid into the fund the sum of $21 397 representing the superannuation refund from his previous employment and is contributing at the standard rate of 6 per cent of salary. His combined contributions will purchase 22 per cent of the total benefits to which he is entitled.

### MURRAY HILL BUILDING

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

1.How long does the Government propose that the burnt-out shell of the Murray Hill Building on the corner of King William Street and Carrington Street remain as it is at present?

2. Why has the site not been redeveloped?

3. What plans, if any, does the Government now have for the future use of this site, and when will those plans be put into effect, and at what cost?

**the Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government is in the final process of disposing of this property.

### PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

21. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to introduce in this session the Statutes Amendment (Remuneration of Parliamentary Committees) Bill which did not pass during the last session and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No time has yet been allotted.

### TRANSPORT POLICY

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning transport with which it went to the last general election:

> "A Liberal Government will institute an immediate review of all current public transportation systems with the purpose of providing Adelaide with a long term transportation plan to carry us through to the end of the century."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is still the policy of the Government, what action, if any:—

*(a)* has the Government taken; and

*(b)* does it propose to take (and when),

to put that policy into effect?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning transport with which it went to the last general election:—

"A Liberal Government will give priority to:
completing the widening of the South Road in the inner suburbs;
ascertaining the application of the new bus system to the southern areas;
planning for a third road route to Adelaide, for example, the Panalatinga-Morphett Road link;
the provision of feeder buses to the Christies Downs railway, and its extension to Moana;
examining bus time tabling to incorporate express buses during peak periods;
examining the re-opening of the Willunga line between Hallett Cove and Hackham;
investigating the further decentralization of more employment opportunities into the Noarlunga regional centre area"?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is still the policy of the Government, what action, if any:—

*(a)* has the Government taken; and

*(b)* does it propose to take (and when),

to put that policy into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning transport with which it went to the last general election: We will institute registration rebates on vehicles which are manufactured to achieve a fuel consumption of 10 litres per 100 km (28 m.p.g.) or better, apply a special rebate to electrically propelled vehicles, encourage the production of electric vehicles in South Australia by the car and manufacturing industry, having regard to developments that have already taken place at Flinders University, make electrification, wherever possible, of the State's public transport system a major term of reference in the review of South Australia's transport systems and long term needs, ensure that any transport system introduced has flexibility and is not a high fixed-cost structure any one route."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is still the policy of the Government, what action, if any:

*(a)* has the Government taken; and

*(b)* does it propose to take (and when),

to put that policy into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## SALISBURY ROYAL COMMISSION

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

1. For how long has the Attorney-General been considering the allegations concerning the evidence at the Salisbury Royal Commission of a Mr. Don Dunstan made by Mr. John Ceruto at the launching of his book "It's Grossly Improper" and in the book itself?

2. When is it likely that he will finish that consideration?

3. Has he yet reported to the Premier as anticipated in the Acting Premier's letter to the member for Mitcham of 23 May 1980?

4. Did the Premier on his recent trip to England see Mr. Harold Salisbury about these matters and, if so, with what result?

5. Is it proposed to re-open the Salisbury Royal Commission and, if so, in what manner and when and, if not, why not?

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

1. Refer to the report tabled on 23 September 1980.
2. See No. 1 above.
3. See No. 1 above.
4. No, the visit was a private one.
5. See No. 1 above.

## SODIUM CYANIDE

240. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When will the report on the spillage of sodium cyanide pellets near Burra be completed?

2. Did the driver of the semitrailer involved in the accident undergo a medical examination after the accident and, if not, why not?

3. Is sodium cyanide manufactured in South Australia and, if so, by whom and in what suburbs are these industries located and, if not, is sodium cyanide transported into South Australia from interstate and/or overseas and, if so, in what quantity?

4. What is the usual mode of transport for this product through the State?

5. Are employees engaged in the transportation of this product given any specific safety instructions as to the procedure they should adopt where spillage on public roads or public places occur and, if so, by whom?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. All reports on the pillage have now been completed.

