

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 November 1980

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appraisers Act and Auctioneers Act Repeal,
Appropriation (No. 2),
Crimes (Offences at Sea) Act Amendment,
Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,
Crown Lands Act Amendment (No. 2),
Foreign Judgments Act Amendment,
Loans to Producers Act Amendment,
Motor Fuel (Temporary Restriction),
Planning and Development Act Amendment (No. 3),
Prices Act Amendment (No. 2),
Public Purposes Loan,
Railway Agreement (Adelaide to Crystal Brook Railway),
Real Property Act Amendment,
South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission,
Statutes Amendment (Change of Name).

STATE BANK (RIVERLAND FRUIT PRODUCTS CO-OPERATIVE ASSISTANCE) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

STATE DISASTER BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 746 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to strengthen existing laws against the prostitution trade, reject any proposal to legalise the trade, and request the Commonwealth Government to sign the United Nations Convention on Prostitution, were presented by the Hons. D. C. Brown, R. G. Payne, and J. D. Wright, and Messrs. Bannon, Billard, Glazbrook, Mathwin, Millhouse, and Trainer.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MEAT TRADING

A petition signed by 50 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. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: I.M.V.S.

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit, to reinstate Dr. J. Coulter to his previous position, and instigate an inquiry into the administration of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, was presented by Mr. O'Neill.

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*: Nos. 81, 282, 309, 358, 388, 389, 492, 586, 590, 594, 597, 600, 603, 604, 606, 607, 610, 612, 617, 618, 629, 631, 633 to 635, 638, 639, 641, 642, 649 to 652, 654, 655, 657 to 660, 663, 665, 668 to 672, 681, 682, 685, 694, 695, 697, 700, 704, 705, 708, 709, 716, and 717.

CRIME ALERT

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (22 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The practice of marking and recording items of property is one which is strongly advocated by police. Furthermore, the police recommend that a photographic record of articles of jewellery and other items of value be maintained by the householder.

With regard to the proposal that the Police Force be responsible for marking, engraving and keeping records of personal property at the request of householders, it is relevant to mention that the completion of the Marion crime prevention campaign marked the end of the first 12 months of concentrated crime alert campaigns conducted by the Police Department throughout the metropolitan area.

Currently, the Police Department is conducting a review of these campaigns to assess their impact before scheduling next year's programme and, no doubt, further modification and improvement of the initial pilot scheme will be identified. Initiatives such as property marking will be considered.

Direct police involvement in marking and recording property would entail a significant commitment of police resources, and the service could best be undertaken by volunteer groups such as service clubs. Current indications are that such groups would be interested in the project. Crime prevention is not only a police responsibility but also a community concern, and for this reason the use of volunteer services is regarded as an opportunity to provide greater impact on the community.

ROAD GRANTS

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (6 November).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It has been decided that priority should be given to the upgrading and sealing of the most direct and practicable route between Cleve and Kimba, a length of some 71 km, as improvement of this route would directly benefit the greatest number of road users. The adopted route does not go through Mangalo, although persons travelling to and from Mangalo will benefit from having a sealed road for part of their journey.

The upgrading and sealing of the Cleve-Kimba road will be carried out as funds and resources permit and, having regard to the low traffic volumes and the high cost of the

project, it is expected to be a number of years before the road is completely sealed. Following this, it may be possible to improve other routes in the area including a connection between the sealed road and Mangalo.

JOSEPH VERCO

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (28 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Assessment of the damage to the Fisheries Research Vessel *Joseph Verco* has not been completed. The steps taken to date have been to salvage the vessel and to move it to a safe anchorage. The steps taken to salvage the vessel and move it from the location where it sank have been in accordance with the advice of the insurance underwriters and the consultant appointed by them to assist the Department of Fisheries, as owner of the vessel.

WALES STATE RESCUE HELICOPTER

In reply to the **Hon. P. DUNCAN** (7 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Since the beginning of the contract for the Wales State Rescue Helicopter on 2 July 1980 to 30 September 1980, the following missions at Government expense have been completed:

Date	User	Mission
4/7/80	Police	Aircraft search
8/7/80	Police	Surf rescue training
8/7/80	St. John	Retrieval familiarisation
9/7/80	Police	Search
15/7/80	Police	Training
16/7/80	Police	Surveillance
16/7/80	St. John	Retrieval
20/7/80	Police	Boat search
22/7/80	St. John	Training
26/7/80	Police	Traffic surveillance
27/7/80	Police	Boat search
31/7/80	St. John	Cyanide spillage
1/8/80	Police	Surveillance
2/8/80	St. John	Retrieval
3/8/80	S.L.S.A.	Crew training
3/8/80	Police	Arcade fire
4/8/80	Police	Training
4/8/80	St. John	Retrieval
7/8/80	St. John	Retrieval
16/8/80	St. John	Retrieval
2/9/80	St. John	Retrieval
6/9/80	St. John	Retrieval
10/9/80	Police	Rescue
11/9/80	Police	Surveillance
11/9/80	St. John	Retrieval
13/9/80	Police	Traffic control
14/9/80	Police	Traffic control
16/9/80	St. John	Retrieval
18/9/80	C.F.S.	Training
19/9/80	C.F.S.	Training
20/9/80	Police	Traffic control
21/9/80	Police	Traffic control
21/9/80	C.F.S.	Training
21/9/80	Police	Traffic control
24/9/80	Police	Surveillance
25/9/80	Police	Patrol
26/9/80	Police	Surveillance
27/9/80	Police	Traffic control
28/9/80	Police	Search

In all of the above missions, the pilot is an employee of

Lloyd Helicopters Pty. Ltd. as per the contract, and crew are authorised officers of the applicable department or authority.

FINGERPRINTS

In reply to **Mr. HAMILTON** (18 September).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Following discussion with the Chairman of the State Transport Authority, the authority is reviewing its employment procedures. The practice about which the honourable member expressed concern has been discontinued.

BRIGHTON ROAD TRAFFIC

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (29 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is expected that Lonsdale Road will be open to traffic immediately prior to the Christmas closedown provided the roadworks are not delayed due to inclement weather. If this occurs, the road will be opened as soon as practicable in the new year.

Traffic signals will be operable at the Lonsdale Road-Sherriffs Road and Lonsdale Road-Majors Road intersections prior to the opening of Lonsdale Road to through traffic. The programme with respect to signals on Brighton Road and the status of each installation is as follows:

Brighton Road-Seacombe Road—signals operating.

Brighton Road-Gregory Street (Pedestrian Actuated Crossing)—operating.

Brighton Road-Sturt Road—signals operating.

Brighton Road-Jetty Road (Brighton)—signals delayed pending Council approval to removal of Pedestrian Actuated Crossing in close proximity.

Brighton Road-Oaklands Road—White Street—anticipated signals could be operating prior to road opening.

Brighton Road-Diagonal Road—signals operating.

Traffic conditions will be observed over the ensuing two to three months after opening and adjustments made to signal phasings and timing to accommodate the changing traffic patterns.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (5 November).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department will commence a substantial on-going programme of replacing trees in the Anzac Highway median next autumn. Native trees and shrubs will be used and it is envisaged that all the trees in the median will be replaced over a period of several years.

The department does not consider that the trees have had any significant effect on the road pavement. However, the lawned areas in the median are a source of concern as they require constant watering in summer and watering may be a factor in the deterioration of the road pavement. Accordingly, consideration is being given to alternative means of treating the median surface.

The department shares the honourable member's concern at the poor riding conditions of the road pavement and is currently investigating means by which this may be improved.

YOUTH ACCOMMODATION

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (23 October).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The reply is as follows:

1. Release of the Working Party Report on Youth Housing: The Government is currently considering the report of the Working Party on Youth Housing to determine appropriate action in respect of the recommendations contained therein.

2. Extension of the Emergency Housing Office to include a responsibility for young people: Various of the recommendations contained in the report relate to an expansion of the Emergency Housing Office's activities to include young people, as well as families. Since the preparation of the report, the Emergency Housing Office has come under the responsibility of the trust, which is currently planning for the progressive integration of the emergency housing service into its normal operations. The implementation of the recommendations of the working party relative to the Emergency Housing Office are therefore being considered in this context.

In addition, the trust has, for some considerable time, leased accommodation to bodies and organisations in the community, working with homeless youth, in the same way that it has assisted other special initiatives, including women's shelters. Practical assistance has been afforded to groups such as Nidlandi Hostel, Ranges Youth Centre, Northern Suburbs (Enfield) Family Services Board and Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services. Also, the trust has agreed to assist with accommodation for the establishment of youth shelters at Noarlunga and Murray Bridge.

PALMDALE INSURANCE LIMITED

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (21 October).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Legislation to establish a fund against which claims relating to workers compensation may be made in the event of the insolvency of an insurance company or an uninsured employer was introduced in the House of Assembly on 5 November 1980.

MOORE'S BUILDING

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (28 October).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On 27 October 1980 Cabinet approval was given to convert Moore's building for use as law courts at a total estimated cost of \$30 000 000. The cost includes demolition and construction work, fitting and furnishing, holding payments to the lessor during construction, the property purchase price and allowance for cost escalation during the period of building. At the same time, and following a public tender call, Cabinet also approved the appointment of A. W. Baulderstone Pty. Ltd. as the Building Consultant/Construction Manager of the Moore's law courts project.

DEATH OF SIR EDRIC BASTYAN

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from Lady Bastyan, wife of the late Sir Edric Bastyan:

Dear Dr. Eastick,

My son and I thank you for your personal message of sympathy in our great loss.

Please extend to the Premier (the Hon. D. O. Tonkin, M.P.) our most sincere thanks for moving the most touching motion in honour of my beloved husband, which we so greatly appreciate.

It is a deep honour to have a copy of the resolution, which

will be much treasured, and I thank especially the Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Hartley and the member for Mitcham for referring to my late husband with such warm praise, and for their thoughts and sympathy for us, expressed on behalf of all members of the House of Assembly.

Sincerely Yours,
Victoria Bastyan

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman, 1979-80.

Ordered that report be printed.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Glenside Hospital Redevelopment (Multi-purpose Hall, Canteen, and Industrial Therapy Workshop).

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CRIME

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In response to questions raised by the member for Playford during the Estimates Committee on increasing crime rates, I sought the required statistical information from the Police Department, which was subsequently printed in *Hansard* on 6 November 1980. It has now been discovered that the figures relating to larceny contained in tables 2.1 and 2.2 of the appendices were incorrect. I have now been provided with the correct statistical information, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

LARCENY STATISTICS

Table 2.1

Offence Category	Offences Reported or Becoming Known to Police from 1976-77 to 1979-80			
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Larceny	36 409	39 101	44 936	62 957

Table 2.2

Offence Category	Percentage Change in Offences Reported or Becoming Known to Police from 1976-77 to 1979-80		
	Percentage Change 1979-80 over 1978-79	Percentage Change 1978-79 over 1977-78	Percentage Change 1977-78 over 1976-77
Larceny	40.1	14.92	7.39

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Tourism): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In July this year, I announced a review into the Department of Tourism. The review, which was conducted by Rob Tonge and Associates, tourist industry consultants, in conjunction with the Public Service Board, and convened by Mr. John Burdett, Assistant Commissioner of the board, has been extremely thorough and has generated significant public interest. Approximately 280 people have been interviewed, including many people directly associated with the tourist industry in South Australia.

The review has been an assessment of the State's tourist industry, its potential for growth, and the department's relationship with the industry. I now table the Review Committee's report. The principal findings of the review are that:

South Australia has the potential for a thriving tourist industry, but development must not detract from the natural grace and dignity of the State.

Tourism in the past has lacked the recognition and Government support necessary for an industry which is vital to the State's economy.

Tourism needs a professional boost in its marketing, promotion, development, research and servicing aspects. The Department of Tourism has a leading role to play in these activities.

Many South Australians under-sell the State as a tourist destination.

The principal recommendations of the review are:

The introduction of a non-regulatory Development of Tourism Act which provides for the establishment of the South Australian Tourist Authority responsible to the Minister for the development of tourism in South Australia.

The appointment to the board of the Tourist Authority of a group of highly respected business and community leaders, preferably with a broad knowledge of the tourist industry.

The complete restructuring of the Department of Tourism with increased emphasis on the marketing, promotion, research, planning and regional liaison functions.

The introduction of an expanded range of financial assistance schemes.

The appointment of regional managers in the State's tourist regions.

The review team's assessment is that the tourist industry in South Australia is in a desperate plight—probably more desperate than has ever been publicly declared. There is no doubt that the review was justified and that strong measures will now be required to remedy the current situation. In regard to the recommendation to create a State Tourist Authority, the convener of the review, Mr. John Burdett, has advised me that he believes that the establishment of a board of directors to administer a strengthened organisation structure, as well as a sound regional tourism structure, could be achieved without the creation of an authority.

In order to ensure that differing viewpoints can be thoroughly canvassed, I propose to allow a period of four weeks for public comment. Staff of the department were briefed on the report this morning and copies of the report will be distributed throughout the State with an invitation for comment on the recommendations. The report will

also be available for purchase at the State Information Centre.

I hope to make specific recommendations to Cabinet early next year to enable implementation of approved changes to proceed as quickly as possible. Precise details of those changes will be determined after Cabinet has made a detailed study of the review report and has assessed comments from the tourist industry, staff of the Department of Tourism, and the public.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Public Service List, 1980.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Superannuation Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Allowances.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Real Property Act, 1886-1979—Regulations—Solicitors and Land Brokers Charges.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Marketing of Eggs Act—Report of the Auditor-General, 1979-80.

Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1976—Regulations—

II. Tail Tagging

III. Canine Parvovirus Vaccine

IV. Proclamation Section 6—Prohibition on Introduction of Cattle into South Australia.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Building Act, 1970-1976—Regulations—Various Amendments

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Planning Appeal Board—Report, 1979-1980

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1978-1979

II. Community Welfare, Department of—Report, 1979-1980

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

Pursuant to Statute—

River Murray Commission Report—Report 1979-1980

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Dog Fence Board—Report, 1979-1980.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to the presence of distinguished visitors in the gallery, members of a visiting United Kingdom delegation, in the persons of Mr. John Osborn, Mr. Richard Alexander, Mr. John Grant, Mr. Stephen Ross, and Miss Betty Boothroyd. I

invite Mr. John Osborn (as Leader of the delegation) to take a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to conduct Mr. Osborn on behalf of the delegation to the Chair and to accommodate him with a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. Osborn was escorted by the Hon. D. O. Tonkin and Mr. Bannon to a seat on the floor of the House.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: EDUCATION

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith and that such suspension remain in force no later than 4.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House, noting and deploring the widespread uncertainty and unrest that currently exists among teachers and parents, and understanding that the root cause of this unrest is the cutbacks in staffing because of lack of sufficient funds provided for education in the recent Budget, censures the Government for breaking its election promises on education and damaging South Australia's education system, and resolves that it no longer has confidence in the Minister of Education and calls on him to resign.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BANNON: This is the first motion of no confidence on a specific matter that has been moved in this way in the time of office of this Government since September 1979. We became rather used to the spectacle of the previous Opposition moving motions of no confidence on a wide range of issues on a regular basis throughout the period that it occupied the Opposition benches, and, by so doing, it devalued one of the most important formal procedures that are available to an Opposition in Parliament, namely, that of censuring the Government and of expressing no confidence on a particular issue.

When we entered Opposition, we decided amongst ourselves that we would not devalue that procedure by using it in an extravagant manner or too frequently: we would choose only those issues of great substance and importance to this State on which to make that formal motion of no confidence in the Government. So, it has been that, despite numerous issues and numerous examples of broken promises, bungling and incompetence, to this stage the Opposition has not formally moved a vote of censure in the Government.

We took the view (a view, I think, shared by the majority of South Australians) that a new Government coming into office had the right to a period in which it could put its policies into practice, and allow them to be judged after some period of operation. We have now come through the second Budget of this Government. We are now able to measure many of the Government's policies against the promises, to measure its performance against a specified period of time in office (about one-third of the time that it will be in Government). So, the time now has come when this Government and its record will be under increasing pressure and attack not just from the Opposition but from all those groups in the community that have been disappointed and rejected by the Government. The time has finished for any sort of honeymoon for this Government: the time has come for it to be judged on its performance and actions.

We are giving notice in this motion on a specific subject that, from now on, the Government will not be allowed to get away with a breach of promises and the administrative and policy incompetence that it has displayed to date. Education has been the subject of many major debates in the House over the past 20 years. It is an area in which much of the State's resources and public funding is put. It is absolutely fundamental to the future of our State, to the quality of life, and to our ability to respond to the challenges of the future. A poor education system means a State that is in real trouble in an increasingly complex world. We in South Australia have, I believe, been rightly proud of the way in which we have pioneered education advances in this country, and of the amount of public resources that we have put into it over the past 10 years. This situation has made us a leader in Australia, and in many areas it has brought us to international attention.

To see this decay and to see those advantages squandered in the way that they have been over the past 12 months is something extremely painful to the vast majority of South Australians, and this motion calls the Government to book. It must change its policies now. It can change them in a fundamental way only by changing the Ministry. The effect of carrying this motion will do both those things. It is amazing that, after the promises made by the then Opposition before the last election, after the support that we concede was given to it by teacher organisations and by many in the profession, on the basis of those promises, we face today a greater crisis in our education administration (the greatest loss of morale since the mid-1950's or early 1960's, when education was starved of funds in an expanding population) than we have faced since the foundation of our public education system 105 years ago.

The State now faces the possibility that, for the first time in that 105 years, there may be a general strike among teachers. If that is not an indication of the degree of loss of morale and unrest amongst the teaching profession, what other indication can there be? I suggest that the Premier and his Minister need not silence their back-benchers; if those members have kept their ears open, if they have wandered around their electorates, if they have talked to people in their schools, they will realise what trouble the Government is in because of what it is doing to education.

For the first time in 105 years teachers are contemplating a strike. It may be that the requisite two-thirds majority is not obtained, but certainly there is significant support for that drastic action on behalf of a professional group in our community, a group charged with looking after, improving and educating the children of our community. Whatever decision the teachers make will be because of this Government's action and because they are forced to the point of considering such drastic action. It may well be unfortunate for teachers to strike, and, indeed, if one speaks to any teachers one realises that there is no relish or enjoyment of the prospect to strike among any of those teachers, even if they are great supporters of the proposal to take strike action. However, whatever their attitudes, if such action is taken in the current situation it will be perfectly understandable. Teachers are seeking to protect our education system, and are spelling out clearly to the Government now that they cannot tolerate any further disintegration or decay of that system.

Teachers are dealing with a Government that has sorely disappointed them, a Government which during its election campaign made them a large number of promises on which it has now turned its back. The immediate issue of transfers is itself the last straw for many in the teaching profession, but it is by no means the cause of the current

unrest. The motion and the debate on it ranges far more widely than the immediate and particular sorts of problems in relation to teacher transfers.

The clumsy handling of this issue by the Minister has merely served to heighten the tensions in our education system. The Minister must cover his own inadequate administration of his portfolio and somehow explain away the broken promises of the Government. In so doing, the Minister has set country against city; he has set school against school; and he has set teacher against teacher. The Minister has reacted in panic to the Budget cuts and the financial stringencies that have been forced on him; instead of acting with a rational, planned approach, ensuring that the resources and the promises made by his Government were kept.

It has been significant to see in recent months that the Minister has increasingly been hiding behind his Director-General and his administration. I thought that it was most unfortunate that today, for instance, it is the Director-General, not the Minister, who is writing to teachers about the strike. I thought it was significant, having read in the daily paper this morning that teachers were to be written to by the Director-General, and having contacted the Minister's press secretary in order to obtain a copy of the letter that was being sent, we were told that the letter had not been written at that stage. This was at 9 o'clock this morning, despite a report in this morning's *Advertiser* saying that a letter had been sent. The suggestion seems to be that publicity surrounding that action taken by the Director-General, acting within what he sees as his departmental responsibility, came from a press release from the Minister rather than the Director-General himself. Whatever the circumstances, it is still a very shabby policy indeed for the Minister to hide behind his administration and to have his Director-General or any of his public servants taking the brunt of criticism, in an attempt to mend the fences that he himself has been responsible for creating.

Let us examine the promises of 1979, which were published under the name of the current Minister of Education, the then member for Mount Gambier and shadow spokesman, so his name was actually on the policy document, and for 12 months or more he has occupied the seat of Minister of Education charged with implementing that policy. The 10-page statement was released with considerable publicity and it was used to great campaigning effect in the course of the election campaign last year. Let us look at some of those specific promises, which covered the whole area of primary and secondary education, as well as the tertiary level. In relation to primary education, the policy document said:

Primary education in South Australia has not received the resources which it requires to enable it to fulfil its important role.

The first significant promise that the Liberal Party made in pursuance of that policy, to ensure that primary education did fulfil its important role, was to reduce class sizes as a matter of high priority, particularly in the first two or three years of primary school education. The policy went on to state:

We will progressively appoint additional staff to help achieve this aim.

That is a clear bald statement of intent. The question of the decline in class sizes from the decline in enrolments, behind which the Minister has taken refuge, I will deal with in more detail later.

Let us take up that specific promise to appoint additional staff, which promise was clear, unequivocal and in black and white. In 1979-80, there were 7 691 primary school teachers, and in 1980-81 there are 7 554 teachers,

which is a reduction of 137. I am quoting figures from the book that was circulated as part of the Budget Estimates that were considered recently. In the context of appointing additional staff, let us look at another specific promise, as follows:

We will appoint specialist teachers in art, music, drama, foreign language and physical fitness.

Physical educational manpower in 1979-80 was 73, and in 1980-81 it is 69; for educational technology the figure is 101 for 1979-80 and 97 for 1980-81; for music and art in 1979-80 the figure was 92, whereas in 1980-81 it is 87; for advisory and support services there were 291 in 1979-80, and for 1980-81 there are 275; for language studies in 1979-80, there were 11, and in 1980-81 there are 10. Again, I am quoting from the yellow document. So, that is the sort of commitment that has been demonstrated in support of specialist teachers in specified areas. There have been reductions in the numbers appointed in all cases at all stages.

The third specific promise was the appointment of trained staff to diagnose and remedy problems of literacy and numeracy and other handicaps at all stages of primary education when they arose. There is no record whatsoever of anything being done in this area. Indeed, as I will mention later, the closure of the Reading Development Centre directed specifically to that literacy and numeracy aspect of the policy is one which cuts directly against that policy.

The fourth specific promise was for the upgrading and extending of health screening procedures to ensure early detection of speech, sight, hearing or other physical defects which might impair learning. There has been no indication of any extra resources or extra priority being afforded to this.

The fifth specific promise was that of aiming to meet the Commonwealth standards for the provision of properly staffed resource centres in primary schools. There has been no indication of any movement towards this standard.

The sixth specific promise related to the establishment of realistic targets for the provision of non-contact time for teachers and the appointment of ancillary staff. My colleague the member for Baudin has already pointed out that that statement is extremely ambiguous. Realistic targets which were interpreted in the community as meaning targets that one would strive to achieve by increasing the numbers available for these purposes are, in practice, targets that apparently are achieved by decreasing the resources and the numbers available, because the total ancillary staff in schools in the face of that promise has been reduced by 60.

Incidentally, on all these policies it was interesting to notice the Government's response to a question from the member for Mitcham in which it was not prepared in any way to explain the extent to which it had attempted to implement those policies and simply advised him, in effect, to wait and see, saying that in due course he would know whether or not those policies were to be implemented. It is that kind of contemptuous dealing with the promises made at the election which has, I think, caused so much of the heat which has been generated at the moment in the teaching profession over this matter.

Then there is the final policy, the grand summation on primary education, a statement which says:

Emphasis will be given to reducing the teacher-student ratio as rapidly as possible to assist learning and to help migrants achieve educational equality as quickly as possible. Whilst we recognise that it is desirable to teach national culture and customs to ethnic groups, literacy and numeracy will continue to be our first priority.

There are two important statements there, statements of policy, statements of direction of resources—the reduction of teacher-student ratios to achieve two aims: to teach literacy and numeracy and to teach national culture and customs to ethnic groups. Incidentally, that second one was echoed in the Liberal Party's ethnic affairs policy released in the name of the Premier. That statement is as follows:

We will encourage the use of suitable bilingual teachers both within the Education Department and within our other schemes. We will ensure that every non-English-speaking child will be given special language tuition immediately upon entering school, and this will continue until a satisfactory standard of fluency is achieved. This is recognised as a very much neglected area.

These are the words of the Premier as expressed in his ethnic affairs policy.

We have seen the cuts which have taken place in that area of multi-cultural education, and it was quite ironic and, I suggest, somewhat shameful that the Premier appeared to open the revamped multi-cultural area in the face of those cut-backs. It went down very badly indeed.

I have been dealing with the range of promises in the primary sector, which is causing greatest concern at the moment. On the subject of secondary education, the Liberal Party policy said that disadvantaged secondary schools would receive the same special attention as disadvantaged primary schools, which in the last 12 months or so has been little at all. I have said that 12 months has been long enough. This Government has now had two Budgets in which to make clear its intentions on education. It is not valid to claim that we must wait the full three years of its term of office to see some action on those promises, because, indeed, by the time the next Budget is brought down the Government will be nearing the end of its elected term. It has had every opportunity in that time to make clear the direction in which it plans to proceed.

What has clearly emerged from the Budgets that have been presented to date, and most particularly the recent Budget, is that education will not receive extra funding in terms that would allow a continuing improvement in the quality of education, and that teachers, and ultimately the parents and their children, will be asked to bear the brunt of the Government's miscalculations about its revenue and its general financial situation.

Let us turn to the issue of the pupil-teacher ratio. The Minister has taken refuge in explaining away the lack of increased resources in these key areas by saying that there is a continuing decline in enrolments in our schools. That is something that has been apparent for a number of years.

The Director-General himself made that specific point in his letter to teachers this morning. He said that the number of children in Government schools had been declining since the early 1970's and that the rate of decline had accelerated in recent years. He went on to say that, over the same period, the number of teachers in the department had actually increased. In 1976, when the sharpest period of decline began, there were 14 320 teachers; there are now 15 170. In other words, throughout the period of the 1970's, the Labor Administration was faced with a similar situation of declining enrolments. Rather than responding, as the present Government has done, by using those declining enrolments as an excuse to reduce the number of staff and the resources devoted to education, the Labor Government continued to ensure that those resources and those numbers increased.

It did that for a very good reason. It did not believe that the optimum level of expenditure had been reached or that the system was in a perfect equilibrium. On the contrary,

the declining enrolments gave it a great opportunity to have a double effect on improvement of educational resources. By increasing the number of teachers, by increasing their skills, coupled with the declining enrolments, we ensured that class sizes were reduced more rapidly and that the quality of education rose more positively and sharply.

That demographic change provided a great opportunity of accelerating the process, an opportunity which has been thrown away by the present Government—scandalous enough behaviour in itself, but totally reprehensible in the face of the promises made by the Minister and his Government. The only conclusion we can reach about what this Government is doing is that it has decided to accept the present classroom size and state of education as satisfactory, and to do nothing to change that classroom size, but rather to allow the process of declining enrolments to make some marginal improvements if the current level of resources is maintained in real terms.

It is a decline and a decay by stealth that will take some time to work its way into the system. Unfortunately for the Government, too many in this State know too much about the education system and care too much about it to allow that stealthy process to take its course. We believe that the Government should be working in terms of its policy to positively improve class sizes. There is no evidence or inclination on its part to do so.

Another refuge taken by the Minister was the recourse to an inquiry. Earlier this year, the Government established the Keeves inquiry. That was done in May, and the inquiry was given wide-ranging terms of reference to examine the South Australian education system, to examine the impact of economic, demographic, technological and social changes on that system, and to look at the implications of those changes for resource allocation. We have no objection to that sort of comprehensive inquiry taking place, although we somewhat suspect the motives behind it.

That wide-ranging inquiry was also to look at the organisation of the various education departments and the curricula and teaching methods of the schools and colleges. It was represented by the Minister very much as a logical successor to the now somewhat dated Karmel Report of the early 1970's, and the Minister claimed that its findings would profoundly influence the direction of education. Again I say that we have no objection to that sort of inquiry, although we wonder precisely what the Minister is seeking to achieve through it. Was it indeed to achieve a proper analysis of the future development of education, or was it to be an attempt to provide an excuse for further cut-backs and reductions in our commitment in this community to education?

That fundamental inquiry has been proceeding since May. At the very least, we could have expected that the *status quo* would be maintained throughout such an investigation, but the actions of the Government, through its latest Budget, have effectively pre-empted a major part of that committee's deliberations. More importantly, what happened in the last Budget calls into question the whole rationale of establishing a committee. It certainly damages its credibility as a committee of inquiry with some prospect of its recommendations being acted on.

When the committee was set up, the Minister was at great pains to point out that its establishment was in no way related to the considerable criticism he was then receiving over the prospects of cuts in education. All members will be well aware of the strength and depth of that criticism among the vast group of people in our community who felt betrayed by the Government's actions in relation to education, but the Minister said that this

inquiry was in no way an attempt to pass the buck or to explain away those cuts. He said:

Contrary to widespread and unfortunate speculation, there had never been at any time contemplated a withdrawal of funds directly towards students and teachers. However, we are determined to make savings in the administration of education at all levels by more efficient management.

Just precisely what that phrase means and what its implications are have been well explored by the member for Baudin on other occasions. This statement, made by the Minister when he was announcing the inquiry, is now revealed as a sham. It is certainly causing doubts about his motives.

Let me deal with just three specific points of major issue at this time that are part of the general unease and loss of morale in our education system. The first point is that of multi-cultural education, about which the Government made great play in both its education and its ethnic affairs policies. The Government promised, for instance, an inquiry into multi-cultural education. It was clearly understood that this was to be a separate and special inquiry devoted to this particular area of importance. It was assumed by those in the ethnic community that they would be playing a role in this inquiry, taking part in it and, in fact, having representation on the committee, but that inquiry has now been forgotten, as have all the promises made in this important area. It has been buried or subsumed within the general inquiry into education.

That has been admitted, under questioning, by the Minister in another place, the Hon. Murray Hill, who told the Legislative Council during the debate on the Ethnic Affairs Commission that that specific inquiry into multi-cultural education was now a part of the investigation by Dr. Keeves. That is the end of that. An examination of the terms of reference of the Keeves committee shows absolutely no reference to multi-cultural education. No doubt it could be encompassed within those broad terms of reference and no doubt the committee will be prepared to receive submissions on it, but there is no-one from the ethnic community on the committee of inquiry and, once again, a major promise has been completely thrown over, and admittedly so: it has not been forgotten, but admittedly and specifically broken in this case. Yet the Premier had the audacity to turn up to the multi-cultural education centre and make a speech praising his Government's commitment and efforts in this area.

There has been an increase in funding from the Schools Commission for multi-cultural education. We must remember that the Commonwealth provides much of the resources in this area: it is not a decision of this State Government. Money comes to the Government from the Commonwealth to support the programmes for which the State Government takes such credit. The important point is that that funding has been provided for people who are involved in multi-cultural programmes, who have been told that they will face cuts in the area of negotiable staff, that is, staff that they can employ over and above the level provided for by the allocation formula. The important point is that it is from this area that most of the schools employ their multi-cultural teaching staff, and it is from this area that the Government has told them that there will be cuts.

The reactions of the schools have been quite clear and unequivocal. The Premier can try to fudge the issue and his Minister can try to explain it away: the schools that are responsible for putting the programmes into effect are quite clear about the implication of those cuts. An article in the *Advertiser* of 5 November 1980 quotes the Croydon Primary School Principal, Mr. C. G. Cook, as saying that, if all the Federal money for multi-cultural education was

spent on multi-cultural programmes, another 50 teachers could be employed. That is the big question. Resources are being provided from the Commonwealth: are they being directed to the area for which they have been provided? An examination of the numbers employed and the commitment of this State Government indicates that some of that money is not being spent in the areas for which it has been allocated.

It is very difficult to get information about this matter, because constantly the Minister and others concerned are unavailable to see people who know what they are talking about and can put them under close questioning. Note the frustration of, for instance, the co-ordinating committee on multi-cultural education, which was set up to advise the Minister and which has been finding it impossible not only to advise him, but also to get access to him, even to voice its complaints. Many of us would have seen a letter from Mr. Talbot, the Principal of the Kilkenny Primary School, expressing the views of that committee, of which he is a member. He points out that, in the public sector, a significant number of schools have been advised that they will be obliged to accept cuts in negotiable staffing. Mr. Talbot says that the effect of these cuts will be to cause individual schools to reduce their programme or, in some cases, to jettison the programmes. His letter states:

Attempts have been made by me on behalf of others at their request to organise a deputation to the Minister. The request was denied on what to me are quite specious grounds. The Minister suggested that we contact the Regional Director and if still dissatisfied that we should write to him, as Minister.

This is another example of the way in which the Minister is constantly seeking to hide behind his administrative staff rather than face up to the facts and the people involved. The letter continues:

This seems a futile gesture, when there are 10 Regional Directors, not one, and the Regional Directors can only allocate staff out of a reduced number of such staff, consequent upon a Cabinet decision to reduce the funds available. It is Cabinet that makes such decisions, not the regional Directors or, for that matter even the Director-General.

Let me make that quite clear: it is on the Minister and the Cabinet, of which he is a member, that responsibility lies for the subsequent problems that are taking place at the grass roots in relation to these programmes. The letter goes on to point out that not only has the Minister been inaccessible but also that the programme is collapsing, without any response from the Government or recognition of the problem. Indeed, Mr. Talbot goes on to say:

I find it personally galling that about a week before the Premier officially opens the revamped multi-cultural centre, State schools should now be in the position of wondering whether there is any future for multi-cultural education in this State.

The centre is open, and the Premier basks in that, while in the schools where the programme is being carried out savage cuts are, in effect, threatening that whole programme; yet, these people are not able to come face to face with those they wish to tell about it. There are some hard comments about that. I will not go into it in greater detail, but later speakers will refer to it. There is the issue of multi-cultural education.

The second matter with which I deal briefly is the Reading Development Centre. An interesting advertisement has been inserted in the press recently. A submission has been prepared, and a protest meeting will be held this very day on this particular area, which one would have thought would be close to the Minister's heart. He has talked about the basic skills, and the three R's, and the

emphasis that should be put on this. The centre, and its operation, was a key part of the education programme in this area; yet, earlier this year the South Australian Council of the Australian Reading Association prepared a lengthy submission indicating its concern about the possible downgrading of services, of staff cuts that might result from the disestablishment of the centre. That body has presented this major submission. It is interesting that it has commented that it has taken eight years of intense work with parents, teachers and children to build this essential set of services, which has been recognised nationally as being well ahead of time and an example which others should follow, something of which we should be very proud in our education system. The advertisement states:

What is the point of setting up a committee of inquiry into education if the Minister takes such unilateral action to downgrade one of the most essential links for schools and parents to seek and expect expert and practical advice and support. Why the urgency?