2. No. The driver himself could see no necessity to undergo a medical examination.

3. Sodium cyanide is not manufactured in South Australia and supplies are imported from overseas by ship. Approximately 300 tonnes was imported into South Australia during 1978-79.

4. By road transport contained in 100 kg or 50 kg heavy duty airtight steel drums.

5. Transport companies involved in the movement of this product are provided with copies of Australian Standard A.S. 1678, Emergency Procedures Guide—Transport—Sodium Cyanide. It is the responsibility of the transport company to ensure that its personnel are made aware of the emergency procedures relating to accidents such as fire or spillage.

## SALISBURY LAND

285. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

Has the Premier or any other Minister (and which) met with representatives of the Salisbury council and/or Myers concerning possible future zoning and future uses of land in the Park Terrace/Wiltshire Street/Commercial Road area and, if so, when did any meetings take place; what approach was taken by the Government to the matters raised and were any undertakings given?

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

Yes, the Premier and Minister of Planning have met with representatives of Myer, and with representatives of

the Salisbury council, on a number of occasions. The Myer representatives outlines their proposals for the area in question. The Salisbury council representatives discussed those proposals. The Government has already acted to register historical buildings on the area and has made it clear that it would give appropriate assistance to the implementation of the proposals only if they were approved by the Salisbury council.

### CO-OPERATIVES

307. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Co-operatives, which the Premier said on 5 June 1980 would be ready in a few months, now completed and, if so, has the Government considered it, will it be released to the public and, if the report is not completed, when is it expected to be completed?

2. When did the committee last sit?

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

1. The report was received on 17 September 1980. The question of its release will be considered when the report has been considered by the Government.

2. The committee last sat formally on 7 July 1980, but has had a number of discussions since then in settling draft of report.

### SCHOOLTEACHERS

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

1. How many teachers are currently in seconded positions in the Education Department?

2. How many of these are on curriculum writing committees?

3. How many are located in regions and what typically are their functions?

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

1. 368.8 teachers.

2. 20 full-time teachers.

3. A breakdown of seconded teachers located in Regions and performing regional advisory tasks is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Central Southern Region | 22.4 |
| Central Eastern Region | 15.0 |
| Central Northern Region | 31.6 |
| Central Western Region | 16.5 |
| Northern Region | 17.5 |
| Yorke and Lower North Region | 9.0 |
| Riverland Region | 6.5 |
| Murray-lands Region | 6.3 |
| Eyre Region | 7.6 |
| South-Eastern Region | 11.4 |
| Total | 143.8 |

The tasks which these teachers perform include advising teachers and senior staff on suitable teaching practices and curriculum development in particular subject areas, assisting schools in the implementation of new courses and organising and conducting teacher development activities.

### FILM GRANT

322. **Mr. CRAFTER** ( on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: What is the total cost, taking into account salaries and normal legal charges, in giving effect to the Government's decision to deny City Films Incorporated a grant of $12 000 (made by the previous Government) for the preparation of a film on the causes, nature and effects of unemployment?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The subject of the honourable member's question is *sub judice* and therefore it is not appropriate for any comment to be made on the matters raised by him.

### GLENELG EFFLUENT

330. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What effect has effluent from the Glenelg sewerage works had on marine vegetation immediately offshore and has any such effect led to movement of sand?

2. Have steps been taken in some areas to construct artificial reefs to reduce any sand movement and, if so, how successful have these artificial reefs been and are there any proposals to extend this practice to other coastal areas?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Evidence suggests that the impact of the effluent discharge on marine vegetation is minimal and very local. Although it is probable that loss of marine vegetation does lead to sand movement, there is no evidence that the local vegetation damage at the outfall has caused or contributed to this.

2. No. The artificial reefs previously constructed by the Department of Fisheries were solely for the purpose of providing habitats for fish, for the benefit of recreational fishing.

### DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

335. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What change of manpower occurred in the Department of Fisheries from 15 September 1979 to 30 June 1980, and how many of these changes were Public Service positions and how many weekly paid?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The change in manpower was eight (8), all of which were Public Service positions.

### SCHRADER-SCOVILL

368. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Did the Chief Secretary receive a request from the manager or management of the Schrader-Scovill factory at Elizabeth requesting that he direct the police to intervene in the industrial dispute at the firm's Elizabeth factory on 21 August 1980?

2. Did the Minister of Industrial Affairs request the Chief Secretary to intervene through the Police Department in this dispute and, if so, what were the reasons given?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

### BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY

370. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What is the present planning position on

a sheltered boat launching facility on the Central South Coast?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Cabinet has approved the engagement of a firm of consultants to undertake studies into the feasibility of providing a sheltered launching and retrieval facility for small craft in the southern metropolitan area, taking into consideration likely suitable sites, availability of adjacent land, environment effects, estimated costs, etc.

## SCHRADER-SCOVILL

390. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has Schrader-Scovill applied for assistance from either the Government or any Government instrumentality and, if so, what assistance has been sought?

2. Has any assistance been granted by the Government or any Government instrumentality and, if so, what assistance?

3. What further employment is it anticipated that such assistance will produce?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:**

1. With the exception of the assistance referred to in Question No. 395, no formal application for assistance has been lodged by the company with the Government.

2. No. However, see answer to Question No. 395.

3. Not applicable.

391. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is the Government aware of any plans of Schrader-Scovill to transfer any of its productive capacity out of South Australia?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No.

395. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Was Schrader-Scovill's operation in South Australia either established with assistance from or subsequently assisted by the Government or any Government instrumentality and, if so, what assistance was given?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Schrader-Scovill was assisted to establish in South Australia through the construction of factory premises at Elizabeth under the Industrial Premises Programme administered by the South Australian Housing Trust. The original premises were constructed in 1960, with subsequent extensions in 1970 and 1975.

## PEST PLANTS ACT

402. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Has the Minister completed the review of the Pest Plants Act that he indicated in answer to a question on 1 November 1979 and, if so, what is the result of the review?

2. Will the Act be amended and if so, when and, if not, what changes in enforcement policies have come from the review?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The review provided convincing evidence of the advantages of grouping rural councils into Pest Plant Control Boards. Board formation is now being finalised.

2. Possibly in 1981.

## PETROL SAVING DEVICES

412. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government investigate the claims made by manufacturers of various petrol saving devices as to their authenticity and, if so, where does the Government publish these results for public knowledge?

2. If these devices are not investigated, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Trade Practices Commission investigates claims made by manufacturers of various petrol saving devices as to their authenticity. Although the Trade Practices Commission does not publish their findings, they do discuss them with the manufacturer.

## RAIL-CAR BRAKE BLOCKS

413. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the S.T.A. use composition asbestos brake-blocks on suburban rail-cars and if so, how many of these brake-blocks per rail-car?

2. What investigations have been carried out on these brake-blocks to reassure the travelling public and railway employees that there is no danger to their health from their use?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies as follows:

1. Eight (8) composition type, plus eight (8) cast iron brake blocks are used on each 300, 400 and 860 class railcar.

Sixteen (16) composition brake pads are used on each 2100 class railcar.

Sixteen (16) composition brake pads, plus eight (8) composition brake blocks are used on each 2000 class railcar.

2. Investigations conducted on the London Underground by "International Environment and Safety" and also by the N.S.W. Railways in city tunnels and in railcars have proven that the quantities of asbestos fibre in airborne suspension were well below levels considered to be potentially dangerous to health.

## BALDNESS

416. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Do certain forms of aggressive chemotherapy sometimes cause baldness?