That statement was issued by Presidents of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations, the Primary Principals Association, and the Australian Reading Association. Yet, it is suggested by the Government that there is nothing really wrong—a few minor administrative problems, maybe, and that is all, so that these people obviously do not know what they are talking about. If that is what the Minister thinks, let him say so very clearly and squarely today and then we will all know where we stand.

I turn now to the matter of the curriculum advisers, people who are providing an important service to teachers in the field, and who are available to develop curricula and in an advisory capacity. They provide essential support services. Of those advisory positions, 45 have already been axed. The contracts for all seconded and advisory teachers come up for renewal at the end of 1981. Not surprisingly, these people feel that the sword of Damocles is hanging over their heads. In the primary area alone, curriculum staff are currently engaged in seven new curriculum programmes. These are now under threat, but it is vital that the number of seconded and advisory teacher positions be at least maintained at the present level to ensure that new curriculum developments are effectively incorporated into teaching programmes. Some areas are already understaffed, and further staff is urgently needed. Yet, there is to be an overall reduction of 45 positions.

The science advisory positions are of particular interest. These include a biology adviser, a physics adviser, a secondary science apparatus co-ordinator, the Botanic Garden secondary adviser and the Zoological Gardens adviser, all of whom are an important part of the structure of our education system. It is significant that all these appointments, with the exception of the physics adviser, were advertised for 1981 in July of this year. So, apparently at that stage the Education Department believed that these positions were worthwhile and were to be continued. Now, they are to be cut out. To concentrate on just one of those positions, that of secondary science co-ordinator, I point out that the decision to discontinue that position absolutely defies logic. That co-ordinator saves time and money by co-ordinating the purchase of science apparatus, which is bulk-ordered at cheaper rates. Teachers have ready access, through the co-ordinator, to information regarding the use, selection and repair of that apparatus. Cutting out the position means that each school will have to do its own ordering. Each school will be forced to negotiate direct with the apparatus supply firms. If this is allowed to occur, it is estimated that schools will have to pay between 25 per cent and 100 per cent more for science

apparatus than under the bulk-ordering service. This could amount to an increase in expenditure State-wide of \$80 000. Despite this, this particular key position is to go by the board.

Many other points can be made about the general state of education, but I refer again to the overriding situation regarding the cutting back of services, a situation of demonstrable concern in this community, not just one of concern among teachers (and, by heavens, that is acute enough), but one of concern to parents and the whole community. I have not even touched on what has happened to the building programme or to what is happening to the quality and standards of the education system which we believe had been built into one which was second to none in this country, one that had shown great dividends, whatever flack has been levelled at it over recent years. The education system has been blamed for many things, but the fact is that a group of professionals and support staff in this community have developed a splendid education system, an education system that the present Government thought so much of that it wanted to improve and develop it—that is what it promised to do. However, faced with the Government's revenue problems and with its general philosophy, I would suggest, the Minister of Education has proved to be totally incompetent in getting Cabinet to provide him with resources necessary. The Minister has proved totally incompetent in dealing with his department and his teaching work force, as witnessed by the massive breakdown in relations between the institute, the teachers themselves and the Minister.

He has proved to be totally incompetent in keeping South Australian education at the standard and quality at which members such as the former Minister, Mr. Hudson, and the member for Baudin kept it over the period of tenure of their office. We can talk about a lot of things in this State of South Australia. We can talk about a lot of problems we face in the eighties, but an adequate, vibrant, alive education system is the cornerstone of the development of this State, and to see it under threat, to see it being run down in this way, is scandalous and it must be publicised as widely as possible. Indeed, it will bring this Government down in time, but for the moment we must content ourselves with moving this vote of censure and demanding that the Minister vacate his portfolio at once and let someone else have a go.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I can only commence by saying that surely this debate would better have taken place several weeks ago when the Budget was before the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We have been accused of dealing stealthily and furtively with material placed before the House, by not only the Leader of the Opposition in press releases and in statements to the media as recently as this morning but also by others allegedly responsible for senior parent organisations in South Australia.

How stealthy and furtive was this Government? For the first time in recorded history in a Western Parliamentary system we have introduced in this House programme performance budgeting which placed before every sleeping member of the Opposition the fine print of what is happening in Government. The figures for which we are being criticised were in fact placed precisely in the Leader's hands and in the hands of the former Minister of Education, but how many questions did they ask about this matter during the eight-hour long session which I attended when the Budget was supposed to be gone

through and the fine print examined? Two hours were spent in debating whether the additional \$600 000 this Government made available should have been included.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: So what?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am saying that this motion is a few weeks late. The Bannon waggon is really a late tram. However, more importantly than that, the motion is of no real consequence. The President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers sought an audience, not with me, but with the responsible people in the Education Department, so that he could spend time with the accounts section analysing the Budget within a matter of hours of its appearing in this House. Permission was given to him to go through the Budget in fine detail. There again, this motion is belated rather than early because all the information being regurgitated by the Leader of the Opposition has not changed, except for the better. The original promise that the Leader of the Opposition gave to South Australia was that our Budget would lead to a cut of 600 staff; this was reduced to 450 in a subsequent press release; it was then reduced to 306 when the Budget was released; and it has been reduced to 282 as a result of further moneys being made available for migrant education, moneys, incidentally, which are spread not over just one budgetary year but over a calendar year that extends into the next budgetary year. Further funds will be made available for 1981-82 to acquit some of the Commonwealth funds that we are being accused of mispending.

The mathematics are pretty straight forward to follow, provided the Opposition has the wit, the wisdom, the time and the interest to do so. I suggest that it should have done this when the Budget was before the House. It is a belated move to bring this motion in front of the people. Why is it belated? It is designed to stir up public opinion. The Government's statistics have not been furtive; they have not varied. They have been consistent, except where they have been improved, and they certainly have not been deceptive. The "big yellow book", as it is referred to, has not been subjected to change since it was printed.

Another question emerges: the President of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations has been quoted as coming out into print very quickly, in fact so quickly that one questions whether he spoke on his own behalf or whether he did have time to hold a meeting and find out the extent to which the South Australian Association of State School Organisations fully backed what he said when he, too, said the Budget had been introduced stealthily and furtively. That statement was made by an accountant, a man whom I respect and a man I appointed to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry because of that respect I held for him. Is he now running with the hounds without having analysed the fine print of that yellow book that gave all the details which the Leader said were kept for out of the way cuts? We said there would be 45 positions reduced in advisory services, 90 release-time scholarships, and about 150 or 160 general teaching positions, but that the teacher-student ratio would still improve this year.

This Government did not have access to the sort of statistics we now have access to because in Opposition we were deprived of them. We asked the Government for them. Programme performance budgeting gives the details for which we used to have to go on our bended knees, and that is the big difference. It certainly makes a difference when forming budgets to have the relevant statistics to date, relevant statistics which the previous Government chose to ignore. The Education Department was the first department to decide that the bonding of students was not really necessary, because there was no way known that they could be employed in the 1980's. We were still

planning to build Monarto, would you believe; we were still planning for an expansionary South Australia, despite the 1975 Borrie Report saying that we were in a state of decline. There was, in fact, a net migrant loss to South Australia of 1 700 people in 1978-79.

We have tended over the past few weeks to have had a lot of toothpicks thrown in front of the South Australian public, when the real logs behind the strike issue, the real chunks of wood, have been largely demolished by this Government. The toothpicks are little bushfires and are being used for kindling. The real log issues are the transfers, which the Leader of the Opposition chose to ignore completely because he finds that, although two or three weeks ago this was a central issue, with people and families under great pressure, now the primary transfers have been largely completed, and there will be no enforced transfer from metropolitan to country areas.

The secondary school transfers at senior level are more difficult, but 20 out of a total of 1 750 senior staff are involved. We have to put into perspective 20 out of 1 750, and that really is the main issue that was made so much of as a key to the strike two or three weeks ago, but it slid completely out of contention in the Leader's speech today. The problem relating to general staff has been largely resolved, too. Maybe one or two general staff teachers out of 6 500 may be asked to transfer against their will to a country area, but what a minute number in proportion to the 15 000 total staff that we still have in education in South Australia.

This Government is reacting to contemporary statistics; it is reacting responsibly and it is appointing specialist teachers. The figures quoted a few minutes ago from the yellow book are misleading. We have two types of specialist teachers: those appointed completely outside the classroom and those allocated to the classroom. Over the past several months, this Government has been planning to place more and more specialist teachers in schools as general staff, rather than have them outside working as advisory staff. The cuts in advisory staff are also essentially in the metropolitan area, and in the country regions, which are much more deprived of access to advisers, facilities will not be reduced.

The metropolitan staffs have much more access to a wide variety of sources of help, assistance and advice than do country people. We have to some extent reduced advisory staff in the metropolitan area, and that obviously is something on which the Government, the Minister, the Institute of Teachers and other staffs can negotiate. We keep stressing that we would prefer an atmosphere of negotiation and co-operation, which we have achieved in the transfer area, rather than this confrontation through strike. Incidentally, this is not the first strike action that has been contemplated. I remember being on a teaching staff in 1970 when we had a look at similar action, and I said that in no way would I condone that sort of action. The motion then did not go through. There is no way that I would ever condone strike action, as a professional teacher any more than I do now as Minister.

I refer now to specialists: 22 people with music skills fronted up at the beginning of last year. We snapped them all up and put them in classrooms. There were nine or 10 people with speech therapy qualifications. We accepted them all and took them on, even though that number was over the establishment number. There are many examples of specialists having been taken on and put into the classroom rather than being itemised as separate to the classroom establishment number.

The previous Government ignored many problems. As I have said, it was building Monarto, it was expanding teachers colleges and it was training 5 500 teachers per

annum, which was far more than we needed, while the population was in a state of decline—and we had a population loss in 1978-79.

This Government still has over two years to go. There are many promises which I will itemise which have already been kept and there are many more to be attacked during next year. We will go well on the way towards accomplishing what we said as a three-year term Government—not one of 18 months, take it as you please, sometimes declared from Canberra and sometimes declared from other unlikely places, as has happened here. We are here for over three years and we intend to stay and to implement promises, not only in education. Promises have been made to students, to teachers and to parents. Let us have a look while we are on the subject of what promises we have kept.

Mr. Keneally: This won't take long.

Mr. ALLISON: Would you like to bet? The maths and English curricula—look at the disaster area of the new maths. We are still trying to remedy that. Youngsters have been deprived of grammar, its form and function and given new maths, and now we are looking at formalising. The class 7 curricula in English and mathematics are well on the way, are being printed, and will be distributed to schools. That section of the curriculum is far more advanced than it was 12 or 15 months ago. That is just one aspect.

We can give the lie, too, to the accusation that we were depriving children of school health services. Additional health nurses have been appointed, and funds have been made available by the Minister of Health to back up the work that they are going to carry out, not by accident but by priority as part of this Government's policy. Resource centres in South Australian primary schools are being replaced, upgraded, and put into new schools as a matter of course. The implication, from what the Leader of the Opposition has alleged, is that they are being completely left out.

What have we done for parents? Partly at the behest of the former Minister of Education, who has formed a working party of his own, in addition to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry and the Federal committee which is looking into the subject, we have introduced the school equipment grants, which the former Government completely cut. We restored them by 50 per cent last year and by 100 per cent this year. We have increased the allowances for school books: not only have we increased them but also we have equated the primary and secondary allowances to give primary schoolchildren a better deal. We have made more funds available for Government-assisted scholars—the so-termed free scholars, who are not really free; they never were free under the previous Government any more than they can be called free scholars now. We increased the ethnic language grant from \$14 to \$28 per student, and we have increased multicultural spending (I will go into that later). We have given allowances to isolated children so that they could study away from their isolated homes in schools of their own and their parents' choice, to give them a better education, and not to privileged people but to those who qualify already for the Federal isolated children's allowances.

We have not retrenched any ancillary staff, and that is an interesting point. What happened at the beginning of last year when we said we were going to rationalise ancillary staffing, just like the previous Government rationalised it in 1977-78—an identical procedure? We said we would abide by what the Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers requested us to do. There was no retrenching, no compulsion, but voluntary, slowly, removals by attrition, if any. The two

associations to which I have just referred said that, if we did it that way, by the end of 1980 everything would be sweet and the whole operation would have been achieved. Has it? No; this Government is carrying an additional amount of money, \$400 000, which it has overpaid in ancillary staff wages and which it will continue to carry into next year because those two associations did not assist to the extent to which we had anticipated. We have not forced the issue, but there are about 1 600 hours of unallocated ancillary staff time for which, in many cases, other schools are still waiting, and in many cases they are not waiting, because we have made additional hours available. That is the extent of the co-operation that this Government shows to its school staffs. We keep our promises quietly while other people are breaking theirs.

As I have said, this Government still has two years to go. In 1970, the Karmel Report said that one-fifth of the State's Budget was being expended on education. In 1980 over one-third of the State's Budget is expended on education, the amount having risen from \$75 000 000 to \$375 000 000. What is the greatest significance of that? For the first time we have South Australia with the greatest expenditure per head of student population in Australia; we have South Australia's teacher-student ratio in primary and secondary education leading the rest of Australia. So, if South Australia is in dire straits, look at the rest of them. This is under a Liberal Government, which is being criticised for cuts in education—not that we are going to claim great pride in saying that we now have the best so we can halt there: we are simply saying what we have achieved by comparison with what the rest of Australia is doing. The rest of Australia is not even interviewing fresh graduates from teachers colleges, because they have tens of thousands of students surplus. There again, we are following on from the work of the previous Government in further tackling the teacher surplus by having a look at rationalising again the teachers colleges intakes, not by closures but by a sensible approach. That still has to be achieved.

This Government is showing a great deal of common sense and responsibility, and I am not claiming that just as Minister, but I am claiming it on behalf of the Cabinet, which is responsible for the entire allocation of people's funds (Governments do not have funds of their own) in South Australia. This Government, like the previous Liberal Government in 1968, 1969 and 1970, initiated the Karmel and Keeves committees of inquiry, which the previous Labor Government chose to implement. It was a good initiative, obviously, and we are carrying on with that.

On the positive side again, we have continued to take initiatives. The Keeves committee of inquiry is not a sop. I hate to think what frame of mind the people on that committee would be in if that was implied, as it were, by the Leader of the Opposition. They are responsible people, and they will be bringing down a responsible report. The JESIFA inquiry into promotion and transfers was the result of Federal Institute of Teachers and Education Department initiatives to find out what solutions there were to country-city transfer and promotion problems, and we all know that they have existed for a long while—far longer than the last 15 months, but look at the fire that is being created. The Auchmuty inquiry into teacher training in Australia has been released. The Tertiary Education Authority Report into teacher training in South Australia is currently in my hands. I am reading it, and that will be released in the relatively near future. These are responsible reports which obviously the Keeves committee of inquiry can work on, based on knowledge, not on ignorance. Had I decided to

implement a lot of things 15 or 18 months ago, it would have been in ignorance. I have learned a lot, partly as a result of being able to get at statistics that were previously hidden from me.

Pre-school funds in South Australia were maintained at an adequate level of \$17 200 000. This State Government took up the tab, as the previous Minister said would be necessary. That was done, and we are spending money not only on the four-year-olds, but the 3½-year-olds programme will get off the ground in the new year, and it will deal with areas of need, as we promised in our policy, which was written before the last election. The 3½-year-olds will be catered for in the new year.

The Department of Further Education is tackling the question of stream 6. We are expecting that some people will contribute towards recreational and similar activities, although we are still providing adequately for pensioners and others who are unable to earn sufficient to pay for courses. It is hoped that people will attend courses which will be to some extent self sufficient.

I turn now to streams 1 to 5, the work-oriented areas. Apprenticeships will be fostered strongly during the coming year. The Minister of Labour and Industry and I have already been looking at the expenditure of \$2 300 000 again next year for Federal funding to match the amount committed for the current year. We are redirecting the effort into apprenticeships. Look what happened under the previous Government. We had the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, more in hope than in anticipation of salvation of this part of the nation, South Australia. We are identifying areas of need. We are training about 500 apprentices in the coming year specifically for areas where employment will be guaranteed. I refer, for example, to the metal trades, and we are short of accountants, as well as people in the electrical trades. They are areas that are readily identified by people out in the wide world, and they are the areas in which we have begun to train youngsters.

State funds will be allocated substantially to the Department of Further Education so that it can proceed with streams 1 to 5 where industry and commerce and, more importantly, the individuals themselves will benefit by being able to move into employment. This is a positive step. It is an educational expenditure that is well justified, at the possible expense of some slight curtailment of recreational courses. We have made that intention quite clear. Recreation, we believe, will not suffer too much.

This Government leads Australia in teacher-student ratios, per 9 capita expenditure, and, probably more importantly (and I keep saying this), in the quality of its staffing in education. I am not decrying teachers for being emotively encouraged to strike. They should know that we are spending more money than any previous Government has spent to get the best results—and that is according to the Schools Commission, and it is not a claim of mine. They should know that teacher-student ratios, by comparison with others (and it is necessary to have a common yardstick), are still better than those prevailing anywhere else, and the best that they have ever been in South Australia.

I turn now to the issue of the Reading Development Centre. Time and time again, we are told that this centre has closed. It is like saying that the teacher has been sacked, as against saying that the teacher has been transferred. The centre has been moved from Gilles Street, where the existing primary school is expanding. It is one of the few metropolitan schools that is expanding. As the room is needed, the reading centre is being transferred not to an isolated area but to the Language Arts Unit at Wattle Park, where the two groups can work

together in harmony.

There is a reduction of four in staff numbers, but the reduction is partly compensated for by a greater degree of co-operation, less duplication, and the fact that people who have been involved in curriculum writing are now less needed, because the curriculum is largely expected to be completed by the end of 1980, and we are already in November. So, there will be rationalisation, a greater working together, and, under the newly to be appointed leader, we are anticipating that the services given by that amalgamated group will improve on those previously offered by the two fragmented groups.

Mr. Bannon: Why don't they see it that way themselves?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They have not started in a working atmosphere yet. We have not yet appointed a new leader of the centre. Members opposite have not given it time to work, and do not intend to do so; they are too busy starting bushfires like irresponsible youths in the Adelaide Hills. The main point at issue is that the English section still has an advisory staff of 26, of whom 16 are in the regions and 10 at the Wattle Park centre. It has not been closed. It is being amalgamated, and the Government believes that its work will expand and improve.

Let us look at the multi-cultural area. This Government has been accused of mis-spending Federal funds. How many times was I told by the previous Government, when I inquired about the way in which the multi-cultural expenditure was being placed, that it is a very complex issue? Once again, we have been told that by the Leader of the Opposition, but it is not all that complex. We have an increase of about \$1 100 000 spread over two financial years. The Federal Government funds in calendar years. We have allocated funds for the 1980-81 financial year, and part of that funding will go into the 1981-82 financial year. From 1975 to 1978, the staff in multi-cultural education remained pegged at 117. In 1980, it had been increased to 150, and by 1981, next year, to 200. So much for misappropriation and mis-spending of funds. That is a very substantial increase in the physical endeavour of schools staffing in multi-cultural education.

I am not sure whether the Premier or I will have time to go into a detailed financial analysis, but it can be made available to Opposition members. The Premier has kindly, I believe, undertaken to meet a delegation of principals from the Multi-cultural Education Co-ordinating Committee. An interesting point arises: who is the Chairman of that committee? It is not the man who rang up and tried to make an appointment with my secretary as a representative of an interested group. It is the Deputy Director-General of Education, Mr. Giles, who is in constant touch with me, not just on an occasional basis. So, the Premier will see the interested parties, and I have been fed information directly through the Chairman, the Director-General, whose office is on my floor in the Education Centre and who has made available accurate statistics which certainly do not show any misappropriation of funds. So members opposite should not crow too soon. I believe that the Premier is being generous in seeing the group of people who have solicited an appointment.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Aren't you people accessible?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We are accessible. Perhaps the former Minister fails to acknowledge that he had 800 separate schools and buildings, 800 staff organisations, 800 parent organisations representing 220 000 students, 15 000 staff, and 6 000 ancillary staff. Did he offer to see them all? He would not even see me when I was in charge of the education portfolio for the Opposition. So much for the claims and the realisation. We do not fail to see a great many people who solicit an audience.

I turn now to the extent to which we have kept

promises. This is a matter that will not take just a few seconds, as a member opposite implied. We have increased ancillary staff by 10.6 since 1977.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is not—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Let us come to the next one. The number of Bursars in schools was reduced by the former Government by 1.4 per cent in 1977; this Government has maintained that level. The number of weekly paid staff has been increased by 110, and in the past two years there has been a 47.6 per cent increase in the weekly paid sector. The non-contact time (now termed free time) for primary school teachers is included on a staffing formula on a release, not an Education Department release, but one independently arrived at. We were informed that the majority of primary school teachers had 8 per cent of free time. This is allocated to a school on a formula basis, and the principal and his senior staff can allocate that free time in accordance with the school's needs.

Perhaps some teachers have that time as free time; perhaps others choose to team-teach and leave themselves spare time; or perhaps they simply choose to have smaller classes. Quite apart from that, a number of incentives have been offered to school staff, and I am not referring to the recent 4 per cent interim increase in salaries for classroom teachers, who have not had an increase of that nature for two or three years, while promotion staff have. That interim measure will cost the Government \$6 000 000, which has been allowed for in the round sum additional expenditure of some \$70 000 000 that is provided for in the State Treasurer's budgetary allowance. That will come forward for education.

There has been an increase from \$150 to \$230 in the allowances for teachers to allow for depreciation of furniture when moving. This will cost the department \$40 000 in the 1980-81 financial year. That was approved six months ago. We have added an additional \$400 000 to ease the problem of transfer of teachers in term 1 to allow a number of schools to remain over complement instead of insisting that people transfer immediately. We are conscious of the short notice that is given for people to move, and we will be waiting for more vacancies to occur, using up that \$400 000. Teacher Housing Authority rents are subsidised up to 50 per cent, and we have twice deferred increases that were normally enforced by the South Australian Housing Trust. Teachers pay between 59 per cent and 65 per cent of the market rentals.

Mr. Hemmings: You're selling them off in my area.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We are selling off very, very few. We still have 1 986 houses, in spite of selling 15: that is a lot of real estate. The early retirement scheme has been introduced to encourage teachers between 55 and 60 years to retire with the opportunity to accept temporary relieving jobs of up to 20 days to try to make more promotional positions available for younger teachers. Parental leave will be available to either sex, male and female (I do not know about middle sex), to help in relation to child-rearing purposes.

Ancillary staff can now be replaced, in special cases, when they take long service leave. Nearly \$100 000 has been allocated for their relief, an initiative that the previous Government refused to take up despite requests over several years; \$90 000 has been allocated this year for this purpose. Because South Australian teachers are held in high esteem, arrangements have been made for transfers to New Zealand, where our young people are in high demand because of the types of people they are: responsible and well-qualified. I have dealt with the redevelopment centre.

A number of bush fire issues of an emotional nature

have been thrown at me over the past few days from country areas where, time and again, teachers have been told, "This may happen, that might happen, or that could happen." For example, at Mount Gambier High School, three senior staff will be transferred, it has been said. What is the truth? One has sought leave during the next year; one has sought to return from accouchement leave and has also sought not to be made a senior but to be given part-time work; another one, I was told a couple of weeks ago, will be held over complement, with funds provided from the \$400 000 that was made available. In fact, the high school will be over-staffed.

What formula are we using? That is another interesting point. Whose formula is it? South Australian schools have been formula staffed in accordance with the very formula devised by the previous Government. In other words, if students move from one area to another, if there is a decline in one area and an increase in another area, we will try to move staff to follow the students. Under common law, education department staff generally sign a contract and, if they do not, the question arises whether they are legally employed. Every Government department other than the Education Department and all private enterprises, under common law and/or contractual law, have the right to transfer staff to where the work is. We sought co-operation and negotiation, and I am very pleased to say that this system has, to a very large extent, prevailed already and the major problem of transfer of staff has been overcome. I am delighted with the results so far. There are still a few problems, but the situation is nowhere near the emotional issue which was being raised some two or three weeks ago and which has now been sublimated under a whole range of toothpick kindling issues.

School staffs are becoming increasingly confused as to the key issue behind the strike, because the tenor of the complaints has tended to change over the past two or three weeks. So it goes on. A whole number of staff have said that they will contemplate striking; vast numbers have already said unequivocally that they will not entertain the idea of striking. A confused issue like this is based on the precept that we have cut educational spending, when in fact there is a 15 per cent increase in cash terms and almost a 2 per cent increase as a result of additional funds spent since the Budget in real terms, and a transfer of effort within the Education Department proper, some of which has gone into the area of expenditure that affects teachers. Indeed, it affects staff and parents. Parents are benefiting because of the transfer of initiatives, and the provision of funds, which were decimated by the previous Government, which then came out with crocodile tears a little earlier this year and said, "Poor parents", when in fact the previous Government's initiatives went a long way towards slashing the assistance given to parents. There is no way that the Government can support the motion, and I will seek to amend it. I move:

To leave out all words after "parents" and insert in lieu thereof the words "censures the Opposition for promoting rumours of wide-spread cut-backs in staffing and spending in South Australian schools, which are without foundation and which have caused uncertainty and unnecessary concern". I seek the support of the House in regard to that amendment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I have wondered in the past 40 minutes or so whether this is all real or whether we are dreaming. The Minister has spent that time, in effect, saying, "We know we haven't implemented a lot of our promises; a lot of our promises are as far away from being implemented as they ever were, but we deserve commendation because we have been frank about it." Is

that the point to which we have come? Have we come to a point in South Australia where a Government can be praised for having reduced the size of the teaching force by something near 300 teachers? Is that really the pass to which we have come, because that is, in effect, what the Minister is saying?

On Friday at lunch time I listened to the Philip Satchell show, when the Minister was attempting to come to grips with the present threat of industrial action. He made the point that he thought that industrial action would be futile, because, although it could draw attention to problems that currently exist (and I thought it was frank of him to say that), there was no way in which it could solve those problems. The thought occurred to me that it might depend a little, since the Minister went on to talk about the reducing birth rate, on how the teachers spent their half-day off. It is interesting to note that this sort of concern with fertility is something to which the Minister returned in the Alex Kennedy report in the 14 November issue of the *Advertiser*, when Alex Kennedy says that the Minister:

... blames the situation on "demographics that went wrong" and in turn blames that on those who "far more well than wisely, preached to Australians the values of zero population growth."

"Now," he says, "we haven't the birth rate we really need to keep Australia going as a viable unit."

Mr. Allison states, however, that he is "conservatively optimistic that there will be a baby boom."

"There are signs already of a small upsurge in the middle '80s," he says. "Then there will be more need for primary teachers."

Let us follow this logic a little further: let us suppose that, magically, all of a sudden there was that upsurge in the population of those of a school-going age.

How would that help this Government? Would that not indeed exacerbate the problem that it currently faces? Why should there suddenly be some magical turn-round in the provision of funds for education, simply because there has been some sort of increase in the birth rate? The Government is saying that it is happy with the resource allocation to schools at present and will allow the teaching situation quantitatively to deteriorate in line with enrolments. That is different, first, from what we did in Government and, secondly, from what this Government promised to do when in Opposition and was trying to seduce the voters of this State. There was no fine print or suggestion that the resource allocation to schools was adequate, and that in the first year of this Government's term of office there would be a reduction in the total number of teachers in the system of about 20 or 30, and in the second year closer to 300; there was no suggestion about that. There was the bald statement, "We will increase the number of teachers, particularly in primary schools and particularly in the earlier years of primary schools." There has been no indication from the Government to schools that, in the event of some reduction in a particular school, it must leave the earlier years of primary alone; there is none of that at all.

The gentleman to whom the Minister was responding on the Philip Satchell show made the point that the teacher he was to lose was from the earlier years of primary education. It is a school-based decision, when losing a teacher, regarding how it will happen. There has been no change there or policy direction from this Government to the extent: leave the teachers in the junior primary or early primary years alone.

The Government is reducing the number of teachers employed in the system, and is leaving itself without the elbow room necessary in order to take account of many of

these other problems. It does not follow, when one is as close to the edge as this, that these minor changes in the pupil-teacher ratio will flow into the classroom area and class size, and there are various reasons for this.

First, schools and teachers are continually being asked to do more. The *Advertiser* of 8 November refers to consumer courses being urged in schools. I have before me a submission (which has obviously gone to the Minister) from the Commercial Teachers Association, a proposal for Matriculation accounting. If that comes in (and I am sure that it is a worthwhile project which would assist the job skills of young people doing Matriculation), it will have to be taken into account, and extra resources will have to be made available for the introduction of such a course. That will not help the class sizes in the generalist areas in any way at all. What about the opening of new schools? When one is opened, there is always some loss of teaching staff to administration, and the new school is almost inevitably staffed a little more generously than will be the case once the enrolment builds up a little. So, the rest of the system has to bear the brunt of that.

We can see that schools have increased in number recently. Statistics made available to me during the Budget debate make clear that, in August 1978, there were 628 schools in this State; in August 1979, there were 632; and in July 1980, there were 638. The forecast for July 1981 was again 638, although, in response to a question that I placed on notice a short while ago, the Minister talked about four new schools being opened next year, although one is a relocation.

The Minister has claimed that there has been no decline in the pupil-teacher ratio; yet, people are jumping up and down, and people behind the Minister are suggesting that it is all the Labor Party's fault, that by some insidious means we have been able to manipulate these poor teachers, which is a ridiculous suggestion to make. Why is the concern there? One must do better than the Government is doing if one wants to make any sort of impact on class sizes and avoid the unpalatable sort of measures which he is having to take and which are leading to this extreme talk, which I certainly do not countenance, of industrial actions in the schools.

The Minister made a few comments about the implementation of his Party's promises. It was a fairly meagre sort of list. He stuck to some fairly confined sort of areas because, in the large-scale areas, there has been no movement towards the implementation of those promises, but rather a retreat from them. If this Government had any intention of implementing the promise to increase the number of teachers in primary schools (which is what it said), and if it thinks that it will do it over the three-year plan, why is it not doing a bit of it now? What sort of Budget does it have to bring in next year to reverse the trend that is showing this year? Surely, the obvious thing would have been to implement the policy bit by bit. What we have in the second of the Government's Budgets is a large-scale retreat from the main thrust of the policy which was put before the people of South Australia and which the Government still says it intends to implement. How it intends to do that, I do not know.

Mr. Gunn: That's not surprising.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course it is not. There is no inkling from the Government regarding how it might possibly do it. There was a word from the Minister about the promises made in relation to pre-school education and 3½-year-olds. It is interesting to note that, at the meeting I attended at Croydon Primary School last week, not one school there indicated that it would be funded next year on the basis of its 3½-year-old enrolments.

The funding will continue to be on the basis of four-

year-olds, as it has been for some particular years. In a few places, there may be some experimentation. I believe that a small sum has been made available for that purpose. It is significant that at that public meeting, which was attended by people from a large number of schools spread around the metropolitan area and beyond (a person or persons from the Two Wells Primary School was there, indicating its concern), no-one could say that next year they would be funded on the basis of their 3½-year-old enrolments; it was still going to be on the basis of the four-year-old enrolments.

The Minister talked about the Reading Development Centre, but I would liken what has happened there to what happened to the position of Women's Adviser. Something which had a specific function is to be downgraded and given a more amorphous sort of shape, with no guarantee that it will be able to deliver the service that traditionally has been delivered—this from the Government which talked about the 3 R's and the way in which it would upgrade basic skills in our schools. That is the way in which the people at the centre see it, and the way in which community organisations have looked to the centre for a lead also see it. That is the way SASSO sees it, and the way in which the people who paid for the advertisement in the newspaper last Thursday morning (to which I do not have time to refer now) see this problem.

The Minister talked about resource centres in schools. If there is any evidence about the development of such centres, it is obviously at the expense of other capital programmes. What has this Government done in relation to capital programmes? It has slashed them considerably. In my time as Minister, there was some slight cut-back in capital programmes. This Government can point to two cut-backs that occurred during the time of the Labor Government, and that was one of them; it was about \$41 500 000 to about \$40 000 000. What is it now? The capital programme for schools is something like \$33 000 000. This was thrashed out when the Budget was debated. If there has been any increase in money for that area of capital expenditure, it certainly has been grossly at the expense of other areas, because of the limited amount of additional funds that have been made available.

I do not want to talk out my time, because there is limited time for the debate, and I want to give the mover an opportunity to reply before we go to a vote. The Minister mentioned the JESIFA programme. I do not have the time to spell out in detail all that I could about that programme. I asked several Questions on Notice about this matter not long ago. One of the things said was that the report would come down about that shortly, before the end of this year.

I wonder what chance there is for an implementation of that report in view of the very clumsy way in which the transfer position has been handled by this Government. Transfers and promotions are a problem, and they relate to a very sensitive sort of area. They should be handled, and be seen to be handled, not as a response to a Budget cut, which in this case is the drastic cut in the number of release time scholars available. That is really what the problem is about, and the fact that there is not the facility to absorb all of those people back into the system whence they came as a result of the cut-down in release time scholars, is what has been seen. There has been a Budget cut; the Government has panicked, and has introduced this system explained to us by the Minister in a long Ministerial statement a week or so ago. All of this should have been handled as the result of close negotiation and as a result of a rational examination of the whole field, which is exactly what the JESIFA team is supposed to be doing. I simply ask the question, given that JESIFA was viewed

with suspicion by the teaching fraternity when it was introduced (one has only to read the *Teachers Journal* to see that), "What is the chance that those recommendations will be adopted in the light of this hamfisted way of handling this problem?" There is very little chance indeed. Yet, there was an opportunity for something to happen.

I return to the main point, namely, that a series of extravagant promises was made by the Minister when he was shadow Minister in relation to the overall funding of education in this State, but we have gone nowhere towards the implementation of those promises. Quite the contrary, we have gone backwards. I remind the House that there was no fine print in the Liberal Party's education policy. We were given quite bald statements about what would happen in the staffing area. The Government thinks that it has suddenly discovered the erosion of enrolments, but they have been going on for a long time. The Director-General of Education made that clear in his letter today.

What is not spelt out in those quite interesting figures about the extent to which the number of teachers was increased is that all the expansion occurred under the Labor Party and all the contraction has occurred under the Liberal Party Government. We have the Budget papers from last year and for this year to establish that very fact. That is why teachers are jumping up and down at present, why parents are concerned, and why members of the Government and Opposition are being invited to indignation meetings and what have you at schools in their electorates. It is not because those teachers and those pupils have been manipulated by the clever people in the Labor Opposition in this State, but because they can see what is going on and they remember what was promised by the Minister before he became Minister, when he was seeking votes, and they are crying "Foul". It is not too late for the Government to change its strategy. It is not too late in this financial year for additional funds to be made available which would help this Government to go some way towards implementing its promises. At present, the Government is going in just the opposite direction.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): This may be the first motion of no confidence that has been put forward by the Opposition since it became the Opposition, but it is certainly not a very satisfactory motion of no confidence. Indeed, I believe that it has fallen flat on its face. I would go further and say that it is a disgraceful exhibition: a repetition, using this House, of all the unfounded rumours that have been promoted throughout the community so assiduously during the last few months. If I have anything for which to welcome this motion of no confidence (and I repeat it is an irresponsible move) it is because it has demonstrated quite clearly to the members of this House, to those people who have been observing the proceedings of the House and to the media that we have a Minister who is totally and absolutely in touch with his portfolio and with what is happening. No-one could fail to be impressed by the degree of the Minister's detailed knowledge of his portfolio. As for the member for Baudin, I would say that he was obviously not listening to much of what the Minister said. That is not surprising when one considers that this activity is designed simply to stir the pot, simply to keep the rumours going.