2. Are affected patients able to obtain wigs as standard ward public hospital patients?

3. What refund is obtainable for those persons insured with health funds?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. There is no provision for a standard benefit for wigs, but health benefit funds may make ex gratia payments to contributors, based on the individual circumstances.

## QUARANTINABLE REFUSE

420. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. When is it expected that the proposed incinerator will be constructed at Port Lincoln?

2. What has been the reason for the delay in construction?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth is funding the installation of a unit at Port Lincoln for the purpose of disposal of quarantinable refuse from ships in port. The unit is expected to be installed and operative be the end of November.

2. Following the Commonwealth awarding the contract to a supplier in Brisbane, it has been necessary for the contractor in collaboration with the Department of Marine and Harbors to modify design specifications to ensure that the equipment would meet requirements.

## NET FISHING

430. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: What action, if any, has the Government taken regarding the suggestions contained in the circular letter of December 1979 written by Mr. Cyril H. Lear to the Premier and others suggesting the prohibition of net fishing in the Coffin Bay area and all water west of a line from Point Bolingbroke to Cape Donnington and, what further action, if any, is proposed?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Department of Fisheries has consulted with representatives of local industry groups, including professional fishermen, recreational fishermen and the tourist industry at a meeting chaired by Mr. Peter Blacker, M.P. at the Port Lincoln Town Hall on 9 September, 1980.

At the meeting it was agreed to recommend to the Minister of Fisheries that restrictions be placed on netting in an extended area of Coffin Bay, to provide all groups with access to an equitable share of the fish resource. The recommendation is receiving consideration.

## MYER PROJECT

431. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Planning: Is the Government in favour of the Myer project for another shopping complex in the heart of Salisbury and, if so;

(a) why;

(b) what action has it taken so far to facilitate the project; and

(c) what further action is contemplated and when, and, if not, what action, if any, will it take (and when) to dissuade:

(a) Myers; and

(b) the Salisbury Council, from going on with it?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Refer to answer to Question No. 285.

## GOVERNMENT POLICY

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning Local Government with which it went to the last General Election:

"A Liberal Government will recognise the role of Residents' Associations and appoint a Residents' Association Liaison Officer in the Local Government Department to maintain communication between residents and Local Government."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## SECRET BALLOTS

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election:

"The Liberal Government will legislate to ensure that there is a secret ballot on a strike or picket line motion put to a meeting. Union members at the meeting can then vote according to their wishes, rather than be directed by fear and group pressure."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when ) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election—

"A Liberal Government will strengthen democratic rights within trade unions and employer associations by legislating for secret ballots for the election of senior officers to elected positions. Ballots will be carried out by the State Electoral Office with the costs being paid by the Government although exemption may be granted in special circumstances."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## INDUSTRIAL OMBUDSMAN

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election—

"A Liberal Government will appoint an industrial ombudsman who will be able to investigate immediately complains lodged by persons against unjust and unreasonable actions by employers or unions. The industrial ombudsman will act to give protection in the industrial area in a manner similar to the actions of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs in the consumer area. The industrial ombudsman will be able to initiate legal action on behalf of those who are oppressed or victimised and to take matters before the Industrial Commission and the court. The industrial ombudsman will report annually to Parliament and, on any matter of immediate public importance, may present a special report."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government, and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## INDUSTRIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election—

> The Liberal Party will establish an industrial code of conduct for unions, and associations. This will be done in consultation with employees, trade unions, and employers.
>
> This code of conduct will be set out in a schedule to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and will apply to all industries.
>
> Provision of effective legal action against industrial blackmail and illegal restraints of trade will be included in the code of conduct.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## UNIONISM

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election—

> "The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be amended to make it an offence for a union to incite a person to take discriminatory action or to threaten industrial action in an attempt to coerce a person to join a union. The penalty for such an offence will be a daily fine for each day the action continues."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is still the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election:

> The Liberal Party recognises the right of an individual to join, or not to join, a union or association representing his industrial interests. This principle is a fundamental part of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, to which Australia is a signatory.
>
> A Liberal Government will protect this freedom of choice by enabling a person to register through the Industrial Commission as an objector to union membership. On being registered, the objector will pay the equivalent of the membership fee into a court-controlled fund.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning industrial relations with which it went to the last general election:

"A Liberal Government will appoint a South Australian industrial relations advisory council to provide a forum for continuing discussion of manpower policies and for the improvement of industrial relations. The council will include representatives of employee and employer organisations, Government and the community."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## SPECIAL MENTOR PROGRAMME

446. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many young offenders have thus far avoided detention in security centres under the "special mentor" programme?

2. How many mentors have been engaged under this programme who provide intensive personal supervision?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. None.

Planning for the implementation of the programme has commenced.

## ABORIGINAL OFFENDERS

447. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many young Aboriginal offenders have been placed in the care of Aboriginal families in remote areas in the Mann Ranges since the adoption of this pilot scheme?

2. Have there been any abscondings to date and, if so, how many?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 5.
2. 3 children each absconded on two occasions.

## YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

448. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many incidents have occurred at the South Australian Youth Training Centre during the period 15 September 1979 to 31 August 1980 involving—

*(a)* injury to staff;

*(b)* hospital treatment; and

*(c)* lost time from duty?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

*(a)* 10.

*(b)* Nil.

*(c)* 6.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS

449. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many young offenders have been referred by the Juvenile Court to the Regional Youth Services programme from the inception of the scheme to 31 August 1980?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** 352 Young Offenders have been referred by the Children's Court to the regional youth project service programme from the inception of the Regional Scheme to 31 August, 1980.

## NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE

450. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many families have been selected thus far for the intensive neighbourhood care scheme in South Australia?

2. Are more families required and, if not, why not?

3. How many participating families were providing intensive care under this scheme as at 31 August 1980?

4. How many families have provided care for more than one young offender?

5. How many families have provided care for more than one young offender at the same time?

6. What are the present rates of reimbursement for families providing care for young offenders under this scheme for—

*(a)* short term remand;

*(b)* long term care; and

*(c)* on call?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 76.
2. Yes.
3. 45.
4. 61.
5. 7.
6. *(a)* $12 per day.

*(b)* $15 per day.

*(c)* $3 per day.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS

451. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many young offenders have been sentenced to detention for periods exceeding four weeks by the Juvenile Court for the period 15 September 1979 to 31 August 1980 and how many of those sentences exceed three months?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 119 young offenders were sentenced to detention for periods exceeding four weeks.

2. Of these, 75 sentences exceeded three months.

452. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many offenders have absconded from the South Australian Youth Training Centre, the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre, and Intensive Neighbourhood Care, respectively, from 15 September 1979 to 31 August 1980?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. South Australian Youth Training Centre 20.
2. South Australian Youth Remand & Assessment Centre 20.
3. Intensive Neighbourhood Care 33.

## GOVERNMENT POLICY

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning recreation and sport with which it went to the last general election:

A programme will be developed to provide more boat ramps, mooring facilities, and youth training course for the proper and safe use of recreational water resources.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning recreation and sport with which it went to the last General election:

We will create and make available where possible more facilities for water recreation, such as catchment areas and reservoirs, for recreational boating, subject to appropriate safeguards for health.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning recreation and sport with which it went to the last general election:

> A Liberal Government will consult with all interested bodies in an endeavour to rationalise the facilities for motor cycle and other off-road vehicles so that there are adequate facilities with emphasis on minimum disturbance to the ecology of an area and the need to protect the environment and residents from fire risk."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If is is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the rural policy of the Government with which it went to the last general election:

> A Liberal Government will examine the run-off and outflow of water in the South-East drainage system and assess the need for construction of weirs in those drains.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the rural policy of the Government with which it went to the last General Election:

A Liberal Government will abolish the South-Eastern drainage rates.?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the rural policy of the Government with which it went to the last general election:—