It is deplorable that this motion has been brought before the House at all, because I believe it has been moved for the sole purpose of alarming teachers, parents and students and, at a time following so closely the activity of a minority of vocal and misinformed teachers, one would be excused for assuming that there has been a degree of orchestration. In truth, there is no substance to the allegations that have been made. There is no accuracy in

any of the claims. The specious and extravagant claims that have been made are totally without foundation, and they are very similar to the sorts of reaction that we heard from the Leader of the Opposition, as the Minister has said, immediately after the Budget, when he said that so many hundreds of teachers would be sacked. Gradually the figure came back and back as he was forced to face reality.

The Hon. H. Allison: Nobody has been sacked at all.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Minister is quite right, nobody has been sacked at all, but the Leader of the Opposition does not much care for accuracy, as long as he can make a noise. There is no specific issue that has been brought forward that sticks. There may have been the matter of country transfers, but the Minister has explained quite clearly that this matter has been solved amicably and voluntarily. However, all of a sudden it has changed from being the absolute issue upon which all of the concern was being expressed to an issue that is not worthy even of mention by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Keneally: If you read *Hansard* tomorrow you will find out that that statement is wrong.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There might perhaps have been an issue if recently reported comments about the allocation of Federal funds for multi-cultural education had been complete and accurate, but they were not, and the Minister has fully explained that matter. Those comments were not accurate and, when the matter arises, I will certainly be pleased to see the members of that delegation when they come and to reassure them that the apprehension under which they are labouring is indeed a misapprehension, and that their concerns are without foundation. That is the sort of attitude that should be taken and not the sort of irresponsible peddling of unfounded rumours that is taking place now.

The fact is there is no real issue. The Opposition has chosen quite deliberately to foment confusion, uncertainty, insecurity, and dissatisfaction among teachers, parents and students alike. I do not in any way blame any of those people because they have been misled. Listening to the member for Baudin say that he does not condone strike action (something which I hope everyone takes note of, when he has been present assiduously at most of the meetings that have been held to discuss the matter) rather strains the credulity of everyone.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The teachers and parents have been misled, and I think it is about time that we got down to a bit of sanity and honesty and faced the facts. The Opposition's wild and irresponsible claims are just not supported by those facts, and I want to examine them in some detail.

We should put the current education situation into its proper perspective; we should trace the budgetary, manpower teaching staff and enrolment situation over recent years so that we can understand what are the difficulties facing the department, and so that we can make certain that the current policies are not misinterpreted. The fact is that between 1970 and 1977, as honourable members will well know, student numbers rose from 228 800 to 233 210, which is an increase of 4 410 or 1.9 per cent. To pay the former Government credit, teacher numbers rose from 9 975 to 14 901, an increase in that time of 4 926 or 49 per cent.

I would say that most people would agree that such an increase was long overdue. The position since 1977 has changed totally and completely, and members opposite know this. The member who spoke last should know that very well indeed because, if he does not, obviously the failure to take allowance of falling enrolments is entirely in

his court. In the past three years, 1977-81, teacher numbers increased from 14 901 to 15 170.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You made a slip; you said 1977 to what?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: 1980.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You said 1981.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will come to 1981 in a minute. That was an increase of 269, whilst student numbers in that time decreased from 233 210 to 218 754, which is a decrease of 14 456. In other words, in three years there was an increase of 269 teachers, and in the same period there was a decrease of 14 456 students. It appears on projection that in 1981 student numbers will fall even further to 213 350, that is, by a further 5 400. Therefore, what we are facing, and what members opposite are trying to cloud and refuse to face up to, is that in the four years to the beginning of 1981 enrolment there will have been a total fall in school enrolments of nearly 20 000 students, whereas the number of teachers actually increased slightly between 1977 and 1980. This is a fact of life that will not go away. There is no way that we can ignore that down-turn in school student enrolments and the present teacher situation, and that presents a problem which this Government has got to cope with and which indeed is the responsibility of the entire community, a matter to which I will return a little later.

With that rapid decline in student numbers and the demographic changes which have resulted in unequal reductions in student numbers in different parts of the State, there is an urgent need to rationalise financial resources and to redeploy manpower in education. Anyone who says that that need does not exist is not prepared to face up to the facts or is deliberately fomenting unrest and concern. It is a responsibility from which this Government will not resile. That is considerably more than can be said for the previous Government and the record that it had because it was a Labor Government which, despite projected population and school enrolment declines, allowed continued increases in teacher training courses at C.A.E.'s. It was a Labor Government which allowed false expectations of employment for all new teachers, whilst removing bonds at the same time, in other words acknowledging the declining teacher demand. It was a Labor Government which initiated tandem teaching as a direct acknowledgement of the variation between student numbers and teacher supply. It was a Labor Government which was unable and unprepared to take any action whatever in the face of declining enrolments. It was a Labor Government which was not prepared to accept the responsibility to the community to ensure that taxpayers' funds—taxpayers who I repeat include parents and teachers wherever employed—were efficiently used.

Let us look briefly now at the Education budget. Despite that rapid decline in student numbers, the present Government has increased education spending allocated to the Minister of Education by 14.5 per cent in the current financial year and this in real terms is an increase, so there is the first fact and the first untruth nailed. There has been an increase in education spending under the control of the Minister of Education of 14.5 per cent, an increase in real terms. Indeed, since that time—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Did you say 14.5 per cent in real terms?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: An increase in real terms. The honourable member would do well to stop trying to get his notes together and to listen properly—an increase of 14.5 per cent, an increase in real terms. Since the Budget was brought down, additional financial incentives have included an additional \$400 000 to ease the problems of teacher transfers and to allow some teachers to stay in

some schools and to avoid transfers until the first term, when further vacancies have become available.

An honourable member: Are you reading—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am reading from the list of initiatives which have been made and which I know the honourable member would be delighted for me not to read, but he will be very disappointed because I am going to read them whether he likes it or not. Another \$200 000 has been provided to employ 22 migrant education teachers, and an additional \$90 000 to allow some ancillary staff to be replaced while on long service leave. Parental leave is provided for a year for both sexes, as the Minister has outlined, increasing job opportunities for teachers, and an announcement of a plan to encourage teachers to retire earlier between 55 and 60 years with the incentive that they can teach on a relieving basis for up to 20 days when needed. This scheme, I understand, will begin next year on a trial basis and whether it is expanded or whether it is successful will remain to be seen, but the hope is that it will create more vacancies for younger teachers.

The truth of the matter is that more money has been allocated in the Budget, and more money has been allocated to education since the Budget came in. So much for the repeated statement of members opposite that education spending is being cut. I can well remember the very loud-mouthed predictions that the Leader of the Opposition made at one stage that we would be facing a \$40 000 000 deficit in the Budget last year. I think he was only \$77 500 000 out that time. The Minister draws my attention to the fact that the last Budget of the Labor Party contained an increase of only 7.3 per cent, which did not even meet the increase in inflation and which was in fact a decrease in real terms. Have we heard about that from members opposite?

Mr. Lewis: That was a cut.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was an enormous cut in education spending. But did we hear anything about it? No!

Mr. Slater: You've got to convince the public out there.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member. We have to get the truth out to the people out there and that is what we are doing now. The "3 per cent exercise", as it was called by the Leader of the Opposition, was another in the attempts to stir up concern, uncertainty and insecurity in the teaching profession. In spite of widespread speculation which occurred in staff rooms and which occurred on every possible occasion, stimulated by members of the Opposition, there has not been any 3 per cent cut in education spending. Savings have been made in certain areas, but a number of important initiatives have been taken by the Government which have been the result of the increased spending. I repeat that the increase has been in real terms, as compared with the Labor Party's miserable record of a decrease in real terms in its last year in office.

The savings have been taken up by initiatives, including increased text book allowances for primary schoolchildren at a cost of \$160 000, and increased allowances for the isolated children—\$500 per child to allow isolated children to come and be educated in a proper way with the facilities which their young friends in the city and near country areas already enjoy, the total cost of which was \$250 000. We have increased support to non-government schools by 1 per cent to 21 per cent of the average cost of sending a child to a Government school, and we are doing that in furtherance of one of our election policies. We have increased free book allowances; we have partly restored school equipment grants, which, as the Minister has said, had been cut well back. We have doubled grants to ethnic

schools teaching children out of school hours, and I may say that that has been well received by ethnic communities. An amount of \$2 500 000 has been allocated to replace teachers taking long service leave, and we have provided a start to the programme to provide kindergartens for 3½-year-olds in the areas of greatest need. These are positive initiatives. They are things which have been done by this Government in spite of the difficulties which we face in the general education system.

Let me make something else quite clear. There will be no retrenchments of staff. That is something which I have also heard moved around in the schools. I have had teachers coming to me and saying, "We have been told that teachers are going to be sacked by your Government," and I have said "Who told you that?" They have said, "Oh, rumours are going around our school." There will be no retrenchments and no sackings, and people who are worrying about that sort of rumour, which is being deliberately spread, in my view, should be reassured. What I think of the sort of people who spread those rumours will not bear repeating in this House, but I believe that some of the responsibility for it must lie with members of the Opposition.

It is anticipated that pupil-teacher ratios in secondary schools will be maintained at better than the national average. We have heard already that in primary schools the ratio will remain the best of all Australian States. This is the education system that we have that members of the Opposition have spent all afternoon knocking. The level of resources provided to schools has been above the average of other States. It will be maintained in 1981. In further education, there is a key priority to place an increasing emphasis on vocational training, while fee-paying enrichment courses will be maintained at last year's levels. I have heard rumours to the effect that "Your course next year is going to be cut out because of the savage cuts that are going to be made in your school." Untrue, and yet they are promoted and, of course, believed, and you cannot blame people for being concerned when they hear this sort of thing said. We have a commitment to allow the building of the new Noarlunga Community College to go ahead as planned at a cost of \$15 500 000.

Mr. Bannon: What about schools?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We will talk about schools in just a moment, if the Leader will contain himself. He had unlimited time, and he might at least do me the courtesy of listening to me in silence, as I did him. The Keeves committee of inquiry will be reporting, we hope, early next year. The committee has been appointed to do a job, and that is to look at the entire question of education and to follow up from a 10-year report from the Karmel Report. It will be looking at the socio-economic and technological effect of changes in schools, and it will be looking at the resources of all schools. The Leader of the Opposition may not believe that that is an important report. Certainly, he has poured scorn on it during most of his speech by inference. I believe it is an important report and an important inquiry, and I believe that it will be as significant to the South Australian community as was the Karmel Report when it was introduced.

Grants to schools have been maintained at the present formula, although, in some schools with declining enrolments, obviously the grants will have to be increased on a per capita basis to maintain them at the same level. Campaigns have been mounted to make savings in the use of fuel, energy, telephones, and transport; in other words, we have been encouraging prudent management in schools. In many schools there has been the utmost co-operation from members of the staff in these projects.

I pay a tribute to the staff of our schools. I believe that they do a fine job. They do the very best that they can, and they are certainly labouring under enormous difficulties when they are constantly attacked by rumour and scaremongering which suggests that they are going to be sacked, that their courses are going to be cut, or that something else which affects their future is going to happen. It does little credit to those people responsible. Neither does this motion do the Leader of the Opposition any credit. He has indeed fallen flat on his face.

The Leader of the Opposition would do well to examine the education staff incentives which have been outlined by the Minister. He has talked also about capital works expenditure. When the member for Baudin was Minister of Education, he was responsible for capital works. Depending on the year, between 85 per cent and 40 per cent of the capital works money was expended on new schools. The Liberal Government is expending 15 per cent of its capital works programme on new schools. Apparently, that is something to be regretted and condemned by the Opposition. What the Opposition fails to take into account is that some 85 per cent of that capital expenditure is being made to upgrade existing schools, providing wider benefits and better facilities for the students of those schools. One thing the Opposition cannot get away from is that, according to the figures which have been most recently provided by the Australian Schools Commission, South Australia expends the highest per capita amount based on student enrolments amongst all the States. The Australian Schools Commission figures also shows that South Australia has the most favourable teacher-student ratio amongst all States. The Labor Party is prepared to take credit for the things for which it believes it is responsible and which are good, but it steadfastly refuses to take any of the responsibility for the mistaken planning and the errors which were made constantly in the last two to three years of its Government.

South Australia retains the most favourable position in this State-by-State comparison because of specific initiatives undertaken by this Government. We spent more on education in the last financial year than the previous Government had allocated in its own final Budget draft: that was quite clear when we came to Government. We restored school equipment grants, which the previous Government had slashed. We have done very well indeed in most difficult circumstances.

The Leader of the Opposition says that the promises made by this Government have not all been kept. We are the first to accept that they have not all been kept, and I would say to the Leader once again that, if he believes that a Government on coming to office can undertake to keep and maintain its promises in the first 12 or even 15 months of its term in office, he has a very funny idea of responsible government. There are still two more Budgets to go, two more years and a bit more, which the Leader had better remember. It is ridiculous to expect that all promises will be honoured in the first 15 months. That being so, what I cannot forgive is the action of the Opposition in promoting the rumours which have caused so much concern, uncertainty, and disturbance in the teaching community.

That is something which I will not forgive. Those rumours have been shown subsequently to be untrue. After each spate of rumours has been disproved, another crop arises, again creating uncertainty. Our teachers do not deserve such treatment from those who would denigrate our education system. We believe that the actions taken have been irresponsible and indeed disgraceful; in fact, such actions should never have been promoted by a responsible Opposition. There is no excuse for what has been done, because the Opposition has been

in full possession of all the facts, as the Leader himself has acknowledged. In the book made available to him with the programme performance budgeting, all the details are included, and all of the untruths which he has mouthed could have been disproved quite easily by simply looking at that document.

There is no excuse whatever, and I believe that the Opposition is worthy not only of censure but of contempt. Teachers have been misled. It is not their fault that they feel insecure, worried, and concerned. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Reading Development Centre and the savage cuts after the last Budget. Such wild statements do nothing to help the situation. Teachers have every right to be concerned, but they have been misled and their concern has been stimulated by unfounded rumours assiduously promoted by the Opposition.

We believe that the present problems facing education are very real problems concerning not just the Government, not just the teachers, and certainly not just the students and parents. The problems concern everyone in the community, and they will be solved only if everyone in the community understands the true position, if they are told the facts, not scaremongering rumours. That is the last thing we need.

I believe that, working together (around a table, if necessary), we can solve the problems of numbers and expenditure in the Education Department, and education generally, but we will not solve those problems in the atmosphere of bitterness which the Opposition continually seeks to whip up by the sort of distorted statements made today. I am proud of the record of the Minister and what he has done. I think he has done it very well. The whole point about the Opposition is that it does not want co-operation or mutual discussion to solve the present difficulties. It does not want to see them solved, for its own blatant naked political purposes. Certainly, the Opposition is not working in the interests of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the motion, for the reasons which I set out in a letter to the Premier dated 14 November. I propose to read that letter, to let the House know why I support the motion. It states:

Dear Premier,

Mr. A. M. Talbot, Principal of Kilkenny Primary School, has shown me copies of his letters to you of 3 and 6 November. I may say, from my experience, they simply echo widespread dissatisfaction with the Minister of Education. No doubt, you will retort that he is doing very well indeed. I suppose that you can say nothing else out of loyalty to Harold Allison. However, if he is, why has he become so unpopular with so many people?

I think the answer may be in part at least his considerable lack of communication with other people. No doubt there are deeper causes, but this may have reduced his popularity and acceptance. Whether he can ever get over it is a moot point. You will have seriously to consider moving him or dropping him from the Ministry altogether.

I should be glad of copies of replies, if any, which you make to Mr. Talbot to his letter of 3 November and to him and his staff to their letter of 6 November.

I have not had a reply, but the views set out in the letter still stand, and, accordingly, I support the motion.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to respond briefly in closing the debate. One can say about the Premier's incredible half-hour performance only that he felt that in some way he could make his Minister look at least a little better by performing as badly as he (the Premier) did. I suggest that he did achieve that. He demonstrated fairly clearly his lack of grasp of this vital

area of Government expenditure. The facts that he was able to produce he read from a carefully prepared brief, interspersed with the most extraordinary attacks on the Opposition and its motives, and the apparent gullibility of the professionals involved in our schools. That, to me, was the most extraordinary feature of the Premier's remarks.

It appears that all this unrest, all these protest meetings, all these letters, all this widespread concern being expressed by teachers and parents is a mere nothing, whipped up and orchestrated by sinister forces which have somehow manipulated and twisted this gullible group of people in our community, forcing them into false fears and panic. If that is his concept of teachers and the teaching profession, the Premier has a severe shock coming to him, because the facts are very different. The agitation, the disaffection, the problems in the teaching profession as seen and perceived by the teachers are real; they are not orchestrated, and they are not invented. They are there; they are real.

If the Government insists on saying that this is a lot of nonsense, that it is not true, that they are being misled and manipulated, then it does not recognise the problems and it will not do anything about them. The Premier said that the position had totally changed since 1977, that the declining enrolments had changed the whole education scene. He neglected to mention that the rate of resignations of teachers had altered dramatically indeed in the past few years and, in terms of predicted needs for teaching, this has been one of the most significant factors. He said that he wanted to introduce sanity and honesty. He said that the position had changed totally since 1977. If that is so, why did his policy, published not much more than 12 months ago, say in relation to primary education alone that class sizes were to be reduced as a matter of high priority, particularly in the first two or three years of primary education, and that his Government would progressively appoint additional staff to help achieve this aim?

There has been no additional staff. The Minister has admitted frankly that there are 280 (nearly 300) fewer staff this year than previously. Those are the sort of reductions and plans, and the Government expects endorsement or congratulations. If that down-turn had been so significant, such an outrageous promise (if that is what it was) should never have been made. Putting that aside, why are there still complaints? Why are teachers not happy with the impact of declining enrolments? Surely they should be congratulating the Minister and his Government on the situation. Surely, in situations such as the Reading Development Centre, if that is the way to upgrade and advance that project, they should be congratulating the Minister, but they are not. They are disputing it and protesting about it, and even contemplating unprecedented strike action over it.

That is the crux of the importance of this issue, and the Minister and the Government cannot hide from it. The Premier has called us disgraceful. He said that we were dealing in unfounded rumours and that it was deplorable that people were alarming parents and students. He said that this was being done not only by us, but by a minority of vocal and misinformed teachers who were being orchestrated for the purposes of this political campaign. I would like him to address a few meetings of teachers and tell them that they are a vocal and misinformed group and that they are being orchestrated. I would like him to front some of these meetings and discuss these matters with the profession. The profession at large is scandalised by what is going on. It is not being manipulated or orchestrated, and it knows the true situation. The Premier should open his ears.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable Leader's attention to the time.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. D. C. Brown and Goldsworthy. Noes—Messrs. McRae and Whitten.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The SPEAKER: With the concurrence of the House, I indicate that the ringing of the bells for the mandatory two minutes could be dispensed with, there having been no movement from the House.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (22)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. D. C. Brown and Goldsworthy. Noes—Messrs. McRae and Whitten.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: I.M.V.S.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: On Tuesday 4 November, on the A.B.C. programme *Nationwide*, a series of allegations and insinuations was made about experiments that had been conducted on animals in Adelaide during the 1970's. The programme, which pursued issues that had been raised in the House by way of Questions on Notice and questions without notice, implied negligence on the part of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and Sir Dennis Paterson, the orthopaedic surgeon who conducted some of the experiments referred to in the House. As a result of this programme, I asked Sir Dennis to provide me with relevant information. He has done so in the form of a letter dated 17 November 1980, which I now read to the House:

Dear Minister,

In response to your request for information on animal experiments which have been the subject of Parliamentary and media comment, I put the facts before you as clearly as I can.

One study entitled "Electrical Bone-Growth Stimulation in an Experimental Model of Delayed Union" was carried out from 1973 until the end of 1975. This work was reported initially to the general scientific meeting of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in Adelaide in May 1976, and to the international meeting of orthopaedic surgeons in London in September 1976. The initial and brief publication

of this work was in the *Lancet* in June 1977.

The animals referred to in the *Lancet* article constituted a complete project and were operated on at both the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the I.M.V.S. animal operating theatres. Most of the beagles reported in the article were operated on at the I.M.V.S. and none were lost during the work until the animals were destroyed. The greyhounds and mongrels were operated on at the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

The dogs received a general anaesthetic and full aseptic surgery was carried out on them. Their post-operative care was of a very high standard. The mongrels were housed during the full period of the project at the Adelaide Children's Hospital animal house; the beagles were cared for after their immediate post-operative convalescence at the I.M.V.S. field station at Gilles Plains; and the greyhounds were cared for on a farm. I mention these facts to indicate how well, at a significant expense, the animals were cared for.

It would be appreciated if acknowledgement could be made of the facts that the research study had the approval of the Animal Ethics Committee of the University of Adelaide and of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, was approved by the I.M.V.S., and has proved to be of great benefit to many adults and children for whom amputation of a leg was advised following either severe compound fractures or a congenital abnormality of bone in childhood.

This research programme has continued since 1975. Beagles have been operated on at the I.M.V.S. and mongrels at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. All projects have been approved by the appropriate committees; all have received substantial research grants; and all work has either been or is about to be published in reputable medical journals. This research work has been widely acknowledged internationally.

I have verified these facts with my co-workers. I stand by the integrity of the research work. I deplore efforts to denigrate what has been, and still is, a major research programme. I have the greatest respect for the integrity of the staff of the I.M.V.S. and for the standards required for research work there. I hope this information helps to clarify these matters.

Yours sincerely,

Dennis Paterson, F.R.C.S., F.R.A.C.S.

Director and Chief Orthopaedic Surgeon

Sir Dennis's letter is written on letterhead of the Adelaide Children's Hospital. It can be seen from Sir Dennis's letter that information, which I conveyed to the House on 22 October and which appears on page 1324 of *Hansard* regarding the article in the *Lancet* to which the member for Mitcham referred the previous day, whilst correct in respect of the location for the experiments on mongrels and greyhound dogs (which were the subject of the member for Mitcham's allegations and challenges during his speech of 21 October), was not absolutely correct so far as the beagles were concerned. I have ascertained that, in addition to the experimental work conducted at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, some beagles were operated on at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

I have also ascertained that no greyhounds were operated upon by Sir Dennis Paterson's team from the Adelaide Children's Hospital at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and that the "unknown but small number of greyhounds" referred to in my reply, which appears on page 184 of *Hansard* for the week ending 7 August 1980, were in fact used by the staff of the Dental Hospital. Because records kept by the institute were no longer available, it was not possible for the institute to provide precise answers. In addition, confusion has arisen

because of the differing interpretation in this House of what constitutes a "set of experiments" as distinct from a continuing research programme, which is what Sir Dennis was conducting. The answers provided by me to the member for Mitcham's questions and the answers to my questions to the institute were provided in good faith, but as subsequent investigation has enabled further information to come to light, I believe that the Parliamentary record should be set right so far as is possible without very detailed documentation.

I deplore the efforts by the member for Mitcham, which became the basis for subsequent biased media coverage, to denigrate the institute and, in the process, to besmirch the good name of Sir Dennis Paterson, whose work in bone re-unification is internationally acknowledged and which has helped to transform the lives of many people who would otherwise have been condemned to disability. The facts in Sir Dennis's letter speak for themselves, as does his personal integrity and his extremely fine record of professional and community service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FORMER MINISTER OF EDUCATION

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: During the previous debate, I was unkind enough, in a more enthusiastic than accurate moment, to say that the former Minister of Education had declined to see me; that was an incorrect remark. He was always accessible, and I withdraw the remark.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: I.M.V.S.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the Ministerial statement that was just made by the Minister of Health, in which she referred to me on several occasions. The fact that the Minister has had to make this Ministerial statement at all, correcting information which she had previously given to the House and which she now admits is inaccurate, is justification for my having to continue to question her.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked leave to make a personal explanation; he is not doing so at this juncture.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had to get it together pretty quickly. I hope that I will not transgress again.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is capable of getting it together, correctly and quickly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, Sir. I reject the allegation in the final paragraph of her Ministerial statement that I have tried to denigrate the institute. I have merely tried to get facts which should be available to every member and to the public of South Australia. There should be no reason why they are concealed. I reject even more strongly the suggestion that, in that process, I have tried to denigrate or besmirch the good name of Sir Dennis Paterson.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Ask medical people what they think.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been granted leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will have silence, Madam.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision. I remind all members that the honourable

member for Mitcham has been given the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I reject entirely the suggestion that, in the process, I have tried to besmirch the good name of Sir Dennis Paterson. Whoever carried out the experiments was irrelevant so far as my questions were concerned. If this is the only way in which she can defend herself in her lack of capacity as Minister, the sooner she resigns the better.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

STOCK EXCHANGE PLAZA (REPEAL OF SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MONARTO LEGISLATION REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 October. Page 1667.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill was introduced by the Minister with a fairly brief second reading explanation, in which he did not canvass at any great length the whole issue of Monarto, nor did he provide to the House much detail of what the Government plans to do with that site, if this legislation is passed.

The first point that ought to be made is that, in moving this Bill, the Government appears to have changed its position from that expressed in the Premier's Ministerial statement on 31 July. We are rather used to the Premier's changing his statements and contradicting himself, and here we have another classic instance. He said, on that date:

As to the Monarto Development Commission, it is my Government's intention to retain the commission as a legal entity in order to avoid the costly process of re-registering the land . . .

There is no concrete indication in his speech or in anything that has been reported in the press that the agreement reached with the Commonwealth Government requires the State to sell off as a matter of urgency the Monarto land. The Premier referred to land sales in his press statement, when he announced the deal with the Commonwealth, but he certainly did not link the two together in a conditional sense. In his reply to the second reading debate, the Minister should indicate to us precisely what the Commonwealth Government required as a result of the agreement to write off a certain portion of the Monarto debt that was owed to it. It would be poor negotiating indeed, if such a condition had been imposed by the Commonwealth. If there was no such condition, part of this legislation, in our view, is completely unnecessary.

Perhaps we should say at the outset that the whole of it, in a sense, is unnecessary. It is, in part, linked to this Government's idea of getting rid of those statutory provisions that it believes are not serving any useful purpose.

But the substance of the Bill relates to the ability of the Minister to dispose of the land, and it is that point on which we take objection. As to the Monarto Development

Commission, we note that the Government has changed its view, and I think the Minister should give this House a full statement as to why that change occurred, why it was felt that it should be retained as a legal entity to avoid the process of reregistering land, and why that becomes unnecessary now by this Bill. I indicate that the Opposition will support the Bill at the second reading stage, but we have an important and fundamental amendment to make to it when the Bill goes to Committee.

I want to say one or two things about Monarto, because this project was very successfully denounced over a period of time by the Government Party when it was in Opposition, and the project was made into some sort of symbol of public waste and extravagance. It was suggested that it was a major error that has cost the State enormous sums of money, and Monarto is always mentioned in a derogatory manner by the Liberal Party. I think it is worth remembering that the original Bill did not attract a great deal of opposition when it was introduced, and the reason for that is, I think it is fair to say, that at that time, based on the population growth predictions of the day, it was felt in our community that a decentralisation project such as Monarto was extremely desirable and valuable. We had a rapid population growth in the late 1960's and the early 1970's—a rapid concentrated urban development which was spreading the thin line of the city of Adelaide longer and thinner as it went, despite such projects as the satellite city of Elizabeth.

I think it was a general view of all planners at that time that this could not go on untrammelled, that there was a need to make a conscious decision to develop an appropriate growth centre if we were to stay ahead of development. It was on that basis that the Monarto project was undertaken. I would suggest that there was considerable support at the time. It was not seen as a bad or disastrous decision; on the contrary, it was seen as a very forward-looking decision. It was a decision that was supported very strongly and handsomely in financial terms by the Federal Government. Also, of course, this was one of the main factors—that if the State was being supported by the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to provide a decentralised population location, with all the modern planning methods and environment and quality of life that went with it, we would have been derelict in our duty not to have taken advantage of it. Again, I suggest that members on both sides of the House felt that the action taken at the time was quite appropriate. Therefore, it has been extraordinary to see the way in which this project has been traduced over the years; even as recently as the last election campaign, major statements and major attacks were being made on the Government. In fact, a trumped-up report referred to a \$200 000 000 debt that represented this land monument, when the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Goldsworthy, in his inimitable fashion of public debate, attacked the Monarto project.

The facts were that by 1979 the State Labor Government (and well before that time, I might add) had taken active steps in recognition of the down-turn in population that had made the project no longer viable in the short term. Those steps included expanding the role and function of the Monarto Development Commission, which did a lot of very valuable work not only in this State but also in an advisory and consultant capacity in other States during this period of time. The commission was a very valuable planning group that had been assembled and, like the Snowy River authority and a number of other such groups, its services could be used very efficiently in a consultant capacity to a number of other State and

national planning projects.

While I am on that topic, I point out that it is interesting to note that the then Opposition vigorously opposed that sort of activity. It seemed that the then Opposition preferred to shell out large sums of money to private consultants (as the Government is doing to a scandalous extent at the moment), rather than use a skilled team of operatives who had been assembled by the Government, even though that team had a national reputation. Thus, the Monarto Development Commission had an expanded role beyond Monarto, a role that recognised that the Monarto project itself was not going to go ahead in the short term. It was winding down and it was diversifying, and insufficient recognition was given to that fact. However, the land itself remained, and there was interest accruing on the land and payments to be made to the Commonwealth. I shall deal with that topic in a little more detail later.

With regard to the population problem that I mentioned previously, the population rate in Australia fell from 2.11 per cent in 1971 to 1.56 per cent in 1973 and 1.27 per cent in 1975—quite rapid reductions. South Australia's growth rate declined in keeping with that national decline. South Australia had a 1.81 per cent growth in 1970, which meant that there were a further 20 800 persons, but by 1973 that figure had declined to about 15 000, and in just three years the impact of the decline in population trends can be seen. It must be remembered that, in national terms, this was not fully recognised in any quarter until the publication of the first Borrie Report in 1975. I remember that occasion well, because at that time I was working on the staff of the then Minister of Labour and Immigration, Mr. Clyde Cameron, who had responsibility for the Borrie Report and was involved in a number of meetings with Professor Borrie when his population projections were first being unveiled, and the implications for the whole of the planning field by State and Federal Governments and private enterprise in Australia were coming under question because of the sudden change in the predicted population levels. So, the Monarto project was well down the track before that became apparent, and the Government responded quite quickly and effectively in dealing with that population change. At the time the Government could not have foreseen the trends, and South Australia was not the only State affected in that way.

Of course, coupled with the fall-off in the natural growth increase was the run-down in the migration programme, which meant that many thousands of people who in earlier population predictions could be expected to come to Australia (and South Australia got more than our national share of migrants) were no longer coming to Australia. Reasons for this included structural change which had occurred, when the manufacturing sector was under major problems, and where jobs were being lost. Again, it is significant in this context to note that the manufacturing downturn obviously affected those States which were heavily dependent on manufacturing industry, and of course South Australia is a manufacturing State, an industrial State, far more than are, say, Western Australia or Queensland. Therefore, when the population boom was on, naturally we were getting more than our share, but when the downturn occurred we suffered somewhat more acutely. Incidentally, I think there is a lesson for us there in terms of future planning: we must protect our manufacturing base in this State.

So, Monarto was a perfectly reasonable planning response to population trends by an activist Government, a response to avoid a possible deterioration in Adelaide's living conditions if the population grew too rapidly. It

involved such things as pollution, the need to construct freeways, the destruction of the inner city area—things on which all urban planners had a consensus view. The Tonkin Government's policy has been to discredit all of that after the event, and to claim that the project has been a great financial millstone around the State's neck.

But even its own committee, set up last year under a term of reference which suggested that Monarto must be abolished in terms of the Liberal Government's policy (a doctrinaire policy by that time), recognised that in the course of the development of the Monarto project the State had not only valuable human assets in relation to the commission and its work but also valuable assets in terms of the land it held. Its arguments ignore the important current and future social benefits, which cannot be expressed precisely in dollars and cents in today's values. It is the sort of argument that has been used to try to discredit the South Australian Land Commission, which is one of the most successful land entrepreneurs in Australia, whose financial position is extremely viable in spite of changes in land values which have taken place, yet this Government, in pursuit of its doctrinaire approach in this area, is seeking to reconstruct the Land Commission, wind down its activities, and restrict it to some minor land banking function.

Be this as it may, the arguments used are arguments that assemble massive amounts of dollars, and these sound to the general public to be gigantic sums, because we are not all familiar with the sums involved in land development projects with which the Government and private mining developers deal. There are always large sums of money in dollars and cents tied up at any stage in large scale land development. Incidentally, when we compare what was being said about the costs of the Land Commission and Monarto and the \$200 000 000 debt with a project like the court reconstruction of the Moore's building, the latter seems to be an extraordinary extravagance on the part of the Government, and several millions of the Government's money is being floated around. I hope we are pursuing the argument here in a much more rational way than the Government did when in Opposition on issues such as Monarto.

I referred a minute ago to the report of the committee on the future use of land at Monarto. As far as I know, despite calls for it, this report has never been released publicly. I have just been told that it was, but I have not seen the final printed version. I am not sure when it was released, and perhaps the Minister can mention that. It was an important report which was put together in a fairly short time under terms of reference that broadly suggested that Liberal policy should be implemented, but even that report with that object had some interesting things to say about the land holding at Monarto. I think the most interesting thing was its reference to the fact that it was extremely cheap land for urban or industrial use. The report said:

Broad acre land north and south of metropolitan Adelaide cannot presently be purchased for less than \$10 000 per hectare.

This was about 12 months ago. It continued:

Thus, even if all debts were capitalised indefinitely under current arrangements, Monarto land would remain cheaper than alternative land near Adelaide well into the next century.

That is an important point for us to remember. If we have any confidence in the State and its development (and I hope we have), there will be a situation in which land such as this will be needed. In other words, I think if we look ahead five or 10 years we can say that Monarto would not

be viable—there is still ample room for development within metropolitan Adelaide itself without destroying the environment that we appreciate so much—but, if one looks at it over a much longer time span than that (and surely that is one of the roles of Government on behalf of the people), there could well come a time when that land, which is now 30 minutes closer to the city than it was when the project was first conceived, will be needed and will be useful for public estate development.