> Rural Disasters
>
> The Liberal Party will establish a permanent Advisory Committee comprising representatives from the Treasury, Departments of Agriculture, Lands, Local Government and producer organisations, to advise on how best to assist primary producers and rural communities when natural disasters occur?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the rural policy of the Government with which it went to the last general election:—

> "We will use our college at Roseworthy and the Department of Further Education to conduct farmer training and retraining programmes incorporating diploma and apprentice courses."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the tourism policy of the Government with which it went to the last general election:—

> "A Liberal Government will establish tourism on a regionalised system similar to that now operating very successfully in Victoria."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the tourism policy of the Government with which it went to the last general election—

> "We see some benefit in developing a register of private home-owners who are prepared to offer to tourists reasonable accommodation in their homes at low cost. We will undertake an examination of this scheme to see if it is feasible."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning public works and water resources with which it went to the last general election:—

> "A Liberal Government will support proposals for reducing salinity and other pollution in the River Murray system by:—implementing the Noora Drainage Scheme with the inclusion of industrial effluents and the drainage water from the Loxton irrigation area: upgrading control works on existing River Murray basins; implementing groundwater interception schemes; establishing an independent irrigation technique and management improvement committee to assist in upgrading irrigation techniques and practices; providing technical support and low cost finance to enable improved irrigation techniques to be implemented; pressing for advances on South Australia's water entitlement from the River Murray."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and , if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning public works and water resources with which it went to the last general election:

> "A Liberal Government will achieve greater efficiency by rationalising the activities of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and will effect economies by:—implementing modern accounting systems in the department; instituting effective management services in the E. & W.S. Department; providing for the proper costing of projects so that a realistic comparison can be made between departmental construction costs and those of private contractors; closing departmental depots which are demonstrated to be redundant; rationalising the operation of the Ottoway workshops."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning public works and water resources with which it went to the last general election:

> "A Liberal Government will seek to arrest increases in water and sewerage rates and encourage the saving of water which is of vital importance to South Australia, *and will review the method of charging for water* and sewerage services with a view to correcting existing anomalies."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following part of the policy of the Government concerning public works and water resources with which it went to the last general election—

> A Liberal Government will appoint a Co-ordinator of Public Works. The major function of this officer will be to provide the Government with objective recommendations, thus enabling better-informed judgments on competing claims of departments for expenditure of public moneys?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if its is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning public works and water resources with which it went to the last general election—

> The Liberal Party will establish an expert working committee to recommend a code of accountability for public capital works. The code of accountability will establish principles, procedures and guidelines for public constructing authorities including all Government constructing departments, directed towards greater accountability to the public for expenditure of public funds?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## MARTINS ROAD EXPRESSWAY

480. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to that portion of the proposed Martins Road expressway between Kings Road and Shepherdson Road—

*(a)* what is the proposed width of the road pavement;

*(b)* what is the proposed width of the pedestrian and plantation reserve on each side of the road pavement;

*(c)* how far away and on which side is the north-western road pavement kerb proposed to be from the present north-western pavement edge of the existing road; and

*(d)* what screening is proposed to protect adjacent residents from traffic flows anticipated on the expressway, if it is constructed?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Martins Road expressway proposal has not been developed in any detail, hence the information sought by the honourable member is not available.

## COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

482. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Planning: Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, what have been the levels of and the period of operations of those levels for:

(a) interest rates on new concessional loans;

(b) interest rates on existing concessional loans;

(c) maximum amount that could be borrowed on concessional loans; and

(d) monthly repayments on those loans for loans contracted over 40 years and over 25 years, respectively, for moneys lent by the State Bank and by building societies, respectively, since 1970?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

(a), (c) and (d)

STATE BANK

| Date | (a) Initial Interest Rate per cent | (c) Maximum Loan available (1st Mtg.) $ | (d) Initial Monthly Instalments 40 yrs. | 25 yrs. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| June 1970 | 6.75 | 9 000 | 54.30 | 62.18 |
| August 1972 | 6.00 | 10 000 | 55.02 | 64.43 |
| July 1973 | 5.50 | 12 500 | 64.47 | 76.76 |
| | 6.00 | | 68.77 | 80.54 |
| | 6.75 | | 75.41 | 86.36 |
| July 1974 | 5.50 | 15 000 | 77.37 | 92.11 |
| | 6.75 | | 90.50 | 103.64 |
| March 1975 | 5.50 | 18 000 | 92.84 | 110.53 |
| | 6.75 | | 108.60 | 124.37 |
| February 1978 | 5.75 | 21 000 | 111.91 | 132.11 |
| | 6.75 | | 126.70 | 145.10 |
| August 1978† | 5.75 | 21 000 | 111.91 | 132.11 |
| | 6.76 | | 126.70 | 145.10 |
| September 1979† | 5.75 | 21 000 | 111.91 | 132.11 |
| | 6.75 | | 126.70 | 145.10 |
| January 1980 | 5.75 | 33 000 | 178.75 | (38 yrs)* |
| | 6.75 | | 206.25 | (35 yrs)* |
| | 7.50 | | 226.88 | (32 yrs)* |

* Note (1): Since January 1980, commencing instalments based upon a percentage of the original advance, comprising a portion for interest and a portion for repayment of principal. The term of the loan is not a relevant factor in instalment calculations and is only stated as an indication of the approximate initial repayment period. Subsequent increases in instalments will actually result in loans being repaid over slightly shorter periods than those indicated at commencement.

† Note (2): During 1978-79, supplementary loans of $6 000 (1978) and $10 000 (1979) were available (over 15 year term) on second mortgage basis at 11 per cent per annum. Repayments $68.20 and $113.66 per month respectively. These loans were not provided from C.S.H.A. funds.

BUILDING SOCIETIES

Initial interest rates on concessional loans were 6.50 per cent from 1970 to 1972, 6.00 per cent from 1972 to 1973, and have been 6.75 per cent since 1973. The maximum loan amounts have generally been raised in line with the State Bank limits.

(b) Initial interest rates have been maintained on the same level throughout the loan, until the housing agreement commencing in July 1978. Interest rates are now escalated by 0.50 per cent per annum up to a maximum, initially 9.00 per cent, and since July 1980, 9.50 per cent. The interest rates on old loans were raised in line with this formula by the State Bank in 1978, by the Hindmarsh and R.E.I.—Imperial Building Societies in 1979, and by the Co-operative Building Society in 1980.

## GOVERNMENT POLICY

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning Mines and Energy with which it went to the last General Election:—

"The Liberal Party will review the nature and use of vehicles by Government departments; encourage a greater use of public transport; consider the removal from legislation and regulations of impediments to the most efficient use of fuel; provide financial assistance, where necessary to enable industry to convert from oil burning to alternate energy use."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning Mines and Energy with which it went to the last General Election:—

"The Liberal Party will institute community education programmes on the means by which energy may be used efficiently; provide special loans to encourage home-owners to insulate their ceilings; provide special loans, intially for new houses, to help cover the extra cost of installing a domestic solar hot water service; provide for these special loans to be repaid through quarterly accounts payable to ETSA or the S.A. Gas Co. over a three-year period; ensure that the tariffs of both ETSA and the S.A. Gas Co. for the energy to boost a solar hot water service will be reasonable priced; review building standards so that new buildings are sited, designed and constructed to minimise energy consumption; investigate the installation of energy saving facilities in new Housing Trust homes and those being renovated; provide the necessary authority by Acts of Parliament for the right of access by individual land-owners to solar radiation; support the establishment of a plant to re-refine oil wastes (including motor vehicle sump oil); encourage the re-cycling of domestic and industrial water as a source of energy generation."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put it into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

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

1. Was the following, part of the policy of the Government concerning Mines and Energy with which it went to the last General Election:

"The Liberal Party will establish a State Energy Authority responsible for the co-ordination and utilisation of the State's energy supplies. The Energy Authority will advise the Minister of Mines and Energy on all matters of energy use, conservation and development."?