If that is so, we should not rush into divesting ourselves of that land. If, in fact, the land is cheaper than broad acre land, which it may be necessary to purchase in 30 or 40 years time, we should be holding on to it, because the amount we are spending in interest payments on that land (and they are a special deal at special rates) will be more than compensated for by the fact that we have cheap land which we hold. If we want to start from scratch in about 20 years time and acquire land in the proximity and of the nature and size of the Monarto land, we will be spending a very much larger amount than we would if we hang on to what we have now.

Mr. Lewis: What was the average annual inflator they used?

Mr. BANNON: In this report (and I suggest that the honourable member get a copy of it, because I do not want to indulge in debate with him; he might like during the course of debate to ask the Minister some of these questions), it was pointed out that, on the assumption that Monarto will not proceed in accordance with the original concept, it may be inferred that the current land holding has cost the Government an average of \$1 350 per hectare. That is very cheap indeed. Projected into the next century, set off against \$10 000 per hectare for broad acre land north and south of the city just 12 months ago, and comparing the figures of \$1 350 and \$10 000, you can see just what a valuable holding this land is. All the talk about the heavy millstone of debt set into a 20 or 30-year context becomes quite wrong and quite unfounded. It is that sort of finance that we should be looking at.

On an economic basis, I am suggesting that we support this legislation. We suggest that the land is a valuable asset which should not be got rid of peremptorily or without some full consideration as to precisely how it is being sold and for what purpose. The site includes 1 680 hectares planted with trees. There is a magnificent afforestation programme down in that area, with about \$2 000 000 expended on it. It is a vital and important social asset to the State, particularly in areas where so much land has been denuded. The Monarto trees will provide greater and greater amenity in years to come. Again, we have to be quite sure that, whatever happens to that site, we do not squander the value of that aspect of the project.

Some reference has been made in the second reading speech to retaining and protecting the major parts of some of the areas down there. On 24 July, the Premier told the *Advertiser* that areas planted with trees would be kept as a national park, yet there is no indication in the Minister's speech of precisely what areas are being talked about in that context. In fact, we have information which suggests that, if former landholders repurchased the land, clearing will again take place, and that nothing would be specified in sale contracts to prevent the clearing of those trees. The Heritage Act is being amended in order to provide for a reduction of rates or some sort of financial incentive for the retention of those trees, but there is no absolute control of it and no guarantee that, if some other use which is calculated as being more valuable or desirable in the short term is found, those trees would be eradicated. I think again the Minister has to make very clear to us precisely what he has in mind, what areas, and what is

going to happen with those trees. They have now become a State asset and something that we cannot simply give away.

The committee certainly supports that view. It said that the Government should retain and protect the major part of areas which have natural, regenerated or planted vegetation. So, simply to have measures to encourage retention of these trees seems to me to go against the whole concept of conservation in that area.

What sort of financial return can we expect? It is very hard to set up the values, but it is interesting to note that the committee's report (and there has been no indication that its recommendation will be enacted as the means of disposal) talks about a number of different sales. Those sales do not involve simply selling the farmland back to those who already owned it. The report talks about reserves and an imaginative housing project relating to a country estate type of concept, and a number of other proposals. I believe we deserve a fuller treatment of those matters by the Minister during this debate. Taking into account the points that I have made in relation to the cost of the land, the possible need for it in the future and the degree of afforestation and development that has already taken place, I do not believe that Parliament should pass any legislation that gives the Minister a blank cheque to dispose of this land as rapidly and in whatever way he thinks fit. In Committee, the Opposition will be moving an amendment dealing with that particular point.

The Opposition believes that there is an onus on the Government to justify getting rid of this land. In fact, it will cost the State dearly in financial terms if it proceeds willy nilly without a properly planned definition of the areas and what they will be used for. Certainly, if it is to be brought back into agricultural production in some areas where that is presently not being undertaken, then some leasing arrangements could well take place. The Opposition certainly agrees with the Government's attempt to make productive use of that land in order to derive some sort of income from it. The land should not simply lie in an idle state.

On the other hand, the Opposition does not believe that sufficient attention has been given to the Government committee's recommendations. We do not believe that the Government has, in fact, done it financial sums. Rather, we believe that the Government is pursuing some sort of ideological commitment based around the concept of Monarto as some sort of white elephant or extravagance that must be disposed of. That is not the way to deal with a public estate. That course of action is short-sighted and this State will pay for it dearly in the future, if proper planning does not take place.

In relation to the land to be reallocated for agriculture, it is interesting to note that the committee recommended that the Government should seek to offer the land on perpetual lease-hold in order that greater control of its lease could be retained. Conditions applying to leases would seek to protect the land from degradation. Again, we have heard no specific undertaking about that.

If the land continues to be held by the State after the area has been annexed to Murray Bridge council, that raises yet another matter. How much compensation will the council receive for loss of rate revenue while bearing the cost of providing services? In this context, it appears that the Murray Bridge council has in a sense accepted the *fait accompli*, that the project will not be going ahead. I hope that the council does not get the impression from the Government that that means no great attention will be paid to Murray Bridge and its surrounds as some sort of growth centre and development area. No doubt, the Minister can reassure us on that point. Apparently, the

land will revert to the council.

Does that mean that the council will from that time become responsible for roads, vertebrate pest control, or any of the other things that at the moment are in the hands of the Government and the Monarto Development Commission? I believe that the council has a right to see that the site is put into some sort of order that meets council standards before it is handed over to the council. It would be interesting if the Minister could advise us precisely what plans the Government has for preparing this site for subsequent annexation or return to the council area. I will refer to no other points; any other points I wish to make relate to the amendment to be moved by the Opposition.

In summary, I believe that there has been gross misrepresentation of this whole project, and it would be a pity if the Government has been deluded by its own propaganda into going hastily into this situation. The Government certainly has managed to get a financial deal with the Commonwealth. Whether that is more advantageous than simply letting the situation ride on, renegotiating the interest, or whatever, we are not sure. However, that is the deal the Government has done and we are stuck with it. The next question is what do we do with this land, and that is the crucial question that this legislation does not really answer. The legislation provides that we should hand it over to the Minister to deal with as he likes, and I do not think that is good enough.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support the Leader's remarks, particularly his criticism of what I call the Monday punting that has been indulged in by the Liberal Party in relation to the whole Monarto project. I think it would be worth while and good for the soul, both of this House and of Government members generally, if I took us on a brief historical excursion to remind all members opposite (the two that I can see at present) of the statements that were being made by the Liberal Party when the legislation was introduced. I have had a particular interest in this, because for a period as Minister Assisting the Premier I had a particular responsibility for the development of the Monarto project. However, I cannot say that I was the person who introduced the first legislation, because that legislation, the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Bill, was introduced into this place by Mr. Dunstan, the then Premier of the State, on 29 March 1972. There was the customary adjournment and we returned to the fray on 4 April that year. As I have said, it is interesting to comment on the remarks made by various Opposition speakers of that time, Liberal Party speakers, on that measure. For example, the Leader of the Opposition, the current Speaker, supported the Bill and this is part of what he said, as reported at page 4555 of *Hansard* of that year. He quoted from the second reading explanation, as follows:

Few matters therefore can be of greater social significance than the quality of living in our cities of the future. As populations grow and urban areas spread, long-term planning is essential to ensure that everyone can live and work in healthy, convenient and pleasant surroundings.

He went on:

No-one would argue with that statement. However, it is difficult to reconcile with that statement the following statement made by the Premier in his second reading explanation:

It surely follows from what I have said . . . that we must now take steps to ensure a more even distribution of population throughout the country.

He goes on:

Only 10 per cent of this State, which is the driest State in

the driest continent of the world, is arable land. However, I accept the following statement made by the Premier:

There is a widespread acceptance of the view throughout the country that new growth centres should be established at selected points in an effort to lessen the growth rate of the major metropolitan areas.

Again, no-one would argue with that statement, which is borne out by what one sees when travelling in other States, especially in New South Wales and Victoria.

So the argument proceeds, and there is no doubt that the then Leader of the Opposition was fully supporting the measure that was before us. He seems to have been followed by a fellow named Hopgood, who spoke at length, as was his wont in those earlier days, and that member was followed by the then member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), who was quite excited about the legislation. As reported at page 4562 of *Hansard* of 1972, he said that he was one of the most excited members in the House in supporting the Bill. Later he said:

The site chosen is the most natural site in South Australia for an experimental town of this kind.

In fact, the then member for Murray canvassed placing Parliament House in the new town. The point he made (and it was not a bad one) was that, if the Government of the day was prepared to send public servants from the various departments to develop the new city, why should the Parliamentarians themselves not spend some time at that place. I am sure that the speech was in part made from the viewpoint of a local member who was looking forward to development in his own electorate and made from the viewpoint of a person who saw that there was a good deal of support in that electorate for that development. I would not for one moment suggest that that gentleman was insincere in what he had to say, because I do not think that he uttered an insincere word in the whole time he was in this place, and I say that quite sincerely. The then member for Mallee, Mr. Nankivell, got up and made one of the shortest speeches ever made in this place. He said, "I support the Bill." It is not the shortest speech, but one of the shortest. The then member for Heysen got to his feet and, as was his wont, did not produce a particularly brief dissertation. Mr. McAnaney supported the Bill. He had some critical comments to make.

Mr. Max Brown: Did he speak about railway lines?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not believe that there was one reference to a railway line in the speech, and that would have been about the only time that that happened. He said that the 30-mile radius as designated in the Bill was too wide. He thought that a 20-mile radius would be sufficient. He said, "However, I realise that the area will not have many limitations placed on it." I am not sure what he was getting at, because the area had all sorts of limitations placed on it and that was one of the complaints that was raised by Liberal Party people from time to time. But he did think that Murray Bridge was possibly the best site in South Australia for a new town of that type. He expected that the centre contemplated would be successful. He thought that authorities in both New South Wales and Victoria had in the past made a mistake by trying to develop too many small towns in an effort to decentralise. He said that they had now concentrated on establishing a limited number of bigger towns and that that was meeting with some success.

That was interesting because what eventually emerged as the Liberal Party's replacement for this policy (the Labor policy that it was supporting and, by implication, the Liberal policy in the Eastern States) was the very thing that Mr. McAnaney said would not work—putting a few extra hundred people here and there and all over the place. In any event, before he sat down he said, "I fully

support the Government's action." He was followed by the member for Fisher, who said that he believed that this was the type of legislative action that we should take, and that he had had this view for a long time. He thought that we should congratulate those who promoted the Bill, and that, regardless of the Party in Government, there would be a realisation of the necessity to start this type of town planning. I hope that members are listening to that in view of what he went on to say the next time that legislation was before the House. He said that the site chosen was ideal for this development. He also said that once the town was on its feet it was important that it became self-supporting as soon as possible. Nobody could quarrel with that. The Bill was read a second time and taken through all stages.

The next step was the introduction of the Monarto Development Commission Bill. On 25 September 1973, Dr. Eastick, as the Leader of the Opposition, got to his feet and said that he gave general support to the Bill but that there was a need to spell out the limitations applying to several of the somewhat radical provisions involved. I will not go on with that, because in my remarks of what one or two other Liberal Party members said that is more or less spelt out. The member for Murray, still Mr. Wardle, again supported it. He was worried about certain aspects of the Bill and worried about the fact that for that designated site the Planning and Development Act was being over-ruled by the specific legislation. He was worried about the fact that the District Council of Mobilong would not be receiving rates from the property in the designated site, but with those quibbles he fully supported the legislation.

The then and current member for Bragg, the present Premier, supported the legislation. He said that he was pleased to see that there would be a commission to oversee the organised development of Monarto, and that was what was provided for in the Bill. He believed that the site was well chosen. He doubted whether it was the best possible site. However, he said that that did not matter, because he believed the disadvantages would be overcome by controlled development and he hoped that was what the commission was for. Looking back on it, I am blown if I know what the member for Bragg was getting at. I think that it was a case of having a bob each way, and leaving some options open.

Mr. Max Brown: He's done that before.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, and is still doing it. He criticised the fact that one of the Commissioners was a representative of the Commonwealth Government, and that was also a criticism raised by his then Leader. The member for Fisher was again on his feet. He said, "I have never been over-thrilled about the concept of a city at Monarto." I am sorry to be tedious about this, but let us look back at what that honourable member said, as reported on page 4570 of *Hansard* in the previous year. He said that it was the type of legislative action that we should take, that the site chosen was ideal for the development, and so on. He also said that we should congratulate those who promoted the Bill. A year later he said that he had never been over-thrilled about the concept of a city at Monarto. He said, "I do not consider that all the necessary investigations were carried out before the announcement was made but, once it was made, the project had to proceed." On page 944 of *Hansard* he is reported, as follows:

I have always believed that the wrong spot has been chosen but I hope I am proved to be wrong in the future, because I should like it to succeed for the benefit of South Australia. The current Minister of Industrial Affairs, who by then had been elected to this place for good or ill, supported it with reservations. His reservation was that he did not want

his old mates in the Department of Agriculture at Northfield to have to go and live at Monarto. There was still general support for the concept. The member for Glenelg supported the Bill. He doubted whether the new town was to be situated at the right place. He thought that it should be near Port Pirie. That was an idea that I flirted with myself for some time before 1972. He went on to say that he thought the Government would have a political advantage because the new city of Monarto would be near Murray Bridge. I assume that what he meant was that, by the progressive urbanisation of that area, Murray would gradually become a Labor electorate. I cannot see what else that statement could mean.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: We all make mistakes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member for Glenelg's forecast may well have been correct if the urbanisation had taken place, because that is the inevitable result of urbanisation.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Murray Bridge is one of the fastest growing country towns. It is not getting any closer to becoming a Labor seat.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is one of the very few growing country towns in South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Come on!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is perfectly true. The Minister should know that because he is the Minister of Environment. I am sure that he has the figures in his head. I am sure that he knows whether Port Lincoln is growing or contracting. I am sure that he knows whether there is growth on the south coast and whether that is a real growth, real urbanisation or merely second homes. I am sure that he knows what is happening around Wallaroo and what plans the Government might have, if any, for growth in that area.

I do not think that the Minister need mislead us on this matter. He knows that what I am saying is correct. To get back to his original interjection, the point is that Murray Bridge is not growing fast enough for our political purposes. Anyway, it was a rather interesting and quaint observation made by the member for Glenelg at that time, as is in fact his wont. The point is that the Liberal Party fully supported this initiative, not only when the first legislation was introduced but also a long time afterwards. Nobody at that time was predicting what was happening in relation to population statistics. Indeed, the Liberal Party was attacking the Labor Government about what was happening, or not happening, in the transport area, based on the assumptions which were built into the MATS plan and the population projections which had been prepared for that plan. The same population projections which we were using to justify the Monarto decision were the population predictions that the Liberal Party was using to justify the MATS plan, yet the then Opposition members were attacking the Government for not proceeding and saying that they were quite sure that, in the long run, that was precisely what we would have to do. It was an argument about the continued development of the Adelaide Plains on the one hand, and the development of Monarto on the other. In fact, when it came to the crunch, when legislation was introduced it was fully supported by the Liberal Party. It is clear, of course, as demographic statistics have become increasingly refined with the passage of time, that there is not a demand at present for a significant urban development on the Monarto site. It would appear that it will be many years before this will be the case. However, we believe as an Opposition that the Government is passing up an opportunity if it is simply to sell the land back for agricultural development without considering all of the possibilities that might exist.

I quoted the Minister of Education this afternoon in a

different context talking about a return to population increase. He was conservatively optimistic, according to the famous *Advertiser* article about him, that there would be a mini baby boom in the early 1980's. The Federal Government continues to talk about increases in immigration into this country, yet I seem to get the same stream of people through my electorate office asking whether I can assist in some way in bringing grandpa, mother, dad or somebody out here. There seem still to be many problems in getting relatives out to this country, yet the Commonwealth Government still keeps rumbling about increasing the number of people migrating to this country. Of course, that can have a much greater effect in the short term on the demographic picture than can the birth rate. That is obviously the more sensitive of the two variables in the demographic equation.

We do not believe that this Government should give away the opportunity that has been bequeathed to it to ensure that in a changed population picture it has an opportunity to do something realistic which will ensure that there will not be additional great masses of people settled on the Adelaide Plains. We can see what has happened. We can see the development that has come with a linear city, with the great transport costs involved in moving from one end to another, the sterilisation of good market gardening land, and even of viticultural land, land under asphalt and concrete. I live on a patch of land that was once under vines, as no doubt do the member for Mawson and one or two other members who live on the northern side of the city. More and more of that productive land will be taken out of production as Adelaide sprawls.

In the short term, there is not too much danger of that. In the longer term, there is considerable danger, particularly if there is a return to large-scale migration. That is, in part, of course, a reaction to political pressures rather than anything else. We know just how sensitive, variable and unpredictable political pressures can be, so the Opposition has foreshadowed certain actions it intends to take in the Committee stage of this Bill which it believes will best safeguard the people of this State and, in particular, the people of Adelaide who otherwise may well face the prospects of continued urban sprawl and decline in their living standards.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In my remarks on this matter, I propose to examine some of the statements made by the Minister in his second reading explanation and perhaps to put another interpretation on the circumstances to which the Minister's remarks apply. At the beginning of his speech, the Minister said that it has been apparent for some time that Monarto is not a viable proposition. Perhaps if the Minister had said that the concept of a Monarto in full blast with a development commission doing all the things that it would have been able to do under the legislation we are proposing to repeal, that would have been a fairer statement. As the two speakers on this side of the House have already pointed out, Monarto is not just a simple question; to members of the Opposition, at least, Monarto consisted of both a concept and a physical action stage wherein land, which now is a possible land bank for the future, was obtained. I trust that the Minister will give consideration to that remark in the truest sense.

It can be argued, of course, that the Government as a whole, and the Minister when shadow spokesman, went to an election on the basis of closely examining Monarto and taking certain steps which purported, on the face of it, to represent to the State a saving if the proposed action were carried out. What we on this side of the House are

stressing is that, irrespective of the circumstances which have occurred since the original concept with relation to Monarto was evolved (a concept which, as has already been pointed out, was supported by almost every member of this House, many of whom are still here, who spoke while in Opposition and are now members of the Government, and who said that the circumstances which have occurred since then do not change the vital part of this matter), that land has been obtained to provide for something to be done about urban sprawl.

Speakers on this side of the House have already used terms such as "linear spread", and so on. In the Minister's second reading explanation I was amazed to find no reference whatsoever to any planning by the Government, of which he is a member, for the future requirements of development in South Australia. Here we have a Government which has been in power for 15 months and which has constantly trumpeted about the great resurgence, as Government members have put it, that is going to occur in South Australia, according to the Premier, almost daily. He says that this State is going to go ahead in leaps and bounds, yet the Minister brings into this House a proposal to repeal legislation and to dispose of the only real land bank that the State has outside of the areas which have already been stretched too far in a linear way in making up the city of Adelaide. Not one word is there about that vital matter. The Minister might argue, I suppose, that the Government has been in office for only 15 months and has not had time to do anything about this. He has not said that, but perhaps we will hear that from him when he replies on this matter. However, when we are faced with a proposal of this nature, to dispose of a huge area of land, the acquisition of which many members on the Minister's side of the House supported when in Opposition for the very purpose of providing an area of decentralisation (if that is the term the Minister prefers), when it comes to the crunch, members opposite are prepared to sell off that land out of hand without one word of any plan for an alternative development of land in this State appearing in the Minister's second reading speech. If that is an example of the new Government's approach, then I am glad that we will be able to do something about it in a couple of years when we return to the Government side at the wish of the people.

Mr. Randall: What would you do?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would do much more than the honourable member opposite, because in two years he will not be here to do anything.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: They would do what they were doing before and that is starting to wind down Monarto.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am surprised that the Minister said that, because the Minister tries to make out in his second reading speech that the previous Government had failed to recognise certain signs and had done little to come to grips with the problem, yet the Minister has just said to the House that we had already recognised it. In the space of a few weeks the Minister has gone completely about face on a matter as simple as this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will not be diverted on this matter, and I am sure that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would require me not to be diverted. I intend to look at other important points made by the Minister in his second reading speech. Relative to the point I just illustrated to the House, the Minister stated:

We believed that the Government of that time—
he was referring to us—

had refused to face facts on this issue. . .

A few moments ago the Minister said exactly the opposite thing. So much for the Minister's credibility on these

important matters.

Mr. Kenelly: They just—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the member for Mitchell needs the assistance of the member for Stuart.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister went on to say:

Accordingly, we announced our policy that on gaining Government we would wind down the activities of the Monarto Development Commission and investigate alternative uses for the Monarto land.

What are the alternative uses? They are to take the land vested in the Minister of Lands and give him *carte blanche* to flog it off. Those are the alternative uses mentioned in the speech. I will return to that point later, because I want to go further into the Minister's speech and take issue with him on another matter. The Minister stated:

Negotiations were entered into with the Commonwealth Government with the aim of varying the terms of the financial agreement relating to Monarto and seeking a reduction in the debt interest burden accruing on the loan. . .

Anyone would be entitled to infer from that statement that action had been taken solely by the present Government, that it was on its initiative and omniscience in the matter. What is the real truth? I challenge the Minister to deny what I am going to put to the House. The very action to which the Minister was referring in his speech had already been instituted by the previous Government in regard to the financial arrangements that applied between the Commonwealth and the State. Let the Minister say that that is not so.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I will when I reply.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the Minister is willing to do that, he is completely wrong. I had discussions on this matter with Mr. Tony Richardson when I was Minister of Planning for a short period (I came into it for only about four months). Mr. Richardson reported to me on the status of the talks that were then taking place between officers of the Commonwealth and officers of the State. I trust that the Minister will redress that inference, at least, that he has allowed to creep into his speech on this matter, because the Opposition is taking a realistic view of the legislation. The Minister can argue that the matter went to the people and, at least on that basis, having been returned to office, the Government is entitled to make moves in that direction, but the record ought to be kept straight in these matters, and the Government has the opportunity now to correct what I have just pointed out. Another point was raised by the Minister when he stated:

On taking office this Government undertook a review of the Monarto project and concluded that population projections indicate that the Monarto land will not be required for an urban growth centre . . .

I emphasise the comment about population projections. How much reliance is the Minister willing to place on those population projections, bearing in mind that one of the major planks used by the Minister when in Opposition was that population projections for the whole concept of Monarto in the first place—demographic information—had been proven to be wrong? Now we are being asked by the Minister to accept another set of demographic projections, and we are being asked to accept that they are right.

Everyone knows that this is a difficult area in which to make accurate projections. In simple terms, we are talking about bedroom behaviour, as it were, and even Mr. Trudeau in Canada has said that he would be unwilling to try to legislate in that area, as it was notoriously unable to be controlled. I ask the Minister, although I am not saying that this second set of projections is wrong, to say what additional facts he can put before the House to allow us to

make a choice on this matter. The whole project went bung because certain projections were wrong. No-one seems to disagree on that, yet now we are asked to accept a second set of projections that indicate that the action proposed in the Bill is satisfactory, because we have made those projections. I am not casting any discredit on the people who have made the projections—I am simply pointing out that it is difficult and over many years it is a rather inaccurate science. In fact, the figures originally used to get the whole Monarto scheme under way were proved to be wrong only after the passage of time, when some of the time for which they were actually extant had elapsed and people were able to say, with the great benefit of hindsight, that it had not worked out that way and that the 10 per cent increase did not occur. We are now in a somewhat similar position. I ask the Minister to think about that in any response that he may make.

After rattling off the figures about how much the Commonwealth Government was owed and whether it was by way of capitalised interest or actual Loan funds, the Minister stated:

In order to reduce this debt and return the Monarto land to a state where it can be of greater use to South Australia, the Government has decided to expedite the disposal of the Monarto land.

I emphasise the phrase "return the Monarto land to a state where it can be of greater use to South Australia". What has the Minister in mind? We have been given no information about that in the second reading speech. I understand that much of the land is already under lease, or it is used for community activities in two locations that I can recall. Houses are already tenanted and rents are being paid, and the land, I believe it is true to say, is subject to short-term leases for the growing of crops and other uses. What is the greater use that we will get from this land? Is the Minister saying that he has some other purpose in mind about which we have not been told? When one reads on one finds that there is a proposal to offer some of the land to the previous owners, and I assume that the Minister is talking about land which was previously in agricultural use and which was taken over, for which proper recompense was paid either by agreement or as a result of acquisition proceedings in the courts. What is this greater use to South Australia?

There is one other point that I would like to raise at this stage, because it could be argued with some sense that on this Bill the proceedings in Committee can be of considerable use to all members who have an interest in the matter, as they will have an opportunity at that time to raise other queries.

The second reading explanation states that the basis of all sale prices will be market value. I should like the Minister to indicate how he defines "market value" in that sense. Does it mean that land parcels will be valued by the Valuation Department or by outside private consultant valuers and, if the Minister is satisfied, that he will approve of that as a selling price? I shall be interested to hear his response.

I have tried to be brief and to indicate that it seems to me that South Australia, by force of circumstances (never mind what they were, who did what, or who should have done what), is in a position to be holding quite a large area of land which could be used for the purposes I have mentioned. My Leader has pointed to the economics of continuing to hold such land which is averaged, according to the report that he quoted, at about \$1 350 a hectare, as compared with land closer to Adelaide at \$10 000 a hectare. The economics of the matter should appeal to the Minister, because his main argument for knocking off the whole project was that it was uneconomic, that money was

owing, and that interest must be paid, so that the land had to be cleared. I ask the Minister to consider these remarks, and to respect the Opposition viewpoint, which will become clearer in Committee when my Leader will move the amendment to which he referred.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): We have heard some interesting comments from members opposite. It seems almost as though the Opposition has not quite decided its present position on what should happen to Monarto.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What about the amendment?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We will wait for the amendment, and see what the Opposition has to say then. Many points have been raised by the Opposition, and I want to explain briefly why the Government has taken certain action on the matters raised. The Leader of the Opposition said that I, as the responsible Minister, gave a brief second reading explanation and did not say what would be happening to the land, and that I said little, if anything, about the negotiations that had been taking place. We have had something of a history lesson about Monarto, but it might be a good idea if I were to explain how we have reached certain conclusions and why we are taking the action covered by this Bill.

One of the concerns of the present Government when seeking office was the impact on the State's finances of the mounting interest burden being incurred on a project no longer relevant to the State's needs. Accordingly, the policy of the Government was to wind down the activities of the Monarto Development Commission and to investigate alternative uses for the site. Later, I shall talk about what the Government believes should be the alternative uses for that land.

It has been rightly said that in October last year, a month after this Government came to office, it set up a review committee to carry out an urgent investigation of future possibilities for the Monarto site. The committee comprised the Director-General of Lands (Mr. Taeuber), the then Director-General of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs (Mr. John Mant), the Under Treasurer (Mr. Barnes)—and it will be appreciated that the Deputy Under Treasurer (Mr. Sheridan) acted for the Under Treasurer on the committee. On 9 January 1980, the committee reported to the Government the results of its investigation. I think that I probably misled the Leader of the Opposition when I said that the report of that committee had been made available; in fact, it was regarded as an internal document.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's why we could not recall it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. It was decided by the Government that the report should be retained as an internal document until the negotiations between Federal and State officers had been completed. One wonders how the Leader of the Opposition was able to quote from that report, but we will let that ride for the present. The report was regarded by the Government as an internal document.

Negotiations were entered into with the Commonwealth Government to vary the terms of the Financial Agreement so that the land could be sold, and to reduce the debt interest burden accrued on the Loan funds advanced by the Commonwealth. As at June 1980, the Commonwealth Government was owed \$15 000 000 and, as a consequence of the negotiations, \$9 900 000 of this debt was written off, leaving a liability for repayment of \$5 100 000. The member for Mitchell suggested that negotiations had commenced before this Government came to office. I agree. When I first took office, it was clear to me that, while negotiations might have been commenced, little had been achieved.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That was because of the election campaign.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I would not have thought that an election campaign would make so much difference to negotiations that should have been taking place between Commonwealth and State officers. However, I give the member for Mitchell due credit that the negotiations had commenced, but they were not far advanced at that time.

Following a resolution of the negotiations with the Commonwealth Government, the State Government decided to expedite the disposal of the land owned by the commission. On 18 August, Cabinet approved a submission on arrangements for disposal of the land. The submission proposed that the Department of Lands would take over immediate responsibility for land management and disposal of the Monarto site. It proposed that the Minister of Lands, in consultation with me, as Minister of Planning, should investigate and report back to Cabinet on the land to be retained for public purposes. We were to report back on policies on disposal and the projected timing of disposal. It was proposed that action necessary to repeal the legislation establishing the Monarto Development Commission should be implemented, and that is why this Bill is before the House. It was decided that action should be undertaken to introduce arrangements for local government administration and planning control over the site. I shall say more about that later. It was suggested that talks should be held with the District Council of Murray Bridge to inform it of Cabinet's decision and to discuss future arrangements. I am pleased to say that negotiations have been carried out between the council and the Government.

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

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: A detailed report on matters relevant to the disposal process was prepared and submitted to Cabinet by me, as Minister of Planning, in co-operation with the Minister of Lands. Land identified for retention was discussed in the House by the Leader of the Opposition, and I was questioned about this subject. For the purpose of the disposal process, the site has been divided into six sub-areas, each requiring individual disposal considerations. Three of these sub-areas primarily contain land that is recognised as being suitable for agricultural purposes and will, therefore, be the first areas offered for disposal. I refer particularly to the area north of the pipeline.

Land that is likely to be set aside for purposes other than farming lies mainly within the remaining three locations and, consequently, these locations are to be withheld from sale for an interim period to enable specific land parcel identification, and ownership and on-going management arrangements to be resolved. Members will appreciate that the future of this land is a very complex issue, and it will take quite some time to identify certain parcels of the land and to consider the management arrangements for that land. Prior to the offer of any land on the open market, previous landowners within the Monarto site have been contacted and asked to express interest in the possible purchase of that land.

I am told that about 30 per cent of the previous owners have replied that they are interested in repurchasing some of the land, and discussions are continuing with these people to determine appropriate land parcels to be offered in each instance. Future planning control of this land was a matter that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Government has agreed that a four-man committee, comprising two representatives from the State Government and two representatives from the Murray

Bridge District Council, be established to consider this matter, particularly as it relates to land that is to be withheld from sale and to the preparation of a supplementary development plan.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are they going to report one day?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will come to that later. The committee will also advise on the administration of interim development control within the site. A report has been prepared for submission to the next meeting of the State Planning Authority, requesting the authority to agree to the delegation of interim development control to the Chairman, and requesting the State Planning Authority to nominate a representative on the four-man committee to advise the Chairman on interim development control matters. As I said earlier, throughout the disposal process detailed discussions have been held with members and officers of the Murray Bridge District Council to inform them of progress.

A draft of this Bill was provided for officers of the Murray Bridge council to consider and to enable them to make submissions to the Government on matters referred to in the Bill. The council has advised that it has no objections to the draft as submitted, and has agreed to appoint the Mayor of the district council and the District Clerk as its two representatives on the special committee appointed to consider planning matters. I am very happy about that arrangement. The member for Mitchell said that much of the land was currently being leased, and asked what would happen to those leases. Existing tenancy arrangements within the site involve agricultural and residential leases. The residential tenancies are on a monthly basis and are capable of individual consideration as regards termination; at present, there is consultation with the people who currently hold those leases.

The agricultural leases expire on 31 January next year, and it is proposed that lessees within location 1 particularly will be advised that their leases will not be extended. All other lessees will be advised that their leases will be extended for one year to 31 January 1982. I also refer to the involvement of the private sector: discussions have been held with representatives from the Real Estate Institute on how members of that institute can assist the Government in the disposal process. Having had personal discussions with members of the institute, I know that they are very pleased with this arrangement, and the institute is at present preparing a submission on this matter to the Government. We believe that it is vitally important that the private sector be involved in the sale of the land.

I was rather intrigued that the Leader of the Opposition referred to the report that was brought down by the review committee. He referred particularly to the cost to the previous Government of the landholdings, and said that it was cheap land. However, he failed to refer to the next paragraph in that report, which states:

Both the Commonwealth and State Governments would be prudent to cut their costs and losses in respect to the planned development of the Monarto site and look to some alternate use for the land in order to recover at least some of their total invested capital of \$19 800 000.

The Leader conveniently decided not to continue with this quote and make that point, which was brought out clearly by the review committee. In the summary, the committee states:

The land at Monarto is unlikely to be required for development in accordance with the original concept of a growth centre established to alleviate problems associated with the expansion of metropolitan Adelaide. Population projections endorsed by the previous Government do not seem to suggest a need for major new areas of urban growth.

I will explain that later. The summary continues:

The land may be acquired ultimately for some limited urban use in relation to the expansion of Murray Bridge. However, that expansion is likely to be incremental and require only a small area of the Monarto site, but unlikely to occur before, say, 1990.

The Leader also referred to statements that the Premier had made in regard to the Government's earlier decision to retain the commission. The Government has retained the commission temporarily, but the problem in retaining the commission is that the Monarto Act (and the Leader would be aware of this) does not allow for ready disposal of land. Indeed, we sought a Crown law opinion on that matter. The Department of Lands was recognised as an agency.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If the Leader will allow me to continue, I will answer him. The Department of Lands was recognised as the appropriate agency that had the expertise in management and in the disposal of land. It is particularly experienced in selling large areas of semi-rural land. With the department's expertise, the Government decided to hand the project over to the Minister of Lands and his department. In doing so, the decision was also made to incorporate within that department the officers who were previously employed by the commission. It is well to note that the number of officers was allowed to dwindle dramatically under the previous Government. Those officers were doing mainly maintenance work and certainly did not have the expertise in disposing of land that the Department of Lands has.

The Leader also referred to the matter of reregistration. I point out to him, if he has not noted it already, that this matter is referred to in clause 5 (2) and, to some extent, in subclause (3). As regards negotiations on behalf of the Commonwealth and State Governments, it has already been stated by the Opposition that it recognises the need to reduce the interest bill. While I do not have the agreement in writing in front of me—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We said that you got elected on the basis of that argument.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I think the Leader implied that there was a need to consider the interest bill. I certainly recognise the fact that the public recognised what we were doing regarding Monarto at the time of the election. The negotiations that took place between the Commonwealth and the State were based on the fact that the land would be disposed of. The Leader said that members of the present Government, when in Opposition, denounced the Monarto project. As I have already said, the previous Government was recognised as dispensing with many of the Monarto commission staff to other departments.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We didn't propose to dispense with the land.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I suppose I could say that the previous Government went half-way down the track by dispensing with the majority of the commission's staff, but it did not take the difficult action in dispensing with the land.

Mr. Langley: Were people retrenched?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: That is another interesting point, because I know that previous officers of the commission were told that they would have employment in other departments or that employment would be found for them by the Government. There was a strong suggestion at one stage that those same officers were given a certain time in which to find other work, and if they did not find work in that time (six months, I believe), they would be retrenched. What I suggest is that the previous

Government went half-way down the road in dispensing with the staff, but it was not prepared to make the difficult decision to dispose of the land itself.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitchell referred to what they saw as problems relating to urban sprawl. The Monarto project was conceived at a time when Adelaide's projected population for 1991 (and I will not dwell on this matter, because the Opposition has already dwelt on it to a certain extent) was about 1 400 000, a figure in excess of the capacity of existing and future designated residential land in the metropolitan area. Population projections produced by the State Government Working Group on Household Formation and published in 1979 showed a 1991 median population projection for the Adelaide statistical division of 1 062 000, and suggested that the most optimistic projection for 1991 was 1 100 000. The median projection for the year 2011 is 1 200 000. When we compare these figures with information on the remaining stocks of vacant residential land, including land currently zoned rural A, deferred urban, it is clear to me that capacity exists to accommodate Adelaide's anticipated population growth up to about 2002 on median projections or 1998 on the most optimistic projections.

As well as that, the Government has committed itself to the consolidation of urban development within the Adelaide metropolitan area and is exploring many ways in which in-fill development, the extension of available housing choices, and where appropriate the achievement of higher densities of development close to the metropolitan area can contribute to the containment of urban sprawl and the extension of the life of the remaining vacant residential land.

The population projections incorporated in the report accompanying the 1962 metropolitan development plan envisage that deferred urban land would be required for residential development by 1981. The downturn in rate of population growth has been such that it is now considered necessary to amend the development plan to ensure that deferred urban land does not automatically become available in 1981, but that it is made available via the statutory processes as and when it can be demonstrated that there is a need for additional broadacre land for residential development. To complement urban consolidation strategy, the Government is committed to supporting attempts by existing cities and towns outside the metropolitan area to attract employment-generating industry, thereby providing a range of living environments as alternatives to Adelaide.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Which towns?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I would suggest the Iron Triangle, for example. Recent work carried out by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs has shown that available land, or land that can be made available, is sufficient for urban use in Port Pirie alone to support the doubling of the population of that town, and much of that land is already under Government ownership through either the Lands Department or the Housing Trust. Also, there are the Riverland towns, and I include Murray Bridge, which as I said earlier is expanding; it is one of the fastest-growing country towns in the State, and now that Murray Bridge knows exactly what the situation is concerning Monarto it will expand even more. It will be interesting to see just what does happen in Murray Bridge now that the uncertainties about Monarto have been removed. In fact, what we are looking at in regard to decentralisation is making better use of the services in non-metropolitan towns which are not being utilised to their full extent at present.

When discussing this whole matter of Monarto, I have

been interested to find that planning officers were not terribly enthusiastic about the idea of Monarto; it was very much a policy of the Labor Government and promoted by that Government. Those officers quite rightly accepted that policy as such and stood behind the Government of that time. However, I have been made aware that there was some concern among senior officers regarding the site of the proposed town of Monarto. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the natural features of the area, particularly the trees that have been planted and the native vegetation in the area.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: They're magnificent.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, and I would be the first to admit that. The staff employed by the Monarto Development Commission have recently been asked to help with the identification of areas within the site which possess good vegetation in its natural state (and I think that members opposite recognise that there are some quite attractive and worthwhile natural areas), as well as areas involving the planting programme undertaken by the Woods and Forests Department. Those areas will be retained in public ownership either as a national park or some other form of reserve (at present discussions are taking place with the Murray Bridge council as to who should actually be responsible for those reserves) or, as has been suggested, they could be sold under the heritage agreements. As members will be aware, only today the Heritage Act has been amended to allow for heritage agreements to be drawn up just for this very purpose, that is, to provide incentives for people occupying land with important native vegetation to retain that vegetation.

It is not our intention to retain every area of vegetation; there is no way that that can happen, and as with everything else we will have to be selective with these areas to be retained. However, the Government is well aware that some of that land under natural vegetation should be retained and, of course, that the commission developed certain facilities on the site, including the Monarto oval complex, a museum, and farm sites, etc., which will also need to be retained. At present negotiations are taking place as to the future use of that land. Finally, the member for Mitchell asked how we would define market value: that is not very easy to do just that.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's why I asked the question.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thought that might have been the situation. When land is being offered to the public by auction, the price obtained at auction is usually a real indication of market value.

Discussions are proceeding at the present time with a view to preparing evaluation briefs setting out land use and other relevant information for each parcel of land. These briefs will be prepared by a team comprising officers from the Land Disposal Unit of the Department of Lands in association with officers from the Valuer-General's Department and also a private consultant. The Valuer-General will prepare the conditions of engagement and a panel from which consultant services can be engaged for the project. Much thought has been given to the best way of determining market value for the purpose of disposing of this particular land.

I recognise that it is not an easy matter to determine just how we should go about setting market value. I think that is all that I need to say at this stage in reply to questions raised by members opposite. The Government has given considerable consideration to the task that is before it in looking at the future use of the land. The working party that has been associated with this actual programme, made up of members of the Department of Lands, members of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs and the

Treasury, worked very well to bring down something as positive as the document before us, enabling the Government to proceed with its proposal to dispose of the Monarto land.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Property of commission to vest in Minister."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think that this clause is germane to my query. In his reply, the Minister referred to a body which I think he described as a committee comprising two members from the Murray Bridge District Council and two from the State Planning Authority.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No, one from the State Planning Authority and one from the Department of Lands.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Well, that same body which, for my purposes, I will refer to as a committee. The property of the commission is to vest in the Minister of Lands. We also know that the Minister of Lands will be charged with the future of the land, and at this stage I take it no further than that. In what way will the four-man committee be responsible to the Minister of Lands as defined in the Bill now before us?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I understand that that particular committee will work very closely with the Minister of Lands. It is necessary for him to do that, of course, because it will keep the Minister of Lands in touch with the future of the land. The committee will make recommendations to the Minister of Lands and throughout the negotiations, particularly with the council, it has been felt that such a committee would be necessary on an ongoing basis to enable continuing negotiations to take place between the Department of Lands particularly and the Murray Bridge council.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That information is useful and I thank the Minister for his reply. Taking it one step further, is the Minister really saying that the four-man body will be responsible for advising the Minister about the disposal of parcels of land at Monarto?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The committee will provide a forum for negotiation on a number of issues. In relation to the actual disposal of the land, immediately after the dinner break, and I am not sure whether the honourable member was present in the House at the time, I referred to the manner in which the area had been divided into certain sections for disposal purposes. It will be possible for the committee to advise the Minister of Lands on matters relating to disposal and other matters that the Minister may want to put to the committee itself to enable close negotiations to take place.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister has gone a little further in that answer than he did when he replied to the second reading. In fact, he said that the land had been divided up. I take it that he is saying that the whole of the Monarto land has already had decisions taken about it to the extent that it has been divided up and that a certain future is postulated on paper for various portions of the land. This clause proposes to vest, as far as members on this side are aware, all of that land in the Minister of Lands. The Minister just said that lines had been drawn which indicate the future of some or all of the portions of land concerned. The Minister is asking the House to approve a Bill that disposes of all areas. Members on both sides of the Committee should be told more about it before they vest this power, through this clause, in another Minister.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is a pity that the member for Mitchell was not in the House earlier when I pointed

out that it was not possible to dispose of all of the land at one time and that the Government was looking at areas that were less complex in relation to future use. Some areas are less complex than others. I referred particularly to one section north of the pipeline where there are very few complications, and it has been suggested that that land could be disposed of first for agricultural use. A section of the land between the pipeline and the freeway, for example, where there are a considerable number of community facilities and more leases, will take more time to determine its appropriate future use. It has been suggested that the area of land adjoining Murray Bridge should be set aside for the future expansion of that township. That land will be retained and will probably be one of the last areas looked at. The Murray Bridge council will probably have the final say about what happens with that area of land.

What I am saying is that the land has been parcelled into five or six different sections, bearing in mind that each section is to be looked at individually in regard to disposal. Some of these areas can be disposed of more easily and more effectively than others. As far as the committee is concerned, it is to be made up of the two members of the Murray Bridge council and a member of the Lands Department. The real job of that committee is to liaise in the preparation of guidelines, including guidelines for interim development control. That was pointed out during the second reading speech. They really refer particularly or directly to planning issues. That is why the committee has been set up.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Sale of land by Minister."

Mr. BANNON: I move:

Page 2—

Line 12—Leave out "The" and insert "Subject to subsection (1a), the"

After line 16 insert subclause as follows:

(1a) The Minister shall not sell, lease, or dispose of land referred to in subsection (1) except—

(a) upon the authority of a resolution of both Houses of Parliament;

and

(b) in accordance with the conditions (if any) stipulated in the resolution.

Line 17—Leave out "This" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (1a), this".

The burden of the additional subclause is to prevent the Minister from selling, leasing or disposing of the land without the authority of the resolution of both Houses of Parliament and in accordance with conditions, if any, stipulated in the resolution of Parliament. There is a further consequential amendment to line 17.

The reason for moving this amendment has been made fairly clear in the course of the second reading debate. We have concentrated on what is left from the Monarto experiment. We are left with the commission, and statements have been made about that. We are now in a position where we will acquiesce in the dissolution of that Monarto commission, although there has not really been a satisfactory reply to our question as to why the Premier, in his Ministerial statement, echoed the remarks made by the committee about the continuing existence of the Monarto Development Commission. It has been answered in part by reference to some of the provisions of this Bill. The questioning by my colleague, the member for Mitchell, on clause 5 failed to elicit the sort of information that would be necessary for us to agree to clause 6 passing in the form in which it is presented. We believe that in those Monarto lands the State has an asset for which it has paid. A lot of money has been spent there, not only by way of interest

payments and purchase but also by way of the various tree-plantings and other attention that has been paid to that environment. It has become an asset to the State which we believe should not be alienated without Parliament being given an opportunity to make some comment on the means by which it will be alienated.

One of the significant things about this is that the authority is to be conferred upon the Minister, who is not the Minister who has been here conducting the Bill through the House, but rather his colleague the Minister of Lands. It gives to that Minister a total discretion as to what to do with that land. He has not seen fit to enter the debate at the second reading stage or in Committee to talk about what precisely he has in mind for the land and what sort of policies he will be following. We have had to rely on the Minister of Planning.

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: You can rely on the Minister of Environment quite safely.

Mr. BANNON: Unfortunately, the Bill refers to the Minister of Lands. If that was the case, then perhaps the response we could get from the Minister of Environment would be appropriate.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I think you have missed the point.

Mr. BANNON: Perhaps I did. The Minister who is to be responsible for the disposal of this land has not expressed any opinion or made any statement as to his intentions. As to the Minister of Environment and Planning, I suggest that his response to questions, particularly from my colleague, has not given us the confidence that should be present in the way that the Government is to deal with it.

The committee report which we are apparently supposed not to have is scandalous. This report, of which I have not a final printed copy—and that is why I questioned the Minister's saying that this was a public document—is scandalous as it has not been made generally public. The Minister made the assumption that it was a public document probably because he believes that there was no good reason for it to be kept secret, and then he remembered or discovered that it had been kept under wraps and away from the eyes of the public. He says that it is pretty rough and that he does not know how the Leader of the Opposition happens to have a copy of the report or details of the recommendations. However, we do have them and it is just as well that we do, because without them I think this debate would have been conducted, as my colleague just said, in a blindfolded fashion.

That report makes constructive and detailed recommendations as to the way in which the land could be disposed of in terms of preserving its community use and value, and also in terms of its commercial value. To simply dispose of it by opening it up to persons who formerly owned the land and to get whatever price is deemed to be the going rate for the land, and then the residue, or if they do not pick it up, to be put on the public market with one or two areas reserved, to do it in six undefined lots or parcels (as the Minister suggested) is all very vague and totally unsatisfactory. The committee, on the other hand, given its marching order, which was, "Find a way of getting rid of the land," laid down details of six specific ways in which the land could be handled and, in fact, defined the acreage or number of hectares that would be involved.

It suggested that 350 hectares should be reserved for community facilities retained in public or community ownership; that a further 590 hectares, which were leased facilities, could be retained or sold; that 1 760 hectares of natural vegetation could be preserved to the National Parks and Wildlife Service or local government, again kept in the public domain and preserved as conservation park; and that a further 5 000 hectares, which were planted

areas and areas where the vegetation was regenerated, could be leased as a residential conservation park or possibly a zoological park, which could comprise all or part of it. That is an interesting project and one which in the future, notwithstanding the financial problems of today, could well go ahead.

The fifth suggestion related to a further 1 000 hectares which could be retained for possible urban use, and pending that urban use would be leased for farming. Some quite imaginative suggestions were made in relation to possible urban uses of those areas. A final parcel comprising 10 600 hectares could be sold or provided on perpetual lease for farming. I have already referred in another stage of the debate to the committee's suggestion about perpetual lease being a desirable thing because it would increase the control that the Government would have over the land use. They are some constructive suggestions. We have had no indication from the Minister that those have been accepted and that the areas that the committee had defined in that way were to be reserved in that way.

What we are being asked to give is a blank cheque to let the Government sell off the land as quickly as it can at whatever price it can get at the going rate in the market place. If the purpose of this exercise is, to put it in the Government's own terms, to minimise the so-called loss on the Monarto project, then surely we are looking, first, not just at dollars and cents but at what we can rescue or conserve for the community, and secondly, in regard to those areas that we do not need to hold for the community, we should try to get as good a price as possible. If, for instance, there are some desirable portions that could be developed for residential use such as country estates, or something along those lines, as suggested by the committee, then that fairly imaginative use should be looked at, because it would maximise the return the Government would get from the sale of land, but we need a detailed plan to do that.

I suggest that a Select Committee be appointed. This needs to go before a Select Committee in view of the size of the holding, its location and financial implications. That makes a fair bit of sense. It would not be a protracted exercise for a Select Committee to look at a specific plan of allotments, subdivision, and land use, to inspect on site and report back to this Parliament. It is only then, I believe, that we would be in a position as a Parliament to make a positive decision about what should be done with this land. We are not being asked to do that. A number of vague statements are being made. We are told that another Minister is going to be able to look after the land, and to do what he likes with it; it will be sold off as rapidly as possible; we do not have to worry about the price—that is the end of the matter, we can forget about it.

That is not good enough, and in consequence we are moving an amendment that goes along with the passing of this Bill, which will repeal the Monarto Development Commission Act and the Monarto Land Acquisition Act. It will clear the way in every respect for action to be taken, but it will reserve to this Parliament the right to make the final decision about exactly how the land is disposed of. I think this is a reasonable suggestion, in view of the history of Monarto, the size of the holding and the expenditure on it. Accordingly, I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support the amendment moved by the Leader. If one looks at the Bill one can see that we are talking about the repeal of certain provisions which were enacted in 1972. The acquisition of the land to which this clause refers has been before the people of South Australia on three or four occasions. The land does

not belong to the Government of the day: it belongs to the people of this State. The amendment before the House recognises that fact. The importance of that amendment has already been outlined by the Leader. We are not talking about five or six suburban blocks: we are talking about 17 500 hectares of land, a considerable area. We are talking about land which has had its value increased through vast areas of planting which have occurred. The Minister agreed earlier that magnificent plantings had been made and that the trees are growing. It would be wrong for this House, representing all the people of the State, to bang this measure with a rubber-stamp and put the land in the hands of the Minister of Lands without having all the information we should have before us. We do not even have a map before us showing what is considered to be disposable land. The Minister has outlined to the Committee information about five or six areas, but he took umbrage when I asked him to tell us what is involved in the areas he described. Fancy coming before the Committee and talking as he did about an asset of this value. Never mind what is owed on the land; there is money value there, too. The land is of such importance that we should be very careful about it. The Minister said, "I think there are five or six areas—

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The honourable member should read *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: For a moment or two before I came into the Chamber whilst the Minister was speaking about this matter I was able to hear him outside the door behind the Speaker, and the Minister knows that one can hear a conversation there. It was only on the second and third occasions that we got a few more dribblets of information from him. I am not going to be a party to this sort of thing. The Minister can crash this measure through because he has the numbers, and we understand that. What we are asking for is reasonableness. Are we going to be denied that? The amendment acknowledges that the Government and the Minister are in power, but we are talking about something that concerns everybody in the State in terms of its value. Therefore, is it too much to ask that this provision be given the careful consideration of both Houses? The amendment provides:

... except upon the authority of a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Is that too much to ask? If we transfer other land owned by the State to the Aboriginal people no member questions the fact that that ought to be done by a resolution of both Houses of this Parliament. Such measures for the transfer of land go through this House and have been going through it for some years. They quite often involve quite small parcels of land. My comments do not mean that I am belittling this subject at all, but I am talking about parcels of land which are required to be shown on a map on a wall of the Chamber so that members have a full understanding of what they are talking about and what they are doing—passing from the ownership of the people of the State a portion of land to some other body. There is no difference whatsoever in the proposal before us now. In fact, this is something which, in my opinion, borders on the scandalous, that the Government proposes to take this colossal area of land and say that nobody outside this place should be concerned about it and that it will fix it by sticking it in the hands of the Minister of Lands, who will handle it all right.

That is not a criticism of the Minister of Lands; it is a failure by the Minister and the Government to recognise the importance of this area of land. Whether one argues about whether Monarto was in the right place or the wrong place, or heaven knows what, it was a good place, and the Minister does not argue with that. It is an important area

geographically in the State, and surely the members of the two Houses are entitled to have a closer look at the ultimate disposal of that land. We should not have to say that we will pass that land over to the Minister of Lands to do with it what he thinks fit. That is just not good enough for a proposal of this size. I urge the Minister to give consideration to the amendment, which does not seek to stop events happening, does not cut across matters and say that the Government must not do that which it proposes, even though the Opposition thinks it is scandalous, but merely states that if the Government is going to do that then let the matter be brought back to the House and be subject to a resolution of both Houses. I do not think that that is too great a stricture to place on this matter and I urge the Minister to reconsider and support the amendment.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government does not support the amendment. I have taken on board what has been said by the Leader and the member for Mitchell. I made reference during my second reading speech and during this debate to the involvement of the working party set up originally which has considered the various uses referred to tonight for this land, whether for community uses, reserves, vegetation or urban expansion; we have looked at all of those things. The Government could have just belted straight into this matter and not consulted anybody.

We set up a working party with representatives from various Government departments to enable us to make the right decisions in regard to the future of the land. We set up a review committee in the first place to look at the future or alternative uses of the land. The Government intends to consider the recommendations. I ask the Opposition how it intends the amendment to work. Does it mean that the land would have to be sold in one block? Does it mean that every time we want to sell a small section of land we would have to bring the matter before both Houses of Parliament? I suggest that this amendment would prevent the staged assessment of the suitability of land, both for retention and sale.

I suggest that the amendment is contrary to the normal processes of disposing of land. For example, when the previous Government wanted to sell Land Commission land, did it on each occasion bring the matter before both Houses of Parliament? There were some large commission areas sold. Did the former Government use the principle it now suggests and bring such sales before both Houses of Parliament?

Mr. Bannon: That's a different situation.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is not a different situation—it is exactly the same situation. What about if the Education Department or the Housing Trust wants to sell a piece of land? Does it bring such a proposal before both Houses of Parliament? It does not. The Government does not support the amendment, because it believes that it would be completely unworkable and quite contrary to the normal processes involved in the disposal of land.

Mr. BANNON: The Minister asked a number of questions, and for a moment I was deluded into thinking that he was actually asking questions, that he wanted information about the intention of the amendment. The Minister is now confirming his position by his facial expression; he is confirming that those questions were totally rhetorical. He has no idea what the answers might be, and he is not terribly interested in the answers, because he is determined that this whole concept is impractical, and he will not accept it.

I would like to answer those questions, and the best way to answer them is to speak in a general way and indicate that it is not our intention to impede the proper disposal of

this land. Much as we believe, and believe strongly, that that is not a sensible policy, if that is what the Government is determined on, then it will have its way. Our intention, as I have explained and as my colleague has reinforced, is to ensure that the disposal of such land is done in a way that is fully understood by Parliament, that is, in a planned and orderly way.

It may be that the Government wishes to dispose of it in a staged fashion. Then let it bring before Parliament that sort of proposition and talk about the stages that it wishes to adopt. I am sure that it would get from Parliament the sort of authority that it seeks. We are asking to have some sort of plan put before us, to have some sort of costing done, and some sort of estimate about the value both to the community and Treasury of what the Government proposes.

One way in which the Minister could respond to this amendment most effectively is to give us that information in as precise a form as he can, or invite his colleague in another place to do so. The Minister has not and he cannot, because there is no real plan or firm costing; there is no great idea about how it could be done. Parliament has a right to know these things. It was the full Parliament, with considerable support from both sides, that passed the original Acts, and got this project off the ground. Therefore, we believe that the full Parliament should have the right to look at what the Government intends to do in regard to disposing of it.

The Minister has raised a number of practical objections. We say simply that those objections can be overcome: pass this amendment and come back to Parliament with some sort of plan and those practical problems can be ironed out. It is as simple as that. It is a desire on the part of Parliament to have some control over this process and some ability to examine the precise financial and community land use implications of any plan that the Government might have.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government intends that this land be disposed of in an orderly and effective way. It is planned that the land will be brought under interim development control. I have already said that the committees which have been set up, both the review committee and the working party, have looked closely at the various alternatives for the future use of this land. Much expertise has been brought in from various Government departments to enable that to happen. The Government does not intend to support the amendment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: One can only come to the conclusion that there are plans for this land that the Minister knows will not stand the light of day. The Minister is not prepared to agree to the amendment, which seeks nothing more of him or the Government than that the disposal of this land be given an airing in both Houses of Parliament. That is all the amendment provides. My Leader pointed out that it is not the intention of the Opposition to try to tie up the Government's plans in this matter, although it is certainly the Opposition's intention, as much as we can, to get the proper information that all members of the Committee are entitled to obtain in regard to this matter. What a load of garbage we heard earlier!

I believe my Leader was restrained in responding to the previous answer given by the Minister when he talked about selling a parcel of Education Department land, or the like. We are not talking about three or four blocks or a bit of ground big enough for a school: we are talking about a large area of land into which—and the Minister will agree—about \$27 000 000 has been invested by the people of this State. The Minister refuses to give us any clue. He says that all we have to do is leave it to his colleague, who will not say a word on the matter and will dispose of it in

accordance with some secretive plan. Can the Minister deny this: if it had not been for the fact that in some fortuitous way we obtained a copy of the report, Opposition members would not even know what the recommendations were of the working group set up by the Minister, and we are now told that another group is involved in advising on this matter. We are told that local government knows about it. However, it is not good enough for members of the Opposition and the Parliament to know about these things. We must just put our signature, so to speak, on \$27 000 000 worth of transactions. Members of the Public Works Committee would not be able to work for even one week on that basis. Members of that committee, of which I am one, are repeatedly asked to decide on expenditures, and that case is an exact parallel to the one we are now debating. If the committee was to operate as the Minister suggests we operate in this case we would be quickly dismissed, and so we should be, yet now the Minister is saying that it is not much different from selling off a couple of blocks that the Education Department no longer needs.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It's not much different from selling off Land Commission land.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister is attempting persiflage, and it will not work. We are not making unreasonable requests in this matter. The amendment moved by the Leader on behalf of the Opposition simply asks that Parliament have the opportunity to look at the proposals.

It does not say that the Parliament will knock them back, and we know that that is not possible. The Government has the numbers, so where is the difficulty? In the interests of the people we represent, the people I believe members of the Government are inclined to forget at times, we are entitled to have an extra look, because we do not have the information before us to allow us to make a decision comfortably on this legislation. The Minister has the numbers, and he can push it through, but he should think seriously before doing that.

The Leader's amendment is a very simple requirement of the type which applies to land transferred forever out of the ken of the people of this State and directly into the hands of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The approval of both Houses of Parliament is required before that land properly belongs to that trust. Here we have an area of land about which very little information has been given, and we are asked to approve the measure. Members on this side are not saying that it is wrong. The Government is entitled to make that decision but, as members of this place, we are entitled to have information to allow us to consider carefully a proposal of this magnitude. Surely, if he reflects on the matter, the Minister can see the merit of the amendment and support it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Plunkett, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. D. C. Brown, Goldsworthy, and Randall.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7—"Designated site to be part of area of District

Council of Murray Bridge."

Mr. BANNON: Will the Minister give the Committee the text of any motion passed by the council, or its formal recommendations, and will he comment again on the suggestion that the Government should undertake certain preparatory work before vesting this land in the council and giving it responsibility over it?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Clerk of the council has made contact with me no doubt as members of the Opposition have made contact with him. The resolutions suggested have yet to be referred to the full council for adoption or amendment, and that will take place on 24 November. A number of matters have been raised by the committees of the council. The majority of the resolutions put forward will be discussed during negotiations. It has been made clear to the council that negotiations on these issues will continue, and other references will be made to matters brought forward regarding compensation and the proclamation of the site.

It has been requested that the council be guaranteed an income which would be derived from the common applicable rate for the District Council of Murray Bridge. That is a matter to be negotiated. In the fourth resolution put to us and passed on to the Opposition, the council seeks the support of the Government in having heritage agreements applied at the designated site where tree planting has taken place or is considered of benefit. In discussions in recent days with a number of members of the council, I have brought them up to date on the amendments recently passed to the Heritage Act.

I referred particularly to heritage agreements, and I said that we would be using these heritage agreements in this project. We will be able to take advantage of the fact that the Heritage Act has been amended to enable heritage agreements to be drawn up to protect some of the native vegetation under private ownership.

Mr. BANNON: The Minister is suggesting that there will be considerable further negotiation: one would have thought that this matter could be determined before the Bill became law. Has the Minister given an undertaking to the council that proclamation will be held over until agreement is reached? What is the attitude of the Mayor of the Murray Bridge council in regard to the whole issue?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We have said that we will continue negotiations, and I have received a letter from the Murray Bridge council, in reply to a letter that I wrote to the council, in which the council indicates its agreement with the terms of the Bill and also agrees that negotiations will continue on such matters. The Mayor of Murray Bridge has expressed publicly that she believes that the Monarto land should not be disposed of, and she is entitled to her view. However, the council agrees with the terms of the Bill.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September. Page 1097.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): This short Bill seeks to enlarge the membership of the Electricity Trust from five to seven members, and at this point I suggest that, in hindsight, it would have been easier, in speaking to a Bill of this nature, if the trust had decided to call its governing body a "board", because when one speaks of the trust as

having five members, one is also referring to the thousands of other people, because the colloquial reference is to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which can lead to some confusion. The body that has the governing authority for the Electricity Trust of South Australia is the Electricity Trust, which consists of five members. The Bill proposes to increase that number to seven and to shorten the term of office of members from five years to three years. The Opposition supports the Bill, but we do not entirely support the inferences that could be taken from the Minister's second reading explanation. The Minister stated:

The Electricity Trust faces quite momentous decisions which must be made in the near future in relation to fuel supplies, generating capacity and a variety of other matters.

Cop these next lines:

The Government believes that the trust would be better equipped to make the difficult decisions that presently confront it if its membership were widened to include additional experts with skills in planning and managing major industrial enterprises and in energy management.

I believe that we would all agree that the trust is already a very large organisation, heavily involved in energy management and in the generation of the major source of power in this State. Apparently, it has been functioning quite well under the control of the present five members of its trust. The Minister who introduced the Bill and who is currently overseas, if he had read the Bill again before he left, might have wished that he had used different wording, because it could be argued that he was suggesting that Mr. Hayes, Mr. Seaman, the Hon. Glen Broomhill, the Hon. John Coumbe and Mr. Keith Lewis (of well known repute in South Australia as the previous Director-General of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, a person who is thought of so highly by the present Government that he was seconded to oversee the amalgamation of the Departments of Environment and Planning), if one takes the second reading explanation literally, do not have sufficient expertise in management of a large industrial enterprise and, therefore, need augmentation.

We will not be uncharitable, just because the Minister failed to choose more carefully the words of his second reading explanation. I think the Minister was really trying to say that the trust is a large enterprise, it will become larger and it will loom very large in the life of every person in this State in these energy conscious and energy hungry years of the next decade or two. In order to ensure that the best decisions can be taken in matters affecting those to whom I referred previously, we should make the load (no pun intended) on the members charged with that duty somewhat easier by increasing the number of members of the trust from five to seven.

The Opposition has no quarrel with that principle generally, particularly as the Government has provided that the terms of those members already appointed at the old time span of five years will be continued respectively from the date of appointment. Presumably, the term of three years is to apply to the two new members and to subsequent appointments, as the other members of the trust are either reappointed or have their appointments terminated by the normal effluxion of time. The Bill also provides for a consequential change to the number that is required to constitute a quorum by changing the word "three" in the relevant clause to "four", because there will be seven members on the proposed new trust.

There is a more interesting amendment, to which I will refer only briefly, as I think that some of my colleagues may discuss this matter more closely, in that there is a provision, by striking out paragraph (d) of section 6 (2) of

the principal Act, that an employee of the trust shall no longer be prohibited from being a member of the trust. I believe that Government members will now see what I meant when I said what a pity it is that it is not a board instead of a trust, because an employee of the trust will no longer be prohibited from being a member of the trust. If we can get any more asinine than that, we will have to stay up later. Be that as it may, matters are sometimes legislated in this way, and we have to live with them.

Recourse to the definitions in the parent Act is no help, either, because the definition there states that the trust means the Electricity Trust of South Australia. If ever I have come across a circular proposition, that is one of them. I do not think the fact that the words are strange will affect the operations of the trust in its efficient running. It has not appeared to do so up to now, and I do not propose to make an issue of it. The Opposition, in general, has no opposition to these matters, although it may have some query as to what the Minister who introduced the Bill had in mind when he provided that an employee can now be appointed a member of the trust.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In examining the Bill, I note, as did the member for Mitchell, that the numbers that constitute the board of the Electricity Trust have been increased from five to seven. I see nothing sinister in the Minister's second reading explanation. I think that the member for Mitchell was looking for something to grumble about. I have read the Minister's second reading explanation. I think that the honourable member was being teasing about it. It is important that the trust have available to it a wide range of people with different expertise.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Let's make it nine.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should not get impatient. The trust is about to embark on a programme of spending many hundreds of millions of dollars, and important decisions will be made affecting the people of this State. It is common sense to broaden the trust so as to bring to it people with special expertise. I put one other suggestion to the Minister and to the Government. We have had a trust consisting solely of people residing within the metropolitan area. As important decisions must be made affecting the distribution of electricity throughout the country, I believe that serious consideration should be given to putting a country person on the trust. I believe that, throughout the entire history of the trust, no country person has ever been appointed to it, even though people have had expertise in local government. As most country members realise, local government acts as agents for the trust in many country areas. I notice that, in a debate as important as this one is, the Labor Party pays scant attention to it. Only one Opposition member is sitting on the front bench; the rest of them are probably having a game of snooker, or doing something else. The Opposition has no interest in the people of this State to the degree that its members will stay in the Chamber. Where is this State's alternative Government? The trust, which has 1 100 or 1 200 employees, is spending hundreds of millions of dollars in building a new town at Leigh Creek. The very fabric of life of the people depends on the trust, yet only one Opposition member is present in the Chamber. Other Opposition members have walked out on the people of the State. I note that we now have two Opposition members in the Chamber; it has increased its members twofold.

Mr. Slater: If you're asking for it, you'll get it.

Mr. GUNN: I do not know what that means. It was a planned walkout, but the member for Gilles was too principled to leave. All of his colleagues have deserted him on a matter of such importance to the State as this Bill. I hope that the Government, and the Minister in particular,

will bear in mind, when making these new appointments, that a country person should be considered. The Government is aware of the good work the trust has done by providing electricity throughout a large part of the State. The trust is still expanding its coverage. Certain areas still require reticulated electricity. Recently in my district, the Government, through the Outback Areas Community Trust (and I am grateful for the Cabinet decision), decided to provide a generating capacity at Penong that will cost a considerable amount to the taxpayers each year by subsidy. It has also agreed to bring the Andamooka operation up to standard to qualify for a subsidy. Other parts of my electorate require electricity to be reticulated. The Deputy Premier has looked favourably on one of the few remaining power houses operating in this State, at Peterborough.

As a Government concerned to maintain employment, it would not allow the trust to close that operation. I am grateful for the Government's contribution towards the trust's operations in my district. I believe that most country members appreciate the good work the trust has done. There is concern in certain country areas in relation to an anomaly whereby certain people in the country have to pay 10 per cent more for electricity than do some of their neighbours, particularly on the West Coast, where one person who buys his electricity directly from the trust, rather than getting it from the district council, incurs a 10 per cent difference in tariff. That anomaly should be rectified so that everyone in the country would pay Adelaide rates plus 10 per cent, as Sir Thomas Playford planned some years ago, or the same rates. I am aware of the problem the Government faces in relation to this matter, because if the 10 per cent surcharge is removed, the Treasury will have to find much more money. The Government would be unable to fund these other costly extensions. I believe that the anomaly I have mentioned, which has been raised at local government conferences for many years, should be examined, and a decision made. I am pleased to support the Bill, and I hope that the Government will consider my suggestion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the Bill, with some reservations. My colleague the member for Mitchell has covered the most important aspects of this short Bill. He mentioned that during the second reading explanation the Minister stated that the trust faces some momentous decisions in the future. I believe that in the past the trust has faced some momentous decisions in relation to the future of fuel supplies in this State, the generating capacities, and a variety of matters. If the five people who are currently members of the trust are unable to make those momentous decisions in the future, I cannot see that seven members will be able to make any more important decisions. I venture to say that the Bill is somewhat of a reflection on the current members of the trust, because, even though their terms of office are protected under this Bill, it provides that there will be a three-year term for those who are appointed in the future. It appears to me that the trust has been well served over the years by those persons who have made those decisions in the past.

In introducing the Bill, the Minister was not as clear as he might have been in relation to clause 3, which removes the restrictions that prevent employees from being appointed as members of the trust. No explanation in any great detail was given in regard to that clause, and I trust that the Minister who is representing the Minister who

introduced the Bill will explain to the House why that clause is inserted. I do not believe that the Government has been converted overnight to worker participation or industrial democracy, and it seems rather odd to me that it has included this provision in the Bill. I venture to say that one of the motives for this clause is to provide the opportunity for the General Manager of the trust, who is regarded as an employee, to be a member of the trust. I do not have any particular objection to that occurring, but I would suggest—

An honourable member: You are not that simple, are you, Jack?

Mr. SLATER: I believe the motive for this clause and for the introduction of this Bill is to give the General Manager of the trust the opportunity to be a member of the trust. As I have said, I have no objection to that, but I believe that it could be carried a little further and that one of the other employees could also be a member of the trust.