2. Is it now the policy of the Government and, if it is not, what change of policy has there been, when and why?

3. If it is the policy of the Government, what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed (and when) to put into effect?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Relevant action, as appropriate.

## QUARRY PRODUCTS

497. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. When have there been increases in the price of quarry products during the past two years, on what dates did these increases become operational, and what were the prices of quarry products after each increase?

2. What was the date upon which the last increase was applied for, and who lodged the application?

3. In the case of the last increase, was the increased amount the same as applied for and, if so, did the Prices Commissioner recommend that the application be approved in full?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Since 10 January 1980, when price control on quarry products changed from formal control to justification, individual quarries do not necessarily have the same product prices. As Quarry Industries Ltd. is the market leader in the metropolitan area, prices and increases given are those of this company.

QUARRY INDUSTRIES
20 mm Quartzite Screenings

| Date of Increase | Increase per Tonne $ | Price per Tonne ex bin $ |
|---|---|---|
| June 1978 | — | 3·17 |
| 28 August 1978 | 5c | 3·22 |
| 7 December 1978 | 40c | 3·62 |
| 7 February 1979 | 8c | 3·70 |
| 12 July 1979 | 5c | 3·75 |
| 10 August 1979 | 27c | 4·02 |
| 21 January 1980 | 68c | 4·70 |
| 23 July 1980 | 1·00 | 5·70 |

2. Under the present procedure of price justification, quarriers are not required to make application for product price increases.

3. See 2.

## INDUSTRIAL PREMISES

514. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: In the 1979-80 financial year—

*(a)* how many industrial establishments were constructed by the South Australian Housing trust and what was the square metreage of each;

*(b)* what was the cumulative gross square metreage of S.A.H.T. factory accommodation accruing rental income as at 30 June 1980; and,

*(c)* what was the income from industrial rents?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

*(a)* Factories and Extensions completed;

| No. of Factories | $m^2$ |
|---|---|
| 1 | 2557 |

*(b)* Cumulative gross square metreage of factory accommodation leased and mortgaged 1979/80 was 271 929 $m^2$.

*(c)* Annual income from and mortgage—$2 563 150.86.

## HOUSING UNITS

515. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. During the 1979-80 financial year, what housing units were completed by the South Australian Housing Trust in the Electorate of Salisbury by type and area?

2. Do the construction goals as stated in answer to question No. 389 in the last Session for the years 1980-81 and 1981-82 still remain the same and, if not, what are the changes anticipated?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 134 housing units were completed

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Salisbury Downs | 51 single units |
| (b) Salisbury North | 44 single units |
| | 18 single storey maisonettes |
| | 21 cottage flats |
| | 83 |

2. 315 single unit housing completions are anticipated for the 1980/81 financial year

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Parafield Gardens | 145 houses |
| (b) Salisbury Downs | 47 houses |
| (c) Salisbury North | 123 houses |
| | 315 |

193 housing completions are anticipated for the 1981/82 financial year;

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Parafield Gardens | 75 houses |
| (b) Salisbury Downs | 91 houses |
| (c) Salisbury North | 15 houses (cottage flats) |
| (d) Pooraka | 12 houses (cottage flats) |
| | 193 |

The Trust regularly reviews its construction programme to ensure it is appropriate to changing community needs and the programme for the 1981/82 financial year is currently being re-assessed in response to:—

(a) the availability of funds for new construction
(b) the present economic climate,
(c) the high demand for Trust housing in the established metropolitan area between Gepps Cross and Darlington.

These factors have already been influential in reducing the numbers anticipated for the 1981/82 financial year as expressed in last year's reply to the honourable member compared to this year's predictions.