The Opposition does not have any objection to the Bill, but we fail to see why it is necessary for the trust to have seven members after all these years, during which time the trust has made some fairly important and momentous decisions for the people of this State. The number could be nine, it could be 11, or it could be any number. If expertise is needed in any particular field, the more people involved the more opportunity there is for that expertise to be forthcoming. The Opposition has some reservations about this matter. As I have said, the Minister did not convince members of the Opposition as to why clause 3 is provided, and I hope that when replying on his colleague's behalf the Minister will explain this a little more clearly. The short explanation that was given lacked a degree of clarity. We want to know the real purpose of the amendments to this Act, and I ask that the Minister in reply explain the Government's attitude to clause 3 and say why employees will now be able to be members of the trust.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I want to follow the line of argument of the member for Eyre when he spoke in support of this Bill. I hope that, with the passing of this Bill and with there being more people on the board, the trust will find the opportunity to make decisions that are a little more favourable for some property holders, not only in the country areas but also in areas that one might term near-city areas, and in particular the Adelaide Hills. I know the responsibilities are vast when it comes to the massive investment needed to be spent for the establishment of electricity-producing plants in this State for whatever type of fuel we might be forced to use to achieve the ultimate goals, and the decisions that we will have to make in having grid connections with other States in the case of an emergency. In particular, I wish to refer to some of the small properties in the Adelaide Hills area. In the past these properties have not had the opportunity to have power connected. They may have been multiple-title holdings which were used for small farms or farmlets but which are not viable propositions, and they may now be separated to the point where different persons own separate smaller titles, and they wish to build houses on those blocks, which is their right, and they also wish to have electricity supplied from the reticulated system of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I have known of cases where people have been asked to pay from \$5 000 to \$8 000 just to have the power connected to their property. That sum may not sound a lot, but in a rural pursuit a person can make an assessment of whether they need to pay, or can afford to pay, that sort of money and get a return from the property. However, for a residential home it is a massive amount to add on just to service the home,

when neighbouring properties may already have the power connected. I raise the point in the hope that the Electricity Trust will look at the situation.

It has been suggested that sometimes it is only people in country areas who must pay a greater surcharge or a higher installation fee. The figure that I used for the connection of power to small holdings, for private homes, is smaller than some of the amounts that the owners of some of the small farms have to pay to have the power connected in the Hills area where there is absolutely no possibility of getting a viable living from rural pursuits.

Mr. Langley: They pay different tariffs.

Mr. EVANS: It is not the tariff but the initial connection that is the problem. The other point that I make is the hope that, with a bigger board of control of the trust, we can get some form of guarantee or agreement with unions that at no time in the future will labour be withdrawn from the manning of power stations of this State or from any section of the power supply system for the people of this State. I fear that one day we will have a withdrawal of labour, for whatever reason (and I am not trying to argue the rights or wrongs of that), at a critical time for some particular area of industry, whether it be primary or secondary. More particularly, it may be at a time when there are operations or some other activities taking place in hospitals, which in the main have auxiliary units, or some other area where elderly people are disadvantaged, just because the power has been removed from the reticulated supply. I hope that in the future when the new board is set up it will attempt to find some method of having a guarantee so that at no time in the future will labour be withdrawn from areas where the supply of electricity is absolutely essential for every-day functioning, not just for comfort for people but more particularly for the aged, for the handicapped and for industries in the secondary and primary sectors. I support the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I listened very intently to the member for Fisher, and once again I heard the old union drag. One can never get away from it, yet members opposite say that they support unions. I believe that all people, no matter who they are, still have the right to strike if they so desire. If members of the Electrical Trades Union heard what the member for Fisher said about the unions tonight, I am sure that they would not be too happy. Personally, I am not happy about his remarks, either. I am aware of very few strikes by this union over the years. The Electrical Trades Union is one of the most moderate unions in this State. There is no reason for the member for Fisher to refer to workers in the way that he has.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to connect his comments to the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the Electricity Trust workers. But for the remarks of the member for Fisher, I would not have risen to speak. Members would be aware that the board of the Electricity Trust has been widened, and I am pleased about that. Because of diminishing energy resources something must be done, and I hope that people will be very helpful to the Electricity Trust in its new field of endeavour. Other honourable members have referred to tariffs. The Electricity Trust has to run somewhere near its budget, of course. The Electricity Trust looks after people with country properties, just as it looks after people in different areas of this State by supplying underground cables. The Electricity Trust has different tariffs that help the rural people of this State, and I am sure they are very happy about that.

I can recall years ago that honourable members from the country areas used to call local electricity stations "Bung

'er on and bung 'er off'', because no-one knew exactly what was going on. The Electricity Trust has taken over many country supplies, and it has provided a good service. People living in country areas must be pleased about the situation. I support the Bill and the increase in the number of members of the board. I only hope that members opposite will recall that electricity is part of the spice of life. I assure the Minister that the Electricity Trust has done a great job. Being an electrician by trade, naturally I am a little biased, but there is no doubt that over the years the Electricity Trust and its board have been very efficient, and I am sure they will be efficient in the future. I only hope that this union bashing is not brought up all the time.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): I rise to make two points in relation to this Bill and the way it affects the Electricity Trust and the capacity of the trust to provide a service. I am referring to a service in particular to people I have the honour and responsibility to represent who live in isolated rural communities that make up the electorate of Mallee. First, I refer to the anomaly that has arisen as a result of the adoption of daylight saving in this State and the way that it affects irrigators *vis a vis* dairy farmers, and the types of changes in the cost structure of enterprises undertaken by those types of people. Some irrigators are dairy farmers, while all dairy farmers are irrigators.

Mr. Hemmings: All irrigators are not dairy farmers.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member opposite has quite properly made the logical observation indicating that one is a subset of the other. The important thing is that the Electricity Trust should, regardless of the structure of the board, take account of the sociological implications of the decisions it makes about when it will make available particular types of tariffs and for what purposes. Further, where the greater good of the community is seen to be involved by a decision that affects things such as daylight saving, the trust should be responsive to the need and ensure that whatever was the case before such innovations as daylight saving were introduced can still be the case afterwards.

Honourable members should remember that the Electricity Trust was established by a Government of the same political persuasion as the present Government. It was a sensible move designed to ensure the extension of those features of civilised life as we know them that are possible only as a result of having access to safe, reliable supplies of electricity. That decision having been taken, the extension of electricity as a service to communities outside Adelaide was made to ensure that the State's economic development could proceed.

That brings me to my second point. The trust's present policy, however efficient it may be by comparison with similar bodies in other States, is nonetheless a change from that original philosophy. It means that constituents in my electorate, more so than constituents whom the member for Fisher has the honour and responsibility to represent, have been quoted figures in excess of \$25 000 to have electricity supplied to their homes and farms. They are then told that it is never likely to happen anyway so they should not bother about the fact that it is too expensive. I must say that that is some sop! It disappoints me to learn that that has been the trust's attitude in determining its policy in relation to people living in isolated communities, because it immediately stultifies development in those areas where development could take place. In so doing, it restricts the capacity of this State's economy to diversify further from a traditional manufacturing base which has provided expansion in job opportunities in the past.

Regrettably, that kind of policy looks like continuing. There seems to be little understanding of the effect it will

have not only on the South Australian community as a whole but in particular on the opportunities which people who live in the electorate I represent would not otherwise have. Where those people wish to extend irrigation facilities on their farms, they must resort to the far more expensive fuel of distillate against what they are being asked to do in the interest of humanity and in the interest of this country's balance of payments position. They are being asked to do that for no other reason than the fact that the Electricity Trust is refusing to supply them with electricity in keeping with the traditions of the trust as first established by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford.

They are the two things that I regard as being important, and I hope that the trust, with its expanded board, will be able to examine the implications far more effectively than it has in the past, especially the sociological consequences, that is, the effects on families of the decisions and the policy changes that are made.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the measure and hope that by expanding the board we may get a greater equalisation of services right throughout the State. Reference has already been made in this House to the anomaly that exists, whereby power is sold in bulk to district councils for distribution. Where that happens, by law district councils have to add 10 per cent to the cost of the power. As has been mentioned by the member for Eyre, who has many constituents in that category, as I have, some people are supplied through the Electricity Trust of South Australia network and others are supplied indirectly through to councils which buy power in bulk from the Electricity Trust of South Australia and then distribute it virtually throughout the same network, with a 10 per cent difference in tariff.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr. BLACKER: I point out to the member for Mitchell that a progression of events has allowed the Electricity Trust of South Australia to come in on a localised power generation system, and one can understand how the situation arose. However, we should now be working towards the equalisation of tariffs right throughout the State, with equal services, wherever possible, for all sections of the community. After all, as we have to vote on an equal pattern, we believe we have a right to equal services in the same way.

Reference has been made to people in the irrigation areas who are at a considerable cost disadvantage in trying to have power connected, particularly where higher horsepower motors are required. It sometimes involves having to go from the single phase to three phase, and it costs thousands and thousands of dollars to get the service connected. Many potential irrigation blocks do not have power connected, purely because of cost. The cost of the connection, I am referring to, not the cost of the power, and that is the problem. From my own experience, we built a small piggery. It was only 200 metres from the homestead to the main line, and across the corner of where that piggery was to go was a single wire earth return line. All that was required was for the Electricity Trust of South Australia to poke a hole under that line and run a wire down the pole. No extra poles were required other than the one to hold the present wire up and to carry a transformer. That cost one single primary producer, involving the simplest possible means of connection, \$1 100.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What's the primary producer's depreciation on that?

Mr. BLACKER: I could not say, but that does not involve the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It might be an expense over four years.

Mr. BLACKER: I accept that, but it does not come under the Electricity Trust of South Australia situation; how it is financed is another matter. Another constituent is installing air-conditioning in a piggery he has just completed, to promote better growth in his pigs. To do that he requires the power to be connected at a cost of \$2 700 for two extra poles to be taken to his shed. The requirement there is to pay up in full before work is commenced. I believe that that is unjust and unfair; surely some progressive payment system could be arranged similar to the old standing charge that used to apply when the first single earth wire return networks were being operated throughout the country.

At my own family property at Cummins, we had what I think was the first single wire earth return programme in South Australia, and we were very fortunate that our property was one of the first connected under that s.w.e.r. line system. Since then most of Eyre Peninsula, as well as most of the State, has been covered, and I have nothing but the highest praise for the manner in which the Electricity Trust of South Australia has been able to provide the network for the State. However, there are still anomalies within the community. The connection charges for new subscribers are in many cases prohibitive. We could have a far wider network and far greater usage of power if a better financial arrangement could be found to facilitate connections. It is fair to say that wherever a major connection is required, such as in the case of a piggery, it is always the initial costs that are the most difficult to meet. If a term payment could be arranged so that the sum could be paid off over a period of years, much greater use would be made of the facility.

I support the Bill, as it gives a wider representation on the board. I only hope that the advice has been taken regarding country representation on the board so that the anomalies and problems that have been cropping up can receive more consideration at board meetings.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: This comparatively short Bill has generated considerable interest, as displayed by members this evening, and I believe that some very valid points have been raised on both sides of the Chamber. I refer briefly to the comments made by the member for Eyre, and supported in the main by the member for Flinders, highlighting problems that exist in country areas. Extending the board from five to seven members and reducing the five-year term to three years will give greater flexibility in being able to bring in additional expertise at short notice. Members will recall the function held at the open-cut test mine a week or two ago where samples were taken from Port Wakefield for testing overseas.

Undoubtedly, the trust is having to move rapidly to keep up with the demand for this essential service in South Australia. I believe that the provision of two extra members will, if they are carefully selected, result in additional expertise being available to the trust. I do not believe that there is anything sinister in the move to enable a person or employee of the trust, from the General Manager down, to be appointed to the board of the trust if so desired. I cannot see any reason why such people should be exempt under the Act from membership of the board. This point was highlighted by the member for Unley and the member for Gilles.

The trust may happen to employ a key person (it does

not have to be the General Manager; it can be anyone) who can add valuable assistance and guidance as a member of the board. It could be an engineer or someone else, who may not be in a position to make that same overall input into the policy of the board as a whole if he is locked into a particular area or field of operation within the trust. Whether a move is to be made to appoint somebody, I cannot say at this stage, but it certainly does open the Act to enable a key person with expertise in a particular area to be utilised far beyond that person's capacity to be utilised otherwise. I believe that that is a worthwhile move. There was a suggestion by the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders that, in the light of problems that they outlined, consideration should be given to the appointment of a country person to the board.

Mr. Keneally: The United Farmers and Graziers, perhaps.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: If there is a suitable person available from the rural sector, or from the country generally, there is no reason why that person should not be a member of the board; not every member of the board has to be someone from the metropolitan area.

Mr. Keneally: They should come from Port Augusta.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I am happy, if the Government sees fit, for a person from Port Augusta with the necessary expertise to be appointed to the board. I would have no objection whatever to that, so long as that person had the necessary expertise to contribute in an area where such expertise was required.

Mr. Keneally: I'm willing.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The member for Stuart is making himself available. I am sure that the Minister of Mines and Energy, on his return, will take note of this debate and consider the honourable member's offer. Comments have been made on both sides of the House that the Electricity Trust, since its inception, has been remarkably successful in the interests of South Australia. It has done an excellent job, and I believe an extension from five to seven board members can only enhance the work it is doing. Because it has done an excellent job in the past, that does not mean that it cannot do an even better job in the interests of South Australia in the future, and the move to increase the number of persons on the board from five to seven, with the ability to change those persons on a three-yearly basis, will enable the changing scene to be adequately catered for.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Members of trust."

Mr. KENEALLY: I was not able to take part in the second reading debate because I was busy elsewhere, so I apologise if I repeat something that may have been said at that time. I seek from the Minister confirmation on two matters covered in clause 3. First, does increasing the number of members of the board from five to seven mean that the Government has opened up the possibility that there will be worker participation on the new board, and that it is likely that the General Manager of the Electricity Trust will also be a member of the board? If that is why the Government is increasing the number of board members to seven, it would have my wholehearted support, and I would applaud the Government for providing representation from those people who work in the trust. Will the Minister advise the Committee on that matter? Also, can the Minister tell the Committee what is the Government's policy on paying additional members appointed to the board? If representation is taken from within the Electricity Trust, is it the Government's intention to pay those people the additional \$5 000, which I understand is

the payment for board members, or would those people from the trust be expected to serve as members of the board and receive no more pay than they receive in the normal course of their employment?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I cannot give the honourable member an answer to his question about remuneration of trust employees who are appointed to the board. However, I believe that that information would certainly be available to the Minister handling the Bill in the other place, and that an answer could be provided in that Chamber. The amendment does not mean that there will automatically be an appointment made from the trust, but removes the restriction that has existed and enables the Government at any time to appoint to the board any person employed in the trust who it feels is qualified.

Because it does not state positively that an employee of the trust will be appointed, I am not in a position at present to tell the honourable member precisely what the situation will be in relation to remuneration. I am not aware of any discussion on this subject, but I am quite sure that before the matter is considered in the other place the Minister handling the Bill will be able to obtain that information.

Mr. KENEALLY: I understood the Government's policy was that senior public servants serving on boards would not receive any additional remuneration. I am not too clear what the Government's policy is but, if that is the case, it would surely have an effect if the Government was to appoint the General Manager (Mr. Didham) who, I understand, would probably attend all board meetings anyway in his administrative capacity. If the Minister believes that that information is available elsewhere and if he does not have it at his fingertips, I suspect that the Committee will have to accept that, but I do not know whether my colleagues will accept it.

Secondly, by the amendment in the Bill we now allow the Government to appoint members working for the trust to the board. That also allows worker participation, so that if a person was voted by his or her fellow workers to the board as a person suitable to represent them, amendments to the legislation allow that to take place. Whilst I am not expecting the Minister who has carriage of the Bill here to be able to say whether or not it is the Government's intention to facilitate that representation, at least I would be happy if the Minister would assure the Committee that these amendments would not prohibit worker participation on the Electricity Trust Board. If the Minister gives that assurance, it leaves the matter open and gives some encouragement to me and other Opposition members who strongly believe that such an appointment would strengthen the board and give some recognition to the work that these people do as well as to the democratic processes that we surely must all hope will be effected in South Australia.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: This Bill gives an opportunity for that to occur. The Act, as it stands now, totally prohibits that from happening. This Bill opens up the way. The honourable member is aware of how board members are appointed—they are direct appointments by the Government and, as such, if the Government sees fit to appoint an employee of the trust to the board, this amendment will allow that to happen. It is the same as if the Government makes the decision to appoint a particular person who happens to come from country areas—it is a decision of the Government. As I said earlier, it removes the restriction and enables the appointment of a person, from the General Manager right down the scale, whenever the Government feels there is a particular person who has expertise that would be valuable to the board at any time, say, for a given three-year

period, because of a certain area that the trust is moving into where that person's expertise could be extremely valuable to the trust.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 November. Page 1872.)

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the Bill, but with some severe reservations. If one reads the debate that took place in another place over the past couple of weeks one would conclude that the explanation to the Bill was completely patchy and not so much false but ill-advised. The Minister was completely evasive, which led to the debate on the Bill being carried on for far too long, in the opinion of the Opposition, mainly because of the Government's inability to come to terms with the amendments in the Bill.

Unfortunately, whenever there is a major amendment to the Local Government Act, the Government of the day tends to put into effect other amendments that it believes can be placed in that category. This Bill is typical of that situation. The main feature of this Bill is to change the date of local government elections from the first Saturday in July to the first Saturday in October. Unfortunately, due to the Government's explanation, other amendments failed to satisfy my colleagues in another place and I believe that they have failed to satisfy members in this House. I intend to go through all of the 73 clauses one by one, but I will give one example first.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Did you say you would go through all of them?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. I will now give one typical example. In the Minister's second reading explanation read in another place—and unfortunately the same explanation was read in this House—paragraph (g) of the upgrading proposals (which is related to clause 47, which was the catalyst of all the problems in another place) states:

an amendment removing the obligation for a council to collect all types of refuse from within its municipality, when, according to the nature of the refuse, specialist firms may be better suited for the purpose;

One can read paragraph (g) and then read the explanation given in regard to clause 47, which is the correct interpretation, and find that the explanation to clause 47 states:

Clause 47 proposes the repeal of sections 542 and 543 of the principal Act. Section 542 imposes on a municipal council a duty to keep public places in the municipality clean and to carry away at convenient times the ashes, filth and rubbish from dwellinghouses and other buildings in the municipality.

The clause proposes the repeal of this section for the reason that the duty to carry away household rubbish, if construed literally, would be quite onerous on councils. Instead, the removal of such rubbish will be authorised by sections 533 and 534 of the principal Act, while the clause substitutes a new section 542 retaining the duty to keep public places in municipalities clean. Section 543 provides that only council employees or persons contracting with a council shall remove rubbish from dwellinghouses and other buildings in the municipality. This section is not enforced and its repeal will remove the threat of prosecution for the private contractors currently providing a service of this kind.

No-one in his right mind will see any connection between the explanation of the clause and paragraph (g) of the upgrading proposals in the second reading explanation given in the other place and in this place. That was the area of disagreement. Anyone who can see a connection between the explanation of paragraph (g) and that of clause 47 does not understand the Local Government Act or the amendment we are discussing.

After all the hours of debate on clause 47 and the advice given to the Minister and his officers, one would have thought that the explanation would have been changed before it was given in this House. However, through the complete laziness of the Minister and his cavalier attitude, the attitude that he has the numbers and he could not care less, the same second reading explanation was given in this place. If there is to be lengthy debate in this Chamber, the responsibility lies with the Minister of Local Government, who at this moment is probably safely tucked away in bed.

The Australian Workers Union, which covers at least 99 per cent of council workers, entertained some fears about lack of consultation in this matter. There was a genuine fear that this would be seen as the next step in line with the edict issued by the Minister of Local Government in June last. I think it is relevant for me to read that edict of the Minister, because it deals with the attitude of the Government to day-labour employees of local government. The Minister's letter was directed to every local government body in this State, and it reads as follows:

Strong representations have been made to the Government about the involvement of local councils in private works, particularly in the area of earthworks and earth moving. I would like to remind councils that the Local Government Act makes no specific provisions for councils to be involved in private works outside of those related to roads and streets. Some councils are involved widely in a range of earthworks as a means of employing staff and equipment and earning extra revenue. I am advised that a council employed in such private works might have substantial difficulty in recovering a debt, because the activity was outside the powers specifically provided to local government in the Local Government Act.

It is the firm policy of the Government that, in its operations, it should employ the private sector as far as possible. This has the advantage of helping to develop a healthy private sector in the South Australian community, while at the same time ensuring that the contractor is professionally responsible and accountable for the standard of work that is done. As a development from this policy, not only do I urge councils to avoid becoming involved in private works that are outside their specific powers, but also themselves consider using private contractors for council work. The same advantages which the State Government believes are accruing in its own operations from the use of private contractors still hold true for local government as well. It is seen that the adoption of such a policy would permit councils to review their need to purchase some of the very large and expensive equipment now on the market, and enable the risk and the overheads to be shared by the private sector.

In order to be consistent in the application of its own policy, the Government has decided that its own departments and agencies should no longer employ local councils to carry out work on their behalf. An instruction will be issued to all departments and statutory bodies that they should seek tenders from private contractors to do site and other works for them. I would stress, however, that this does not apply to debit order works directed to local councils by the Highways Department.

I bring these matters to your attention because I am sure that you all share with the Government the wish that the

private sector in South Australia can be strengthened and provide the necessary basis for economic growth and employment which this State needs.

That edict did not deal with the collection of rubbish, but one can understand the fear of the Australian Workers Union when it sees the statement that specialist firms may be better suited for the purpose. I understand that fear, as I am sure do most of my colleagues on this side. We recognise that the explanation of clause 47 is relevant and that the principal Act states quite clearly that any householder who no longer wishes to place his rubbish on the street or who wishes to allow it to accumulate can then ring the council and ask for it to be collected. That provision of the principal Act needed to be amended. Nothing in the explanation, apart from the reference to clause 47, said that, so I can understand why the Australian Workers Union is fearful of the amendment. The union saw it as the next step in the Minister's wish to rid local government of its day-labour force and to employ private specialist firms to carry out those functions.

My colleagues in this House and I consulted with the Minister, and I consulted with senior officers of the department. We have asked for an assurance that the amendment in clause 47 will not affect the Australian Workers Union. We thought that it did not, but the union needed an assurance, either here or in the Upper House. Such an assurance was not forthcoming in the other place; in fact, the Minister waffled on, having no intention of giving such an assurance. I understand that senior officers of his department have perhaps prevailed upon him to see the wisdom of giving an assurance, and I hope that the Minister in charge of the Bill in this Chamber tonight will give it. If it meets the wishes of the Opposition, members on this side will be grateful and we will pass it on to the union.

When this Government was elected, apart from being elected on a platform of being a small Government which would reduce taxation, and so on, it said that it was going to consult with all bodies and organisations on legislation to come before the House. The final sentence of the Minister's second reading explanation, before the explanation of the clauses, stated that the Local Government Association had been consulted on the general provisions of the Bill and had raised no objection to the proposals.

If the Government believed that consultation with local government was necessary (and everyone would agree that the local government legislation is in a mess and the review committee has been considering it for the past 10 years because it needs to be updated and brought into line with a common sense approach to local government), one would have thought that the Minister would consider consulting with the Australian Workers Union, but he did not. In fact, on Wednesday night, when the President of the Australian Workers Union, because of sincere and genuine interests, went into the other place to see, in the interests of his members, what was happening in regard to this Bill, the Minister had to be introduced to him, because the Minister did not recognise him—that is the kind of consultation that we get from the Ministers on the other side.

That is where the Minister is going wrong: he consults with only one side. One would have thought that, before the amendment was discussed in the other place, the Minister would have directed his Director to talk to the Hon. Mr. Creedon and me, because we saw problems in the Bill. He would then have realised that the Opposition was troubled by one amendment. One would have thought that he would contact the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union and explain the situation, or perhaps he

could have asked his Director to pick up the phone and contact the Secretary of the union, but this Government does not believe in consulting with the trade union movement—it believes in consultation with employer organisations only.

We can take that one step further: during the debate in the other place, an amendment was incorporated into the Bill under clause 36. That amendment dealt not with the Australian Workers Union but with irresponsible councils that would be frightened to set a rate prior to going before the people. I will refer to this matter in more detail later. When the amendment was put before the other place, the Hon. Boyd Dawkins, who moved the amendment, was quick to tell the Council that he had consulted with members of the Local Government Association, and that proves the point I am trying to make—the Government always consults with the Local Government Association but never with the Australian Workers Union. Perhaps at this point I could correct a statement that was made in the Upper House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Order! The honourable member should realise that the Bill must be debated as it has come to this House. The majority of the comments that have been made by the honourable member have referred to another place. I ask the honourable member to speak to the Bill as it has been introduced in this House and to omit any reference to the other place.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. I will be guided by your ruling, but perhaps this situation shows what is wrong with the system. In the other place, there were something like eight hours debate—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have referred to the honourable member's comments in regard to the other place, and I ask him to speak on the Bill as it has been presented to this House.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. Perhaps I could rephrase my remarks about the deplorable history of this Bill prior to its introduction in this House. It is only fair that allegations made in my name—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. When an amendment to clause 36 was mooted, it was said that I had spoken to the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association, and it is only fair that I set the record straight in this regard. Bearing in mind the deplorable history of this Bill prior to its introduction in this House, I believe that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, will give me licence to correct the record. I contacted the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association, Mr. Hullick, in regard to an amendment that was to be made to clause 36, seeking the views of that organisation so that the Opposition could formulate its own view. When the issue was debated in the other place, it was said that the Secretary-General had stated that he was appalled by the amendment.

That is not correct: I contacted the Secretary-General, who told me that he had no idea that the amendment was before the House, and I asked whether the amendment would appal some of his members. He made no comment; therefore, it is only fair that the record be corrected. I have sufficiently canvassed the Bill before it was introduced into this House, so I will now go through the clauses one by one. I stated earlier that it is unfortunate that, in regard to the Local Government Act, when a major amendment is put forward, the Government of the day tends to put in minor administrative and other amendments and, whilst that may help to speed up consideration of the Bill, in some cases it can create

problems. One would hope that the Local Government Review Committee will speed up its consideration of the Act so that situations will not occur in which we discuss, for instance, not only the change of voting from July to October but other things as well.

Mr. McRae: It is about time they did, because the lawyers have been waiting for this, too.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I could not agree more with my colleague. I hope the Minister's rather foolish statement, that in 12 months his Government has done more in reviewing the Local Government Act than the previous Government did in the past 10 years, can come true, but I do not think it can, because the Minister, at the annual general meeting of the Local Government Association, stated that the Government was still working on the Act and that he was not quite sure when amendments would be made to the Act. However, three or four days later in the heat of the moment at 20 minutes past 12, the Minister made that rather foolish statement, and I hope he can live up to it. I have a lot to say about this very serious subject and I remember that, when I came into this Parliament, there were many experts on local government sitting on the back benches of the then Opposition, who told us where we were going wrong. As one of the real experts on local government, I will try to put this Government right.

We are dealing with amendments that will bring the legislation into line with the Electoral Act. I would be the first to agree that this Government is at last following the original provision put forward by Geoff Virgo for making voting procedures in local government easier for the electors (we no longer call them ratepayers), and not making people suffer a property franchise before being able to vote. In that sense, I applaud the Government.

Dealing with the clauses concerning the appointment of returning officers, deputy returning officers, and presiding officers, I will canvass some points which, I believe, are necessary, and I hope that the Government will consider them in its next batch of amendments to the Act.

Mr. Lewis: Stick to the Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will stick to the Bill. The member for Mallee should listen closely. I am sure that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, will tell me if I stray from the Bill, because you are usually a vigilant officer.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will listen closely, because I believe that the honourable member referred to matters that should have been considered. Therefore, he may not be sticking to the Bill. I ask him to debate the Bill, not matters that should be in the Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir. I will deal with the matter of voting, referring to amendments to postal voting procedures, the appointment of returning officers, deputy returning officers, and presiding officers, designed to bring the Act into line with the provisions of the Electoral Act, and that is where we should be looking when considering local government elections. In talking about the Electoral Act, we are talking about not only the names and titles of officers who are given duties within the organisational area of the poll, but also about bringing the legislation into line with other aspects of the Electoral Act. For many years, there has been criticism (usually from unsuccessful candidates in local government elections) that, because of the responsibility of receiving nominations (and we are talking about receiving nominations in the Bill), and the fact that people receive postal votes, etc., there could be a suspicion that individual returning officers could favour individual candidates. No-one will lay any specific charges against any individual returning officer.

When we talk about voting in State and Federal elections, and union elections run under the auspices of the Electoral Department, Electoral Department officers

receive nomination papers. That is their responsibility, and no-one else has any idea of who is nominated. Those of us who have been involved in local government (I see that the member for Rocky River is listening intently to what I am saying) will know that, if a particular returning officer, usually the clerk, wishes to have some influence on the nominations as they appear, he can, in his misguided wisdom, notify certain people.

Mr. Lewis: Where is your evidence?

Mr. HEMMINGS: If one can talk about corruption in government, local government would have a hard job in defying anything that does not smack of corruption in its election workings. Like yourself, Mr. Acting Speaker, I was always elected on a unanimous vote, usually unopposed, so we did not have to take part in this corruption, whereas others have had to use it. It is a serious matter that a clerk, who is acting as a returning officer, who finds that a very good member of the council is being challenged, perhaps by someone who may be able to get some support, can release that information so that the person he wants on his council, for good reasons, can then marshal two, three, four or five other people to nominate, thereby splitting the vote, thus almost guaranteeing that the clerk's nominee would be elected. That can go on.

Mr. Lewis: Is it corrupt?

Mr. HEMMINGS: If the honourable member thinks that that is not corrupt, I would have hated to stand for local government in his area. As it was, I stood in Elizabeth, where everyone was pure and honest, and always the best candidate was elected. That area is suspect. If this Government is so keen to bring local government elections into line with the provisions of the Electoral Act, it should consider using the Electoral Department as a vehicle for receiving nominations, so that no-one can say that there is any form of corruption in the receiving of nominations.

Other areas of local government elections concern me. In local government elections we still retain the cross for the candidate of a voter's choice. If this Government is sincere in saying that the Bill is designed to bring the Act into line with the provisions of the Electoral Act, one would have thought it would have used an optional preferential voting system, but there is no mention of this. I cannot mention what occurred in another place concerning this Bill, but I understand that a few senior Liberal members of that august place canvassed this idea. I hope that the Government, in its next batch of amendments, will bring voting in local government elections into line with what applies in State and Federal elections. What is even more important is that it make voting in local government elections compulsory.

It has always concerned me (and I know that it has concerned you, Mr. Acting Speaker (as a former member of local government), that that important third tier which has a direct contact with the grass roots of the community, that tier which, as the years have progressed, has had more and more State and Federal money made available to it, can be elected on a 10 per cent vote. I remind the House that, when I entered local government, I went across to my returning officer and suggested that I wished to nominate. I was given the rather startling advice "Door-knock 400 homes, get them to vote for you, and you are in."

That is what local government is all about and, until we bring compulsory voting into local government, that is the kind of thing we are going to have. In bringing this Act into line with the provisions of the Electoral Act, I hope that the Government will seriously consider optional preferential voting and also compulsory voting.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS: Members opposite say "Rubbish"; that is all they can talk about. I also want to deal with the amendment which enables councils to enter into schemes for the establishment of aged persons cottage homes. This is something that has been dear to my heart for some considerable time—that local government should recognise its responsibility, that it has something more to offer the community than roads, rates and rubbish, and that it should be involved in this matter. I congratulate the Government for this amendment. I ask members to look at that amendment and also at the following rather vague statement in the second reading explanation:

In this category are some amendments which give effect to local government policies of this Government as enumerated in the August 1979 statement of Liberal Party local government policy.

In effect, what that is saying to local government is, "If you want to build aged persons cottage homes, go for your life. This amendment will allow you to do that, and to circumvent some of the problems that you have experienced in the past." However, nowhere in the Liberal Party policy which was put out in August 1979 can I see mention of any assistance to local government. That is also the case with the clause dealing with the provision of a community bus service. This Government says it is giving local government greater responsibility and greater involvement, and by amending the Act it is saying that local government can get involved, but at the same time it is not giving local government any money or any grants, by which I mean not necessarily through local government moneys but perhaps through community welfare or some other Government agency. That makes the Government's intentions very hollow indeed. We know the record of local government—unless funds are forthcoming, local government does not want to know. I think the grand statement concerning enumeration of the Liberal Party's policy of August 1979 is not in good taste. Unless the Government had said in the second reading explanation or by an equivalent statement from the Minister of Community Welfare that there would be grants to local government for it to become involved, I think we are just wasting our time. The same situation applies with regard to library services. This Government's record in providing library services, which I shall deal with in relation to another clause, is also completely hollow.

I have dealt with the clause dealing with the obligation of councils to collect all types of refuse, and I hope that the Minister will give us the assurance I have sought tonight. One thing that makes Opposition members slightly uneasy is the clause dealing with the South Australian Jockey Club. We all know the trouble that the Adelaide City Council has had with a certain lady who objected to trees being chopped down. We also know that this amendment is being introduced to allow the Adelaide City Council to go ahead with any development of the racecourse area in conjunction with the South Australian Jockey Club. One thing that concerns me—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You mean another one?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Another matter that concerns me—I can deal with quite a number of other things that concern me if the Minister wants to carry on that way—is that there are specific areas for which admission can be charged and from which any person can be ejected. This Bill increases that area, and the final paragraph in the explanation states:

It should be said that this proposal does not mean the question of a lease has been settled: it merely means that the articles of any future lease can reflect existing usage and practice.

I hope that the Minister in his reply will be able to explain

exactly what that means, because the original second reading explanation that was given in the other place differs from the one that the Minister gave in this place. If he would like to check them out, he will find that there were two words deleted in another place which were not deleted from the Minister's speech in this place, and that does concern me.

I will now deal with the clause which the Government feels is the most significant, and that is the changing of the council elections from the first Saturday in July to the first Saturday in October.

Mr. Mathwin: Well, that's a good idea.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The member for Glenelg, in his usual sweeping way, says, "That's a good idea." He said that Proclamation Day should be preserved, and a year later said that Proclamation Day should go, so perhaps by next year he will say that we should go back to the first Saturday in July, but he is not a very consistent man. We were told in the second reading speech that:

For several years there has been general dissatisfaction where new councillors elected to office in July who have had no previous exposure to the workings of a council find among their first duties the determination of a budget and the declaration of rates.

No-one would deny that. We all went through that in our first election to office in local government, and we also accept that local government generally considers that there should be a change. We know that the executive of local government is for the change from the first Saturday in July to the first Saturday in October. At the annual general meeting of the Local Government Association, at which I was present, the President made that remark forcibly. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris in another place was the first person to say openly that there were many councils that objected to this. As the debate proceeded in the other place, Opposition members heard that more and more councils were opposed to a change from the first Saturday in July to the first Saturday in October, and that some wanted it in the Easter period. I realise that there are problems during the Easter period. When the Labor Party was in Government we recognised the problems of fitting it in between the day that nominations were declared open and the day of the election. However, the thing which concerns us, which concerns the executive of the Local Government Association, and which I think concerns the Minister, is that there are people in local government whose sole reason for objecting to elections being held on the first Saturday in October is that they are frightened to face the ratepayers or the electors after setting the budget or the rate. The fact was brought out in an amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in another place which in effect dealt with that matter.

Mr. Mathwin: They had some trouble in Elizabeth council about that. They blamed it on the Town Clerk, didn't they? Mr. Hemmings was the Mayor, I remember, at that time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will ignore that rather stupid outburst.

Mr. Mathwin: Because it is true, isn't it?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I was talking about irresponsible councils—

Mr. Mathwin: Which blamed the Town Clerk.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I do not usually answer interjections, but I think I will place some remarks on record about the matter that the member for Glenelg is talking about. I went public in protecting my Town Clerk, and more senior and responsible members of his Party came to me and privately and publicly congratulated me. The member for

Goyder did that, the Premier did that, as did the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Mr. Mathwin: Did the Town Clerk—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HEMMINGS: We should send him back to the old gum tree and let him sit there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS: One of the things about this amendment is that there is a very good chance that, within the next 12 or 18 months, this Government will amend the Act yet again and change the date to the Easter period, because there is a growing movement within local government that says that October is not satisfactory.

Mr. Max Brown: Mainly because of the budget.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mainly because of the budget. The fact is that this Government was forced to introduce another amendment providing that local government must declare its rate by 31 August. In effect, that was to stop local government from sitting over from the first Saturday in October and then declaring its rate in either the third week in October or in November, which is what was happening in July. That means that this Government is not sure of local government's attitude, yet the Minister has told us that local government is generally happy with the Bill. I would like an assurance from the Minister tonight that there is no intention to gauge the reaction of local government over the next 12 or 18 months to see whether there will be a further amendment. We all tend to laugh at local government and say that it does not really mean much—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Who laughs at local government?

Mr. HEMMINGS: A lot of people. I am not saying that the Minister does. I do not; I treat it very seriously.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I hope you are not saying that the Government laughs at local government.

Mr. HEMMINGS: After the way the Minister in another place treated this Bill, I would say that he treats local government with contempt. There again, history will judge this particular Minister's attitude towards local government. There is a problem. We are aware that many local councils, although initially quite happy to proceed with local government elections on the first Saturday in October, had second thoughts, because they realised that they would have to set a budget and declare a rate two or three weeks before the election. Therefore, they would be facing the hip pocket nerve of the electorate, and they are now considerably worried. The amendment put forward by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins at least ensures that the rate will be declared by 31 August. However, I would not like to think that in a year's time we in this Chamber will be debating a further change. At least the Minister should be able to give this House a complete assurance that there is no intention to change the date at any time in the future.

Mr. McRae: I bet he won't.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Of course he will not give us that assurance, and that is unfortunate. We never get any assurances from the Minister in charge of a Bill concerning local government. I understand that there is one assurance in his pocket concerning the Australian Workers Union, but I think that is the only assurance we will receive tonight. There are other matters in this Bill which, of course, are consequential on the change of date of the elections.

I now turn to clause 63 which deals with postal voting papers and I believe it is the second most important clause. All members would be aware of the situation that prevailed beforehand. If one required a postal vote, application would have to be made, and the postal vote

was then posted to the elector. It was then filled out and posted back. That was a very archaic situation, and I congratulate the Government for changing that procedure, although it simply brings the system into line with the existing Electoral Act.

I come back to the rather sloppy way that this second reading speech has been written. In relation to clause 64, it states:

Clause 64 amends section 841 of the principal Act, which in its present form requires postal voters to post their voting papers to the returning officers in all cases. The clause amends this section so that an elector who will be absent on polling day may, having applied for a postal vote and received postal voting papers over the counter, mark his vote on the paper and then deliver the papers back over the counter.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what will happen in that situation? This clause simply states that a person who will be absent on election day will go to the council office and apply for a postal vote. He will then be given a voting paper, which he passes back over the counter. One would have thought that that would be clearly explained in the Bill. I am not suggesting that any junior clerk in charge of the counter will take the voting paper home.

The explanation of that clause also states that a postal vote can be delivered up to the time of the closing of the poll. Anyone who knows anything about elections, whether they be local government, Federal or State, would know that the Chief Returning Officer does not stay in one particular place. I can see a real problem arising, and I hope that the Minister can explain it tonight. It has not been adequately explained that when voting papers are returned they will go to the right person. Archaic and as bad as it was, the old system at least guaranteed that a voting paper had to go back to the returning officer by a certain time. Therefore, the system was correct. In no way is this clause explained in this sloppy second reading explanation. I am sure that if Government members read it they will not be able to understand it either. I now turn to clause 68.

For some reason known only to itself, the Government wishes to increase the maximum penalty for fishing in the Torrens River from \$10 to \$200. No reason is given. One can understand, when dealing with parking offences or other local government offences, that the courts are given the power to impose rather substantial fines. However, when we are discussing the Torrens River, the only water course in the metropolitan area, why is it so important to stop someone from fishing there for a few yabbies or a carp that might have managed to enter the river? If the Minister can give us a reason why the environmental impact of too much fishing in the Torrens River justifies an increase in the fine from \$10 to \$200, and if he can tell us how they are going to extract \$200 from the little fellow down there with his fishing rod, we will be grateful and will obviously go along with that clause.

As it is, clause 68 amends section 8, which regulates fishing in the Torrens River, by increasing the maximum penalty against an offence from \$10 to \$200. One could say that it is an extension of the Adelaide City Council's attitude towards parking meters. With due respect to the House and bearing in mind the late hour, I will skip the rest of the clauses, but I believe that the Government should have given further explanation. There are certain areas that we wholeheartedly support, but other areas require greater explanation. Primarily, as regards voting and the repeal of existing sections 542 and 543 of the Act, we believe common sense has prevailed, and some explanation is forthcoming.

We have never denied that, under existing section 542,

people could have made use of the council, but I think that the explanation given is inconsistent, and that the Minister will be the first to agree with that. If the Minister can give us a suitable explanation and an assurance on this matter, we can guarantee the speedy passage of this Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the Bill, but I have reservations about the two clauses involving garbage collection and elections. First, I ought to say that garbage collection has been expertly carried out by the Unley City Council over the years. No-one could condemn the people concerned in any way: they are gentlemen, who cater for the needs of the people in the district. From my own experience, never at any stage have I heard a bad word said against these people, and never at any time have they not done their job. But, all of a sudden, the Government has done something to make these people think that they may lose their jobs.

I was at their picnic recently, when this matter was canvassed strongly by employees of the Unley City Council who are members of the Australian Workers Union. What happens in this district may happen in other districts: a clean-up campaign is conducted and in certain districts a unit from a truck stands in the street for a week or so and then it is taken away. The Unley City Council over a period has had such a clean-up campaign, which is taking place again this year and is in progress now. Workers in the Unley City Council used their own truck last year, and then it was decided to use a private contractor with his truck. This was manned by people employed by the council, and it was done excellently and always on the appointed day, except in inclement weather, when the system might have been upset. The clean-up campaign was kept up to date and was carried out excellently by those involved. Now, however, it has completely changed. It is all done by a private contractor, whereas it used to involve five men from the council.

Jobs are hard to get these days, and there have been many retrenchments. What has started here can go even further. These council people's jobs are in jeopardy. If this Bill is passed, I am afraid that many people may be retrenched. I am not sure that the Opposition has the Minister's guarantee on this matter; he certainly has not reassured me. I am concerned about the future of these people in the Unley council who collect garbage in the area. Unley is a built-up area, and one hardly ever saw any refuse left in the streets. However, under the new system, it is lying around everywhere. The collector does not attend on the days he should, and it is a bad situation for the district and all concerned. I would like the Minister's guarantee on this. I would like him to go even further and give an assurance concerning the proper collection of refuse, although maybe he is not in a position to do that.

Councils in this State, whether country or city, are divided about what will happen regarding these new election dates. I know that there are arguments for and against and that a decision has to be made. The Minister does not have the support of all councils in this matter, although perhaps he has their majority support; I am not sure of that. I know that the Unley council is divided on this issue, and candidates will also be divided on it in future. Before members are elected to this place, policies are usually expressed by the Government and Opposition on certain matters. However, many people standing in local government elections do not understand how council budgets work; especially nowadays, more and more persons attaining office are entirely new to local government.

Before their election those people say that they are not going to raise the rates, or do certain things, without in

many cases understanding what local government is about. They make promises and then find, on being elected to council that they cannot fulfil their promises to their constituents.

Perhaps it would be better for councillors, after being elected, to learn precisely how councils work. I must praise the people involved in local government, because they do an excellent job. Many fine people are performing an excellent function in local government. Whether or not a change in the election date will be of benefit is something for councils to decide in the future. We can generally say that on the first Saturday in July there are few elections for State or Federal Parliament, so that may give candidates for local government an opportunity to canvass their districts without people getting them mixed up with people running for Parliament. Other elections are held later in the year, but I am willing to give this new date a try.

I have never been in local government, but I have had a close liaison with the Corporation of the City of Unley. One thing that worries me and possibly many people, however, is voting at local government elections. I believe in compulsory voting for anything where money is involved, because people should have a say in where their money goes. Whether a person pays rent or owns his own home, he pays or at least contributes towards council rates. I think we have too many methods of voting in elections; sometimes we have voting by numbers and, at others, voting by a cross. We should all vote one way or the other; we should not be divided on this issue. I know that if we voted by cross that would cut out preferential voting. However, I believe the use of one method of voting would improve the system.

It has been tried by the Local Government Association, and was reasonably successful, but not as successful as the association and the Premier would have liked it to be. Local Government is part and parcel of people's lives, and they pay for it. I do not know whether the Government agrees with compulsory voting at local government elections, but we are getting closer to it all the time and it may be implemented in the future. If voting is not compulsory many people do not vote, yet after the election, particularly a local government election, it is often the people who did not vote or take an active interest who cause a stir. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. The member for Napier seems to pay tribute only to the past Minister of Local Government, Geoff Virgo. If the honourable member had been in this country long enough, he would realise that this all began with the recommendations of a Local Government Revision Committee set up in 1965 by the then Minister of Local Government, Stan Bevan. So Stan Bevan should get a mention in relation to the setting up of that committee. He was then followed by the Hon. Murray Hill, and Mr. Virgo cannot get much credit for bringing down these recommendations. There is no doubt that he did quite a lot in the area of local government. I remember his fingers being well and truly burnt at one time when he started talking about precisely what members on the other side have been saying about introducing compulsory voting in local government elections. It was only then that that gentleman learnt that when dealing with local government one has to be a bit careful, because the people involved are very jealous of their rights and very partisan about some of the issues involved.

I need not remind the House about the issues involved in changing council boundaries, which is a partisan issue with any council and the people living in that council area. The member for Napier had a lot to say about the date of

the election. He should look at the report by the Local Government Act Revision Committee dealing with powers, responsibilities and organisation of local government in South Australia. Paragraph 1396 on page 154 states:

It is a curious feature of the local government legislation in Australia that there is no uniformity at all as to the date upon which the ordinary election is to be held. Even the month varies from March (in the case of Tasmania) to December (in the case of New South Wales).

In paragraph 1397 it is stated that in Queensland it is the last Saturday in April; in Western Australia it is the fourth Saturday in May; in South Australia it is the first Saturday in July; in Victoria it is the fourth Thursday or the Saturday next following in August; and in New South Wales it is the first Saturday in December. Paragraph 1398 states:

The committee has received evidence that the first Saturday in July is an unsatisfactory date for the holding of annual elections. For example, Ald. L. A. Ellis, of the City of Enfield wrote to the committee advocating a change from the July date because of "the difficulty of arranging or finding candidates with business commitments to offer at the present end of year period".

The report goes on in regard to the matter of the date. Many people gave evidence about why the election date should not be in July. This gentleman stated in the transcript:

This is obviously sound commonsense. The end of the financial year is a busy one for many people and particularly so for company executives, accountants and auditors.

Paragraph 1400 states:

The committee recommends that the date for the annual elections be changed from July.

Paragraph 1402 provides:

The December date used in New South Wales does not seem a desirable one to adopt. If the holding of elections early in July discourages businessmen and professional men standing for election, surely the holding of elections in what may at the least be described as the working up period for Christmas sales must have some discouraging effect on businessmen who would otherwise be interested in standing for election.

The report goes on to say that a submission was received from the city of Payneham. The submission states:

It is an unfortunate situation . . . We had an experience here last year of brand new faces bobbing up, sitting around the table, in the first meeting in July and then about three meetings later we're considering a year's estimates and striking our rate for the year.

The member for Napier would well know that situation, because he has been in local government, just as I have been. I well remember my time in local government. My first meetings were to determine and strike the rate. I found that to be most upsetting, because I did not feel that I was equipped to undertake such a responsible job. I think the recommendation in regard to local government was that the date should be in October, which would give a council member a longer period to consider the situation before being called on to make a decision in regard to striking the rate. I draw the attention of the House to evidence supplied by Mr. Davidson, the Clerk of the District Council of Kapunda. He stated:

It would possibly be better for such new members to attend quite a few meetings before they are confronted with this big problem of a budget.

Paragraph 1404 states:

Nearly 14 years ago it was recorded that "Victorian local government officers would probably agree that their own

election date is unsatisfactory because of its close proximity to the estimates and the consequent loading of the heaviest work of the local government year into too short a period."

There is indeed evidence in this report, which is available for any member to read, indicating that it was the desire of all local government because; not one part of the evidence indicates that the election date should remain in July. In the summary of the recommendations on page 162 of the report, paragraph 1468 states:

The date of the annual elections should be changed from July because, falling as it at present does about the end of the financial year, it comes at a time when many people who should be attracted into councils cannot afford the time to stand for election.

It is for these reasons that I took part in this debate. I felt that there was perhaps some misunderstanding, because the member for Napier suggested that it was wrong that we should change the date from July. Yet here in this report is sufficient evidence. The report was worked on for many years and involved members of councils and other representatives who spent many hours on it.

I refer to the two members opposite who have referred to compulsory voting. I am opposed to that completely. Indeed, I am surprised that the member for Napier spoke the way he did, because he came from a country where elections in all spheres are voluntary.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: More's the pity.

Mr. MATHWIN: There are a few countries in the world that have compulsory elections. The honourable member should know that, other than totalitarian governments. Does the honourable member want us to have a system similar to that in Spain? Russia has voluntary elections, but I refer to Turkey. I think only six countries in the world have compulsory elections, and if the honourable member wants us to share our bed with such types of government, then I am sorry, but he will never get my support for that.

The honourable member knows that a voluntary vote is a considered vote. People go to vote if they consider the situation and they then give a responsible vote. Many people who are forced to go to the polls do anything to save themselves from having to pay the \$8 to \$10 fine or whatever it is. I remind the member for Salisbury and other Opposition members that the former Minister of Local Government (Hon. G. T. Virgo) found with a rude shock that the people of this State and local government would not stand for that sort of decision from a Government. I suggest that the honourable member does his research a little better, particularly around his home people in his own district. He should ascertain how they feel. The honourable member represents many people from the United Kingdom who are not used to being forced to go to the polls. In England they are used to the cross system. I have not read the honourable member's Party's platform recently but, from memory, the little green book stipulates that voting is by a cross.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I hope that the honourable member is not going to deal at length with the cross system of voting, because I do not recall there being anything in this Bill about that matter. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I was just replying because this matter has been dealt with by members from the other side of the House. I bow to your ruling and know that you are quite impartial and that you would not want me to get on to the wrong line. I bow to your ruling because you, Mr. Acting Speaker, happen to be the boss in here by sitting in the Chair.

I leave those thoughts for honourable members

opposite, especially for the member for Salisbury, who seems to think that compulsory voting is one of the main things that should happen. I support the Bill.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I have various comments to make on the various provisions of the Bill, and I want to make some comments on aspects touched on by the member for Glenelg that come within the ambit of the Bill. The Local Government Act is a very complex and large Act, and I was interested to learn tonight just how complex it is by comparison. The Act contains 908 sections and 24 schedules, and it is interesting to see that it is almost exactly three times the size of the Constitution of the Republic of India, which has only 290 sections and eight schedules—a most interesting feature that we believe that local government is so convoluted and so complex a matter that it takes such a large Act.

The Bill seeks to amend certain of the 908 sections. I will be touching on some not yet touched on, because I believe there are hidden points of significance worthy of mention in those areas but, before doing so, I will come to the two areas touched on most frequently—the matter of the date being set for the election, and the matter of the collection of refuse.

Regarding the date of the election, I support the provisions of the Bill, which has been amended from the Bill in its original form introduced in another place. In its amended form it means that the setting of the rates will still have to be done by 31 August. That is a wise move. The suggestion mooted in certain quarters that the option for declaring of the rates should be deferred until after the election of the council in October has many complications, not least of which is that we would have councils seeking to have their elections before the declaration of the rate so that they could not be held immediately accountable for that declaration; there would be a 12-month delay.

I want to put another problem that we would have if the suggestion of having an October declaration of the rate had been accepted. Inasmuch as the present declaration of the rate runs up to about two months after the election of councillors, it would be worse with an October declaration. It would be four months into the financial year; fully one-third of the financial year would have expired before the rate had been declared and only two-thirds would be left. That places two constraints. It places an important constraint on the elected councillors. If they come into the council situation with one-third of the year having gone, they are severely circumscribed in their ability to adjust the rate, because a spending pattern would have been established already.

Under this measure, a council will be able to continue to set its rate by the end of August, only two months or one-sixth of the way into the year, and it will have 10 months or five-sixths of the year still to come, allowing a greater opportunity for an elected council to adjust the rate and to see that adjustment responsibly reflected in council spending.

As a second constraint, to keep to the October figure would mean that far too often councillors would feel obliged to accept, without much discussion or consideration, the advice of council staff about what the rate should be, because the council staff could argue legitimately that they had already gone through much of the year and little else could be done to change the system without causing financial chaos in the council books.

If it is done in the early stages of the year, the council has the opportunity to adjust. I know from my experience on the local council that the council showed that ability to adjust. In one case, we cut the rate dramatically below what the staff had recommended, and there had been cries

that this could not be acceded to. Because it was done so early in the year, by the end of the financial year the deficit projections were not lived up to to the extent that the greater pessimists had suggested. I believe that the Bill before the House, with regard to the date for the setting of the rate, is wise in that aspect. I support that, and I think all members of this place would be wise to support it, too.

Another question that comes with the rates is the matter of whether we should have rate setting before or after an election. If one looks at the growth of imposts at the various levels of Government, I believe that one of the most dramatic areas of growth has been the local government area. The percentage increases in local government rates in many areas have far exceeded the growth in wage rates, and in many instances have exceeded inflation rates. In many situations that could be done because councils have been secure in the fact that they have up to 12 months more before they have to face the electorate. Having it the reverse way, having the setting of the rate relatively close before an election, means that councillors have to consider the impact on the average wage earner.

I have received many complaints in my electorate about the economic effect of the increase in rates. People are commenting on how much it is taking out of their pay packets to meet the rates bill. They are arguing that their wages have not kept pace with the growth of rates over the last few years, and by forcing councils to have their rate declarations before elections, councillors will have to justify them to the ratepayers and say, "We still believe that you should pay higher than average rates because," and then outline the reasons, and stand the judgment of the ratepayers as to whether or not they believe that reasoning is correct.

Councils deal in many cases with large sums of money. In the Salisbury council, the rate revenue alone is more than \$6 000 000 a year, a large sum for local government. Such an amount needs a greater degree of accountability. I do not say that the Salisbury council has not expressed that accountability. I believe it has performed remarkably well over the years in spending money and in providing community services. I am making the general point that there is no harm in our having election dates only two months after a declaration of the rate, because councillors should be prepared and able to defend themselves in the light of a rate increase and to justify it. That is what politics at the local government level is all about.

With regard to another area, the question of refuse collection, some points worry me greatly. In the Estimates Committees I raised the matter of contract cleaning in the education area and the problems I foresaw with regard to the enforcement of industrial conditions. This is a principal problem of the employment of contractors to perform certain services, the control which the elected body has over ensuring that industrial conditions are properly applied.

In case it should be thought that I raise unnecessary fears, I would quote an example of a local council in my vicinity which has refuse collection done by contractors. My predecessor met a constituent who came to him with a workers compensation matter saying that he had a legitimate claim for workers compensation payments, that he was entitled to those payments by legal opinion, but that he was told that he would not be able to proceed against the contractor, because the contractor had not lived up to his obligation to take out insurance on this matter that would be able to meet the payments that the constituent was entitled to and that, if he pressed his workers compensation claim, the likely possibility was that the contractor would go bankrupt.

That would mean that the local government authority would merely let out another contract, but the constituent in question would not have his compensation claim attended to. That is the sort of thing that I fear—the extent to which unscrupulous contractors (and I do not suggest that all contractors are unscrupulous) take advantage of situations. If situations go wrong and if they fall foul of the law, they can solve the problem by merely disappearing in a corporate sense and leaving the worker to be the victim. I strongly believe that garbage collection should be handled by corporations directly; the corporations should employ the people, purchase the trucks, arrange for the disposal of the refuse, and should have more direct policing of the industrial conditions under which people work.

Clause 39 amends section 383 of the principal Act, and provides that councils can contribute towards the provision of motor omnibus services for the transport of passengers, for hire or otherwise. In general, I support that clause. I believe that councils could do good work in providing community bus services, and I know that the Salisbury council has been involved in a joint committee in regard to the operation of the community bus services in that area. I am also aware that other councils have done the same. However, I point out that some dangers may be faced. When I was overseas, I had the good fortune to meet transport authority people in The Netherlands and I discussed the question of community bus services, because they are particularly well advanced in that country. The authorities there have already faced many of the problems that can occur in regard to community bus services, particularly the problem that employees of the regular bus services feel that their position is somewhat threatened. It should be noted that community bus services in The Netherlands are regarded as being feeder services to regular transport runs; they do not detract from these runs, but help make regular transport runs more viable by increasing passenger access to them.

The second requirement that has been accepted by the Dutch authorities is that, where community bus services reach a certain level of patronage, they automatically transfer to the regular network, and the drivers are paid according to the award conditions and receive all of the rewards to which they are entitled under the awards. By those two constraints, the Dutch Government believes it is able to meet the legitimate qualms and worries of regular paid drivers of the regular transport system, at the same time providing for the needs of communities with the community bus concept. If councils are to become more actively involved in this area, as the Minister in another place obviously wants, he should pay attention to this kind of constraint and consider whether it might apply here. While I applaud community bus initiatives, I believe that those areas should be given more attention.

Clause 67 amends section 858 of the principal Act and deletes the reference to the request of 100 electors and replaces it with the words "not less than 10 per cent of the electors enrolled on the voters' roll". I wonder about that figure of 10 per cent and I also wonder about the differences that must exist between councils of different sizes. I know that the Corporation of the City of Salisbury is very large; I venture to suggest that it is probably the largest in population terms in the metropolitan area. It can be compared to much smaller councils, such as the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville. Ten per cent of the number of Salisbury electors will represent a much larger figure than 10 per cent of the number of Walkerville electors. I do not have the figures to hand, but I suggest that 10 per cent of the electors of the City of Salisbury would be well nigh equal to the voting population of the

Town of Walkerville, and this means that, if there is a borrowing proposed in each city for a facility of the same cost, the electors of Salisbury would have to go to more trouble than the electors of Walkerville.

That is not a fair situation: the rights of access to the provisions of the Act should be similar. One could say that 10 per cent is the same in both areas but, in terms of getting that 10 per cent, it is much easier to get a 10 per cent that equals 500 than a 10 per cent that equals 5 000. There should either be a modification of the percentage figure chosen or an acknowledgement of the fact that some councils are very much larger than others. Even within the metropolitan context, some councils are larger than others, and I cite again the example of the Salisbury council as compared to the Walkerville council. There would be a dramatic increase in Salisbury if the figure was increased from the present 100 electors to the 10 per cent proposed—a difference of about 5 000. It will be more difficult for a community group within Salisbury to raise that figure. Certainly, in the non-compulsory voting situation that we have, it must be admitted that there have never been more than 5 000 people vote in the Salisbury area at election time for local government.

Clause 40 amends section 344a of the principal Act and gives councils the authority to bear part of the cost of constructing or repairing private streets or roads. I indicate my support for this provision, because, from past experience, I know that situations can occur in which no-one seems to be willing or able to construct roads through private property when those roads have a distinct public purpose. When I was on the Salisbury council some years ago, I was concerned with an interesting case in the Bolivar Park area. Some houses in the Bolivar subdivision next to the Globe Derby trotting facility were supplied with public roads—it is a public subdivision. However, by some quirk of planning in the past, access to other public roads from that local network of public roads is across private property. The private road that was owned by Globe Derby was not being maintained and its condition was becoming worse each winter. Naturally, the residents were upset and complained. The council was not in a position to maintain the road or to pay for its proper paving or grading.

Instead, ratepayers themselves faced the prospect of having to reach a private financial arrangement with the owner of the trotting course and paying for the road themselves, in total. It would have been much more logical for the council to have reached that financial arrangement with the trotting course, as provided in the clause in the Bill, and arrange to recoup, if such it wanted, from the ratepayers in question, who were to be serviced by the road, at its own leisure. I think that that clause is a useful one to see included.

Clause 18 refers to section 108 of the principal Act, and is one of the provisions referring to polling places. I believe that the Act is deficient to the extent that it does not touch enough on the whole question of polling places. It has been my contention for some time that polling places for local government should, as far as possible, be at similar venues to those used for State and Federal elections. Again, I cite the example in my own area. A great many of the polling booths used in local government elections are, indeed, different from those used in State and Federal elections. In an area where there is already much confusion in the minds of electors between the various levels of government, it does not help to have yet another area of confusion, namely, differing places for voting. I hope, since it has not been dealt with this time, that in the future that matter can be attended to, so that polling places can be made the same.

Clause 12 relates to returning officers. I am sorry to see that, again, in my opinion the clause is deficient to the extent that there is no particular stipulation whether the returning officer may or may not be a paid officer of the very council for which he is conducting the election. I believe that there could be grounds for suggesting that the returning officer should, indeed, be someone independent of the local government authority; he should not be an employee of that particular council. I do not want in any way to reflect on the way in which the returning officers may have conducted their duties in the past, but there have been occasions which could be open to interpretation, misinterpretation, or cynical interpretation and which might not have resulted in an elected councillor having the best opinion of the way in which the staff member, the erstwhile returning officer, performed his duties. I know in my own council area, with regard to my election, there was a difference of interpretation of the permissible wording of how-to-vote cards, inasmuch as an opponent of mine had how-to-vote cards that clearly stated his full policy. It was the largest how-to-vote card I have ever seen (it was A4 in size), and that was permitted. At another ward in that same city at another election a candidate who had only one-quarter as much information on the card was ruled out of order. A cynical man would venture to suggest that the returning officer had a biased opinion. I am not a cynical man, and I am not attempting to suggest that, but we must face the realities that that might have happened.

Another area of concern is with regard to the matter of compulsory voting. I believe that the Act has been deficient, since it has not touched on this area sufficiently. It has given consideration to voting and to changes in certain areas, such as postal voting, but it has not given attention to compulsory voting. It has been mentioned to us tonight that electors should exercise their responsibility, and they will do so only if it is proved to them that they should do so. I would like to argue a slightly different philosophy. In a democratic society, we have not only rights and privileges; we also have responsibilities. I think that all members would acknowledge that every single member has a democratic responsibility to pay his tax. I hope that we would all acknowledge that. We all know that the workings of government cost money and that, because it costs money, we do not enjoy the democratic right to say, "I don't want to pay tax. Someone else can." We all acknowledge that there has to be a compulsion to pay tax; that is part of the means by which we can preserve our democratic society.

I would argue the very same case for compulsory voting. I believe that it is our democratic responsibility to preserve the democratic system we have. One of the ways we can do it is by preserving it from extremist elements from whatever wing they come. This can most easily be done by compulsory voting. Because, by that means, you put upon those extremist groups of one side or the other the very heavy task of convincing 51 per cent of the entire electorate. In a non-compulsory situation, which the present Act has, I believe, mistakenly sought to maintain, at local government polls only a very few need to be convinced. In the situation we have seen in many council areas, the figures for voting are low indeed.

When I was first elected to council I achieved 130 votes; my opponent achieved 58. I have to confess that that was the average for the ward over the years gone by. In my second election, when re-elected to council, I achieved what was regarded in local terms as a landslide—270 votes. My opponent achieved 130 votes. That has to be taken as a ridiculous situation, where 270 could be regarded as a landslide, in an area that had over 4 000 electors. In other

words, 400 people in total made a decision out of the 4 000. It could easily have been the case that a cynical candidate could have attempted to manipulate local opinion bodies in that community and, by a very small margin of the total voting population, sought to distort the representation of that area. Indeed, in another ward in the same election at which I was re-elected by this landslide, another councillor won with 13 votes. His opponent received only 12, in an area which had fewer voters than mine, but still over 1 000 electors. How can that possibly be regarded as a true reflection of community opinion? How can it possibly be said truly to represent all the electors of the area? Surely that is what we want: a local government truly responsive to all members within that area. Therefore, to that extent, I believe that the Act is very much deficient in that regard.

Likewise, I believe that it is deficient in that it has not attempted to sort out the problem between State and Federal voting patterns and local government voting patterns. We have seen often how many scrutineers have reported to us in our various capacities in this regard that they have gone into local government elections at the end of the day to see the votes counted, and reported informal votes being piled up, because the numbers 1, 2 or 3 were written on the ballot-paper. The same scrutineers at the next State and Federal elections report back how many votes have been informal because a cross has been put on the ballot-paper. The differences between the systems confuse many people. The problem could easily have been solved by this particular amendment before us now going further than it has actually gone.

In many ways, the voting pattern, voting places, and the compulsion to vote indicate, I suggest, unnecessary attempts to limit the involvement of people in local government. I do not believe that that is what we are about or what we want. I believe that local government is a very important sphere of government in this country. In many ways, it is the level that provides many of the services needed, at the most immediate level, by many people in the country. Therefore, our attempt should be to increase public participation, either by voting or by elected participation.

As I have indicated, this Bill has achieved my support in certain regards. I am pleased with its provisions in certain matters, and I am unhappy with its deficiencies in other areas. In summary, I would therefore say that I indicate my support for the overall Bill, but the amendment to the Local Government Act before us is somewhat ambivalent, and I hope that the Minister handling the Bill in this House will report the matters that I have raised to the Minister in another place and ask for his serious consideration of and attention to these matters.

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

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I do not intend to speak very long in reply. I shall be pleased to answer any questions when the Bill comes to the Committee stage. However, there are a couple of matters to which I want to refer. Clause 47 seems to have been referred to by all Opposition members who have spoken. This clause repeals sections 542 and 543 of the Local Government Act, which sections deal with the power of council in relation to the removal of rubbish. Those sections are written in archaic language and impose unreasonable obligations on individuals and councils, as I think is generally recognised by both sides of the House. The new section 542 as proposed is a more modern, up-to-date replacement.

I appreciate that there has been lengthy debate in this

House and in another place on the effect that a repeal of those sections might have on local government employees under the South Australian award. As a result of this argument, I have had the award examined by the Solicitor-General to see whether there is any foundation to the argument. I refer now to the Solicitor-General's opinion, which I hope will allay any fears that members opposite may have. That opinion is as follows:

The doubts expressed by some members of the Legislative Council raise but do not call for any examination of the validity of the prescription beyond the effect upon it of the proposed repeal of section 543. It seems to me to be sufficient that those members be informed that, from a perusal of the transcript before the commission when the Local Government Employees South Australian Award was made, the A.W.U. advocate placed no reliance upon the provisions of the Local Government Act as supporting the inclusion of clauses 3 and 4 in the award. In my opinion, the provisions of the award cannot and do not rely upon sections 542 and 543 of the Local Government Act as a basis for their validity. Further, in my opinion, the exclusive franchise given to the councils by the existing sections 542 and 543 have no more force in supporting class 3 and 4 of the award than the provisions of section 543 read with the proposed new section 542 do, and in my opinion the repeal of the existing sections 542 and 543 will not affect the validity of the award.

I hope that pleases members opposite in regard to clause 47.

Mr. Mathwin: They have all gone.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. It is rather interesting that, after all the interest that has been shown by members on the other side, there is only one Opposition member in the House.

The Bill also changes the date of elections to the first Saturday in October, and this, too, has raised a certain amount of comment from the other side. Arguments have been raised, particularly in the other place when this matter was brought up, that this would clash with the long weekend. I am informed that research carried out by my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, has shown that the first possible clash in that regard is in 1984, and by that time, it is suggested, the Government will have had adequate opportunity to assess the success of the new election date, and if any changes are needed they can then be made prior to the 1984 election. However, the Government does not accept that the long weekend should mean lower attendances at local government polling booths, and the simplified procedures for postal voting arrangements contained in the Bill will assist those holidaying at the relevant time in 1984.

I want to deal briefly with other matters that have been brought up. The member for Napier referred to the Electoral Commissioner's receiving nominations instead of the clerk. I think when the member for Napier reads the debate in *Hansard* tomorrow he will see that what he has said is quite an insult to local government and to the clerks working within local government.

What has been raised is exactly in line with the Electoral Act, under which returning officers are not permitted by law to disclose nominations. The member for Napier might be interested to know that that section was actually amended in 1977 by the previous Minister of Local Government, Mr. Virgo.

Mr. Hemmings: How can you guarantee it's going to work? You cannot guarantee it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Reference was also made to clause 64. I do not know what the honourable member was getting at. I really do not know what on earth it does mean other than to permit what was outlined in the second reading explanation, that a person is able to fill in papers

and return them over the counter. The presiding officer can receive the papers on the day of the poll, and I think that is generally recognised, together with the fact that the presiding officer can be the returning officer.

Mr. Hemmings: It does not say that.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: All right. I am telling the honourable member now; the presiding officer can be the returning officer or the deputy returning officer; he has the authority to receive those papers.

Mr. Hemmings: What happens if the presiding officer is outside the council office? To whom does it go? One can put in a postal vote up to the close of a poll; who is going to receive it?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I shall check that out. I turn now to clause 68, as that has been referred to also. This clause corrects an administrative error in a previous amendment Bill that changed all the fines. I point out that the Adelaide City Council does not apply the power except, as I understand it, on the weir, and that is for safety reasons. There is no intention whatsoever to stop fishing altogether, as was indicated by the member for Napier. The city council has assured us that fishing will not be stopped.

As would be appreciated, voting patterns are being looked at by the review committee, but the intention is to determine the intention of voters, and I think that is

generally recognised. I want to make two other points relating to section 435, concerning housing for the aged. All this amendment does is permit councils any approved arrangements. Also, the matter of community buses was raised. I inform members that, as I understand it, there are about 11 councils that are running community buses which are, in fact, subsidised by grants from the Department of Transport.

[Midnight]

They are all smaller points, but I give an assurance in relation to the two matters that have concerned the Opposition more than any other. I am referring to clause 47 of the Bill and also the matter of the date of the actual elections.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported: Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.2 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 November at 2 p.m.

PALMDALE INSURANCE LTD.**OFFICE ACCOMMODATION**

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

1. What action, if any, has the Government taken in relation to the failure of Palmdale Insurance Limited?
2. What action, if any, is proposed for the future?
3. When does the Government propose that the statement contemplated in the last paragraph of the Premier's letter to the member for Mitcham of 30 April 1980 be made?

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

1. Legislation to establish a fund against which claims relating to workers compensation may be made in the event of the insolvency of an insurance company or an uninsured employer was introduced in the House of Assembly on 5 November 1980.

2. See 1.

3. The Minister of Industrial Affairs issued a press statement on 5 November 1980 announcing the proposed scheme and giving details of it.

282. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: When, if at all, does the Minister propose to answer my letter of 30 June to the Acting Minister of Industrial Affairs about the failure of Palmdale Insurance Ltd.?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The matters raised in the honourable member's letter of 30 June 1980 had previously been answered in respect of similar correspondence to the Premier (5 May 1980, 27 March 1980, 17 April 1980 and 13 February 1980). Legislation to establish a fund against which claims relating to workers compensation may be made in the event of the insolvency of an insurance company or an uninsured employer was introduced in the House of Assembly on 5 November 1980.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

309. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Did Mr. R. H. Allert of Allert, Heard & Co. draw up long term plans for the Riverland Fruit Cannery under instructions from the South Australian Development Commission?

2. Did Mr. Allert also draw up plans for the Southern Vales Co-operative long term operations under instructions from the South Australian Development Commission?

3. What is Mr. Allert's experience and expertise in the wine and canning fruit industries?

The Hon. W. CHAPMAN: The replies were as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Mr. Allert is a chartered accountant who has had experience in a wide variety of industries involving financial and management expertise.

INTEREST RATE

358. **Mr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government negotiate with the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia in an endeavour to have it lower its interest rate on loans to school councils to the level now offered by the National Bank?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No. School councils are under no obligation to seek loans through the Savings Bank and are able to explore the availability of finance from other sources (including the National Bank) to obtain the most favourable terms.

388. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How much space is vacant in the State Administration Centre, how long has it been vacant, and what plans has the Government for its use?

2. Is this vacant space the result of consolidation of a department into rented accommodation and, if so, which department?

3. How much is the rented accommodation now being used in lieu of the State Administration Centre costing the State per annum?

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

1. In order to allow for construction work, an area of 2 904 square metres has been vacant since February 1980. The area will be occupied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Publicity Section, Premier's Department. Occupation, in February 1981, will enable both departments to vacate leased accommodation, with consequent savings in rental charges.

2. The Public Buildings Department has vacated the State Administration Centre and moved to rented accommodation in Wakefield House which is owned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. The relocation has consolidated the city offices of the department, major elements of which were formerly dispersed in rented accommodation at various locations.

3. Wakefield House rental for offices previously located in the presently vacated areas of the State Administration Centre is calculated at \$375 000 per annum, inclusive of cleaning, electricity, water rates, maintenance and security.

389. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the former Publicity and Design Services Branch of the Premier's Department been dismantled and its officers transferred to other departments and, if so, how many such officers have been transferred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

2. When did the majority of the said officers move out of the office accommodation in the Grenfell Tower and has that leased accommodation remained vacant since then?

3. How much did the Government spend on fixtures and fittings for this accommodation in order to equip it for use by the Publicity and Design Services Branch and when was this expenditure incurred?

4. What plans has the Government for this accommodation?

5. How much have the lease payments for this accommodation cost the Government since it became vacant and if the Government is to buy out its lease commitments, how much will it cost to restore the premises?

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

1. Yes. Two.

2. Between 17 March 1980 and 7 July 1980. The accommodation is not vacant.

3. Expenditure totalling \$281 320 was incurred between September 1977 and May 1979 in commissioning the accommodation.

4. The head office operations of the Department of Fisheries will be concentrated on the 12th floor of the Grenfell Centre.

5. See 2. above.

MINISTERS' OFFICES

492. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Have there been any requests by Ministers to have their electorate or Ministerial offices refurbished and, if so:

1. Who are the Ministers;
2. What is the expected cost of each refurbishing;
3. Does the refurbishing allow for new or additional furniture;
4. What is the cost of each item of furniture; and
5. Will the furniture be manufactured in South Australia?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, the Attorney-General, the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Local Government, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Water Resources, the Minister of Education.
2. Total Costs of Refurbishing: Electoral Offices, \$1 832 plus \$10 800 for relocation costs of Minister of Transport's office. Ministerial Offices, \$17 952.

3. Includes both new and refurbished furniture.

4. Impractical to provide details of each item.

5. Furniture is generally assembled or manufactured in South Australia. Chairs are brought locally but manufactured interstate.

HOSPITALS CONFERENCE

586. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many senior administrative officers and medical superintendents and/or their deputies from each of the following hospitals attended the conference arranged by the Australian College of Health Service Administrators at Goolwa on Friday 19 September, what are the names of those who attended and what are the names and qualifications of those personnel left in charge of the hospitals, respectively: Adelaide Children's, Flinders Medical Centre, Glenside, Hillcrest, Lyell McEwin, Modbury, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Queen Elizabeth, Queen Victoria, Wallaroo and District, and Whyalla and District?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Name of Hospital	Names and qualifications of staff who attended the Conference	Names and qualifications of senior staff who were on duty at the respective Hospitals during the Conference
Adelaide Children's	Mr. J. M. Gibbs, Admin. Superintendent; Mr. C. E. Hall, Manager, Finance Services; Miss H. B. James, Director of Nursing.	Dr. M. T. J. Jelly, Assistant Medical Superintendent; Mr. T. A. Ball, Manager, Admin. Services; Mr. E. I. Lane, Manager, Hospital Services; Mrs. Z. Karay, Deputy Director of Nursing
Flinders Medical Centre	Mr. J. M. Hehir, Deputy Administrator; Mrs. M. Jonson, Assist. Administrator (Services); Miss A. Cook, Medical Records Officer; Mr. M. Dixon, Administrative Assistant; Miss A. Monck, Director of Nursing.	Mr. M. Foran, Admin. Officer; Mr. M. Hawkins, Assist. Admin. (Management Services); Mr. R. Greatrex, Finance Director; Miss C. Summers, Acting Deputy Director of Nursing.
Glenside	Dr. A. S. Czechowicz, Superintendent; Dr. E. Glew, Specialist Psychiatrist Class 2; Mr. A. Tucker, Finance Officer; Mr. J. Howland, Admin. Assistant.	Dr. J. A. Carson, Acting Superintendent; Dr. B. R. Meldrum, Assist. Superintendent; Dr. K. Halwax, Assist. Superintendent; Dr. R. Steele, Assist. Superintendent; Mr. G. Gabb, Acting Senior Admin. Officer.
Hillcrest	Dr. N. M. James, Superintendent	Dr. D. J. Rampling, Assist. Superintendent; Mr. D. Wall, Senior Admin. Officer; Mrs. L. Barnett, Nursing Superintendent.
Lyell McEwin	Mr. O. H. Rose, Administrator; Miss J. A. Baohm, Director of Nursing	Mr. A. J. De Bruin, Medical Superintendent; Mr. J. A. Fischer, Acting Secretary/Accountant; Mrs. P. E. Firstbrook, Deputy Director of Nursing.
Modbury	Mr. D. J. Coombe, Administrator	Dr. G. D. Williamson, Assist. Medical Admin.; Mr. D. Young, Acting Assist. Administrator; Miss L. M. Schneider, Director of Nursing.
Mount Gambier	—	All senior staff

Name of Hospital	Names and qualifications of staff who attended the Conference	Names and qualifications of senior staff who were on duty at the respective Hospitals during the Conference
Port Augusta	—	All senior staff
Port Lincoln	—	All senior staff
Port Pirie	—	All senior staff
The Queen Elizabeth	Mr. W. I. Layther, Administrator	Dr. J. H. Kneebone, Medical Superintendent; Mr. R. J. Sayers, Deputy Administrator; Dr. B. H. Jeanes, Deputy Medical Superintendent.
Queen Victoria	Mr. W. Altree, Admin. Superintendent; Mr. G. W. Beard, Admin. Officer.	Dr. C. C. J. Gibbs, Medical Superintendent; Miss M. Cantello, Director of Nursing.
Wallaroo and District	—	All senior staff
Whyalla and District	—	All senior staff

PORT AUGUSTA POWER STATION

590. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. In relation to the new power station at Port Augusta, is it correct that Comalco products were recommended for roofing and some exterior walling?

2. Were tenders called for the supply and fix and, if so—

- (a) how many companies tendered;
- (b) what were their names;
- (c) which was the successful tenderer, what was the price, and was it the lowest price;
- (d) how many South Australian companies tendered;
- (e) how many companies from interstate tendered; and
- (f) in approving the successful tender, did the Government take into account the unemployment situation in South Australia?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. No. However, Comalco Ltd. was nominated as a material supplier by the successful tenderer.

2. Yes.

(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) The Electricity Trust's normal policy is that it will not disclose details of tenders received other than to give the name of the successful tenderer. In this case the successful tenderer was Associated Insulation Pty. Ltd., of Lane Cove, New South Wales.

(f) The question of local manufacturer and employment was considered by the Electricity Trust. Only one offer for locally made material, namely, asbestos cement, was received. This material was not acceptable because:

- it carries a risk of future rejection on health grounds and non-acceptance industrially
- it is a brittle material, particularly after aging, and its performance in an earthquake is doubtful (the power station site is in a designated zone of possible earthquake activity and this must be taken into account in the design and selection of materials)
- it is more costly overall than the aluminium material selected.

A large part of this particular contract is the erection of the cladding which will involve local labour.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

594. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will equal opportunities officers be appointed to the Education and Further Education Departments, will they serve on high level committees, as did Ms. Bradley in the Education Department, and what additional "manpower" positions are being created to service these responsibilities?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The reply is as follows:

1. The positions of equal opportunities officer in the Departments of Education and Further Education have been advertised and applications have been received. At this time it is not possible to give a precise date for these positions to be filled, however, it is anticipated that nominations will be made before the end of 1980.

2. (a) In the Department of Education one of the tasks of the officer will be to sit on, and give advice to, a number of high level committees.

(b) In the Department of Further Education the officer will have access to all high level committees and any decision about serving on committees will be made after the person has been in the position for sufficient time to gather relevant information and experience.

3. No additional manpower positions will be created immediately in either the Department of Education or Further Education.

SOLAR POWER

597. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Why is the minimum charge under the "K" tariff set at \$18 per annum for users of solar hot water systems and, for the average household, approximately how many days per annum without adequate sun would that amount of electricity represent?

2. Has the Minister received any representations from manufacturers or users of solar hot water systems to amend the tariffs that apply?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. The tariff covers costs in providing booster supplies, particularly metering and control equipment expenses which may not be recouped by revenue received in cases of very small consumptions. However, on approximately two-thirds of all existing "K" tariff accounts, the consumption is sufficient to completely absorb this charge.

A quantitative answer cannot be given to the second part of this question because a number of variable factors, such as the storage capacity of the solar hot water system, the quantity of hot water used, the pattern of use and the amount and intensity of sunshine, are involved.

2. Yes.

H.C. MEYER

600. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Were automatic bilge alarms fitted to the *H.C. Meyer* and, if not, why not?

2. Were regular soundings taken of compartments on the *H.C. Meyer*?

3. Had the below deck compartments been modified or altered in any way and, if so, what modifications or alterations had been carried out, who authorised them and did they contribute to the capsizing?

4. Will the findings of the inquiry into the sinking of the *H.C. Meyer* be made public and, if so, when, and, if not why not?

5. Have any approaches been made by the owners of the *A.D. Victoria* for the Department of Marine and Harbors to purchase that vessel?

6. Have any approaches been made by the Department of Marine and Harbors to the owners of the *A.D. Victoria* to purchase that vessel?

7. Is the Department undertaking any action to quieten the operating noise of the *A.D. Victoria*?

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

1. No; not considered necessary in larger vessels.

2. In the normal working of the *H.C. Meyer* crew members were required to enter most compartments during a shift to take out or stow gear but there was no regular inspection procedure.

3. Yes. During 1967 cofferdams were built into the forward holds along each side of the bucket ladder well. The modifications resulted from an engineering management initiative. It is believed that the presence of the cofferdams slowed the sequence of events but did not contribute to the ultimate capsize of the vessel.

4. The findings of the committee of inquiry are not to be made public on the advice of the Crown Solicitor.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

7. No.

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

603. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What studies, if any, have been made of the potential for conservation of the unallotted Crown lands in the hundreds of Gosse, Ritchie and McDonald, when were they made, and, by whom, and, will the Minister make the studies available publicly?

2. If no such studies have yet been made, is it proposed to make any, and, if so, when, and by whom, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. No specific studies relating to the conservation potential of the unallotted Crown lands in the hundreds of Gosse, Ritchie and McDonald have yet been undertaken. However, the unallotted Crown lands have been included in more general surveys of the native vegetation on Kangaroo Island. The most relevant of these surveys has been conducted during 1980 by the Nature Conservation

Society of South Australia as part of a State-wide co-operative study programme between the society and the Department for the Environment. A report on this survey is unlikely to be completed until early 1981, but will then be publicly available. A brief survey in the area was also conducted in 1980 by an officer of the Victorian Fisheries and Wildlife Department, who sought evidence of ground parrot, *Pezoporus Wallicus*, without success.

2. The Government is currently giving consideration to a land capability study of Crown lands.

ATLAS

604. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. When did the Government become aware of the take-over of Atlas by Atco?

2. Is the Government aware that employees of Atlas were only told one hour in advance of their position?

3. Did the Government agree to this take-over of an Australian owned company by this international multinational?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government was advised by Atco of the proposed take-over on 25 September; the take-over took effect from 1 October.

2. The Government was aware that the take-over would be announced to employees on 30 September. All employees of Atlas were given the opportunity to work for Atco (subject to satisfactory completion of medical examinations).

3. Approval of take-overs by overseas companies is a matter for the Federal Treasurer; State Government agreement is not required.

NORWOOD ABORIGINAL HEALTH CENTRE

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

1. What is the cost of operating the Aboriginal Health Centre at Norwood and is this cost entirely met through Federal funding?

2. What incorporated body operates the health centre, who is on that body, to whom do they submit an annual report, who prepares the report, and is it available for public scrutiny?

3. What share of operational costs is taken up by staff salaries, what are the major areas of expenditure, and how many patients have been treated as a result of this expenditure?

4. What sort of patient data is recorded, other than is standard procedure in a typical medical practice, and what is the purpose of these records?

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

1. The Aboriginal Health Unit Office at Norwood is not a health centre. It is:

(a) the headquarters of the State-wide services of the Aboriginal Health Unit.

(b) The base for 14 Aboriginal health workers (all Aboriginal staff) and one community health nurse who provide health visiting services to Aboriginal people at their homes and in hospitals, schools and institutions throughout the metropolitan area.

The cost of operating the office, other than salaries, cannot be isolated from the overall cost of operating the service. All salaries, except that of the Acting Medical Director, were funded under the Commonwealth-State grants programme.

2. There is no incorporated body operating the Aboriginal Health Unit. It is an operational unit of the South Australian Health Commission.

3. Staff salaries, including those of the 42 Aboriginal staff, represent 73 per cent of total expenditure. The largest single area of expenditure is the provision of primary health services by nine community health nurses and 12 Aboriginal health workers at five centres in remote communities on the North-West and Yalata reserves.

These services are available to the total population of these remote communities, about 2 000 Aboriginals. The other major area of expenditure is the metropolitan service. These services are directed primarily at improving and maintaining Aboriginal health, and serve a population of about 4 000 Aborigines in the metropolitan area.

4. No data is kept on individual patients other than is usual in good medical practice. Aggregated data is maintained for epidemiological, evaluation and service-monitoring purposes.

ART AND CRAFT COURSES

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

1. What major alterations to art and craft certificate courses in the Department of Further Education have taken place in recent years?

2. Does the Government plan to centralise such courses in the city?

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

1. The Department of Further Education has not made any major alterations to its art and craft programme for several years. The department offers a range of enrichment classes and two certificate courses; the art and craft certificate, 600 hours, one year full time, and the advanced art and craft certificate, 1440 hours, two years full time. However, at present the department is rationalising the art and craft programme so that students may more equitably gain access to courses throughout the State.

2. The Government plans to centralise the advanced art and craft certificate at the Croydon Park College of Further Education. The new craft certificate, 360 hours, will be offered at several country and city locations. This certificate is practically orientated and is designed to meet the majority of vocational student needs. The art and craft certificate is to be offered at strategic locations where a proven vocational need exists (Croydon Park, Elizabeth, Adelaide Hills, Tea Tree Gully, Mount Gambier and O'Halloran Hill). Successful students may then study, subject to counselling, the advanced art and craft certificate. It is planned to implement the above changes over a period of time and in such a way as to minimise the effect on current students.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

610. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Government any policy to tighten registration and insurance provisions concerning mini motor cycles and trail bikes, whether or not such vehicles are being used on public roads?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Mini motor cycles and trail bikes must be registered and insured for third party risk if they are to be used on roads. The question of introducing legislation to control such vehicles in off-road situations is currently under consideration by the Department of the Environment. Insurance of such off-road vehicles is one aspect under consideration.

CABINET MEETINGS

612. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier now answer those portions of question 566 not covered in his answer of 30 September 1980?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is an informal meeting of the members of Cabinet, held where and when required. It has no formal powers.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH UNIT

617. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. When were the recommendations on reclassification of staff within the Aboriginal Health Unit made to the Minister?

2. Will these reclassifications be implemented in the 1980-81 year and if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No recommendations have been made to the Minister. However, on 25 August the South Australian Health Commission recommended a classification structure to the Public Service Board.

2. Unless there are lengthy industrial negotiations, the classifications should be implemented in 1980-81.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

618. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the total number of beds currently being used at the Lyell McEwin Hospital in relation to—

- (a) children's wards;
- (b) maternity wards;
- (c) surgical wards; and
- (d) intensive care?

2. Have any of these wards been filled to capacity during the past two months and, if so, when?

3. Has any patient been refused admission to the hospital on the grounds that a particular ward was full?

4. What is the policy of the hospital if people seek admission with severe chest pains and no beds are available?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 23; (b) 35; (c) 58; (d) 4.

2. For the period 1 September to 31 October 1980, inclusive, the wards were filled to capacity on the following dates:

Children's wards: September 24, October 1, 22, 23.

Ward 6 (surgical ward): September 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 26, 30; October 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22.

Ward 7 (surgical ward): September 5, 8, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30; October 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28.

Intensive care: September 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28; October 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30.

Maternity ward: Figures are available only for the latter part of the month of September: the ward was full on September 25, 27, 29; October 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29.

All the above figures are as at 7 a.m., which is the first bed statement of the day. Occupancy fluctuates during the day, according to admissions and discharges.

3. Yes, but not maternity patients.

4. The policy is that the patient is examined in Casualty

by a Resident Medical Officer and a specialist physician. If admission is considered necessary, the patient is transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or to Modbury Hospital by ambulance.

BURIALS

629. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister had discussions with her Federal colleague regarding religious groups carrying out burials in South Australia without caskets and, if so, what were the results of those discussions?

2. Is the practice contrary to public health regulations?

3. What are the implications to public health of this custom and the possible spread to other religions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. It is not prohibited under any health legislation. The conditions applying to burials in cemeteries are prescribed in the general cemetery regulations made under the Local Government Act.

3. Following a number of recent requests for the use of above-ground mausoleums, the South Australian Health Commission proposes to prepare a report on burial practices for consideration by the Central Board of Health. The report will include an examination of the public health aspect of alternative methods of interment.

PESTICIDES

631. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the ultra low volume technique for aerial spraying of insecticides carried out in South Australia?

2. Has the Government specific regulations with respect to the spread of aerial sprays during calm air conditions usually applying after dawn?

3. What steps has the Minister taken to ensure that the conditions for aerial spraying recommended by the N.H.R.M.C. are complied with in relation to the aerial spraying of herbicides and how many breaches of these conditions have been detected?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. None—the N.H.R.M.C. has not made any recommendations in relation to the aerial spraying of herbicides.

RADIOPHARMACEUTICALS

633. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many hospitals in South Australia currently use cyclotron-produced radio pharmaceuticals?

2. How many hospitals use cyclotron-produced radio pharmaceuticals in preference to nuclear reactor produced isotopes for medical purposes?

3. Is it a fact that higher quality isotopes with shorter exposure times are denied to patients in South Australia and, if so, why?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Three. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Adelaide Children's Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre. In

addition, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (Division of Nuclear Medicine) uses cyclotron-produced radiopharmaceuticals.

2. All four institutions named in (1) use both cyclotron-produced and reactor-produced isotopes.

3. All radiopharmaceuticals used in Australia are of highest quality. However, those cyclotron-produced isotopes which have very short half lives and which would therefore generally result in a lower radiation dose to the patient are unavailable in Australia. There is no facility for their production in Australia, and importation is impractical as they would decay excessively during the journey.

NURSES

634. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many registered mental retardation nurses are there in South Australia and if there are no provisions for registration of these nurses in this State, why not?

2. What are the names of the institutions at which these nurses are employed?

3. Are there plans to train mental retardation nurses in South Australia and if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 861 mental deficiency nurses are currently registered with the Nurses Board of South Australia.

2. Strathmont Centre, Minda Home Inc. Many nurses employed in other areas as general or psychiatric nurses have the additional registration in mental deficiency.

3. Mental deficiency nurse training in South Australia will continue in the foreseeable future.

NURSING HOMES

635. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many patients and residents at nursing homes in South Australia:

(a) transferred to other nursing homes; and,

(b) left nursing homes for other types of accommodation (excluding hospitalisation),

in the years 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 and the period to 30 September 1980?

2. In the case of part 1 (a), how many of those transfers were to nursing homes charging less than the fees at the previous nursing homes?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It would not be possible to obtain information on the transfer of patients between nursing homes and to accommodation other than hospitals without undertaking a major research project. This would not be warranted.

DRUGS

638. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is valium a trade name for diazepam?

2. For what conditions is the drug used?

3. What are the trade names for the benzo-diazepine group?

4. How many prescriptions have been written for—

(a) barbiturates; and

(b) members of the benzo-diazepine group (by type), during each year since 1978?

5. Are benzo-diazepine drugs safer than barbiturates, both medically and sociologically?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Anxiety, tension, excitation, muscle spasm, epilepsy, tetanus and in obstetrics.
3. Lexotan; Librium; Valium; Adumbran; Benzotran; Murelax; Ativan; Raporan; Serepax; Tranxene; Nitrazepam; Flurazepam.
4. There are no statistics available for the number of prescriptions written in Australia during and since 1978 for the specific classes of pharmaceuticals referred to in the question. However, the following national figures are the most recent available relating to the broad groups of drugs to which these classes of pharmaceuticals belong:

Year	Sedative/hypnotics (including barbiturates)	Tranquilizers (including benzo- diazepines)
1977-78	3 457 000	4 598 000
1978-79	2 865 000	4 307 000

These figures give an approximate indication of the relative extent of prescribing for both classes of pharmaceuticals.

5. As a very general statement it could be said that benzo-diazepines are "safer" than barbiturates, both medically and sociologically, because of their lower toxicity and lower tendency to induce intoxication or addiction. Nevertheless, both classes of pharmaceuticals are "safe" when taken within proper medical limits.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

639. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What research projects are being undertaken in South Australia into the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis?
2. What institutions are involved in this research, what are their locations, and what funding is provided by the Government to the respective institutions and researchers?
3. Does the Government monitor research carried out overseas and interstate?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. None, but all neurologists and the Multiple Sclerosis Society of South Australia are collaborating in a national study into multiple sclerosis which began on 1 January 1980.
2. The Departments of Neurology in all metropolitan teaching hospitals, including Modbury Hospital, are associated with this research and the neurologists in their private practice are also contributing data. Neither they nor the Multiple Sclerosis Society of South Australia obtain Government funds in order to participate in this study.
3. No.

641. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What are the statistics on the incidence of multiple sclerosis in South Australia including the geographical location of its occurrence?
2. How many Australian born residents have been afflicted?

3. How many European migrants have been afflicted, what countries were they born in and what is the number from each country?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Multiple Sclerosis Society of South Australia has 500 known current cases on its register and there are at least another 100 who are not members of the society. Reliable information on the geographical location of its occurrence is not available. The Project Officer in South Australia for the National Multiple Sclerosis Epidemiological Survey has so far been able to identify 600 cases of presumed multiple sclerosis and there will be others which will come in before the end of the year, but all these cases have not been verified by neurologists. It is expected that there will be between 600 and 800 cases in South Australia.
2. and 3. There is no recent information available to answer these questions.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

642. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Minister intend altering the polling booth hours for State and local government elections in line with Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No decision has yet been made concerning State Government elections. In regard to local government elections, the answer is "No". The matter will be examined by the committee presently reviewing the Local Government Act.

LEVEL CROSSINGS

649. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many level crossing accidents have occurred at the intersection of—

- (a) Clarke Terrace and Morley Road, Albert Park; and
- (b) Tapleys Hill Road and Trimmer Parade, Seaton, involving S.T.A. rail cars and motor vehicles and pedestrians, respectively, in each year since 1977?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) 1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 One (car and train)
1980 Nil
- (b) 1977 Nil
1978 Nil
1979 One (train and pedestrian)
1980 One (car and train)

ROAD FUNDS

650. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What funds have been provided to South Australia under Commonwealth Road Funds for road purposes by category and in total since 1975?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reply is as follows:

	1974- 1975 \$M	1975- 1976 \$M	1976- 1977 \$M	1977- 1978 \$M	1978- 1979 \$M	1979- 1980 \$M	Sub- total \$M	1980- 1981 \$M	Total \$M
Construction National Highways . . .	16.21	17.49	17.30	15.00	16.13	17.34	99.47	24.97	141.40
Maintenance National Highways . . .	1.31	2.11	1.40	1.90	2.03	2.18	10.93		
Construction/Maintenance Export/ Development Roads	0.33	1.00	1.30	1.30	0.70	1.40	6.03	8.94	38.35
Construction Rural Arterial	1.20	1.77	3.30	7.00	8.09	8.05	29.41		
Construction Urban Arterial	7.51	8.29	7.60	4.60	4.92	5.29	38.21	6.33	44.54
Construction/Maintenance Rural Local	4.79	5.30	5.30	6.70	7.16	7.70	36.95	11.37	57.98
Construction Urban Local	0.54	0.94	1.10	2.20	2.35	2.53	9.66		
M.I.T.E.R.S.	1.52	1.50	1.50	1.70	1.82	1.95	9.99		9.99
Total	33.41	38.40	38.80	40.40	43.20	46.44	240.65	51.61	292.26

Note: Commonwealth road fund categories reduced to four in 1980-81 as indicated above. Allocation 1980-81, for local roads, provides for urban local road maintenance, whereas previously only construction included. Also, in 1980-81, M.I.T.E.R.S. category deleted and funds incorporated in those for other categories.

DIESEL FUEL

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

1. Does the State Transport Authority pay a tax on diesel fuel used for its—

(a) metropolitan rail services; and

(b) metropolitan bus services,
and, if so, what is the rate of tax?

2. Do metropolitan community bus services pay a tax on diesel fuel and, if so, what is the rate of tax?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority does not pay a tax on diesel fuel used for its metropolitan rail services. However, it does pay a Commonwealth levy at the rate of 5.155c per litre together with a levy of 1.72c per litre under the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act on diesel fuel used on its bus services.

2. The same rate of tax applies to metropolitan community bus services for diesel fuel used as that applied to the authority's bus services.

GLENELG TRAMLINE

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

1. What is the expenditure for the upgrading of the Glenelg tramline?

2. Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to use concrete sleepers on this line and, if not, why not?

3. Does the S.T.A. intend concreting the rail-lengths into Jetty Road, Glenelg and King William Street?

4. What is the maximum speed for trams currently on the Glenelg line and what is the maximum speed these trams are capable of, given a suitable track?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Preliminary estimates for the complete upgrading of the permanent way and overhead equipment is approximately \$1 650 000.

2. No. In the case of a tramway timber sleepers are considered to be more cost efficient than concrete sleepers.

3. There is no such proposal at present. However, the authority is currently examining this option for Jetty Road.

4. The maximum allowable speed for trams is 65 km/h and it is not intended to raise the maximum speed when the track is upgraded.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

654. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: What number of industrial accidents have occurred in—

(a) private industry; and

(b) State Government instrumentalities,

in 1978-79 and 1979-80, respectively, and what has been the cost involved in each category?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

(a) In 1978-79 there were 54 759 industrial accidents resulting in a compensation payout of \$46 097 636. The figures for 1979-80 are 60 621 and \$46 491 167, respectively.

(b) In 1978-79 there were 10 103 accidents in Government departments and instrumentalities not insured with private insurers. The amount of compensation paid was \$10 283 226. The figures for 1979-80 are 8 970 and \$11 268 592, respectively.

It should be noted that the figures for 1979-1980 are preliminary and may be revised when more complete data is available. It should also be noted that the figures for the two periods under review cannot be compared because some Government business previously handled by the Government Insurance Office was transferred during 1979-80 to private insurers. An example of this is public hospitals once they became incorporated institutions following the establishment of the Health Commission.

655. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Does the Government have a programme for the development of uniform and comprehensive statistics of industrial accidents and, if so, what is that programme and when will it be introduced and if such statistics are currently available, from where?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government through the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment (in conjunction with the Australian Bureau of Statistics) compiles statistics on industrial accidents in South Australia. There is a programme to make the existing collection more comprehensive and more uniform.

Approximately two years ago the Australian Bureau of Statistics formulated a plan for the production of a core of items on industrial accidents for use by each State and Territory in order that there could be standardised concepts, definitions and classifications. The Australia-wide programme will be designed to rationalise and standardise data collection between the States in order that there can be a uniform and comprehensive system of reporting of accidents which result in more than one day off work. Changes made to the South Australian statistical collection are designed to fit in with that Australia-wide programme. Statistics on the total number of accidents reported to insurers and the amount paid out in workers compensation is collected on an annual basis by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment and contained in its annual report. Details on industrial accident statistics are available both from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

AWARD BREACHES

657. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many breaches of State industrial awards by employers have occurred since 1977, how many employers were fined for such breaches and what were the respective amounts?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member's question is in three parts and the answers to each of those parts are as follows:

1. Officers of the department have detected 131 breaches of awards since 1977.
2. 80 employers were fined for such breaches.
3. The respective amounts are:

	\$
1978	1 692
1979	1 289
To date in 1980	630

SELF-SERVICE STATIONS

658. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many self-service stations are currently operating and how many are planned in—
 - (a) metropolitan Adelaide; and
 - (b) non-urban areas of South Australia?
2. What has been the reduction in staff at these outlets since self-service was introduced?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) currently operating 100
- (b) currently operating 7

The oil companies are not required to advise the Government of their business planning proposals.

2. The Government has no knowledge of changes in staff structures because of the introduction of self-service petrol retail outlets.

WORKER TRAINING

659. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: What actions has the Government taken in respect of training workers in the safe handling of dangerous chemicals, how many employees and organisations are involved and what is the annual cost to the Government?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Section 29 of the Industrial

Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1978, places a duty on employers to take all reasonable precautions to ensure the safety and health of workers. The training of workers in the safe handling of dangerous chemicals comes within the scope of that duty. The action taken by the Government involves the dissemination of information to industry on the safe handling of dangerous chemicals. This is done through the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment and the South Australian Health Commission. In addition, the Department of Further Education, in its courses on pest control, rural studies, and safety, provides instruction on the safe handling of dangerous chemicals. It is not possible to indicate an annual cost to the Government for all of the initiatives taken in various areas by it.

Mr. S. P. COOPER

660. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Did the State Transport Authority receive an application for employment from a Mr. Sylvester P. Cooper of 9 Calstock Avenue, Edwardstown, a qualified spray painter and qualified welder who is a deaf mute, and was Mr. Cooper's application rejected on the basis of his deafness and, if so, how long has this been Government policy and why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Mr. S. P. Cooper of 9 Calstock Avenue, Edwardstown, called at the Authority's Employment Office on 29 October 1980, seeking employment as a spray painter. Mr. Cooper was advised that the authority currently has no vacancy for a spray painter. If a vacancy had existed, an official application would have been accepted from Mr. Cooper. He would have been advised, however, that under the conditions of the State Government Job Transfer Scheme the authority is obliged to first consider applications from Government employees. As is the case with all new entrants, employment is conditional upon passing an examination by the authority's medical officer.

HOUSING TRUST MAINTENANCE

663. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the South Australian Housing Trust reduced the number of contracts to maintenance contractors performing work for the trust and, if so, to what extent has the reduction occurred in the metropolitan and country, respectively?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Housing Trust maintenance contractors are engaged in three main areas of maintenance activity:

- General Maintenance—which includes the ongoing daily routine maintenance such as repairs to vacancies, interior and exterior painting, roof renewals, renewals of clothes hoists, etc.;
- Upgrading the trust's older rental stock to a more acceptable present-day standard which includes the installation of a hot water unit, new built-in bath, vitreous china basins, troughs, cupboards, etc.;
- Upgrading special rental houses. After the purchase of these private dwellings, they are upgraded to a suitable standard before they are added to the trust's rental stock. In a number of cases the work involves major restoration, e.g., reroofing, salt damp repairs, complete replumbing and electrical rewiring, etc.

The volume of total funds for the trust's maintenance work in the above areas is virtually the same in 1980-81 (\$19 767 000) as in 1979-80 (\$19 814 000) most of which is classified as operating expense and a portion as capital expense.

MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURE

	1980-81	1979-80
	\$m	\$m
General Maintenance	14.031	13.143
Upgrading Trust Housing	2.521	4.636
Upgrading Special Rentals	3.215	2.035
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	19.767	19.814
	<hr/>	<hr/>

As indicated above, in the area of general maintenance and upgrading of special rental housing, the volume of funds has increased. Upgrading of existing rental stock is the only area in which funds have been reduced. This has been brought about by the fact that there are less than 2 000 houses remaining to be upgraded and a number of the sitting tenants do not want the upgrading work carried out whilst they are in residence.

It is anticipated that the present upgrading programme on trust properties will be completed within two years. This will require a number of contractors to seek work in other areas of maintenance. The majority of houses which remain to be upgraded are located in the metropolitan area, so the impact on country contractors of the winding down of the upgrading programme, will be minimal.

The special rental scheme, whereby the trust spot purchases private dwellings and upgrades them as necessary for addition to its rental stock, has traditionally concentrated on the central metropolitan area. This programme has increased in response to the needs of those on the trust's waiting list and the longer waiting period in this area where land for development or redevelopment is not readily available.

Steps have been taken to increase this programme of property acquisition from 343 units in 1979-80 to a budgeted total of approximately 500 units in 1980-81. This will generate considerably more work than the existing special rental maintenance work force can cope with, thereby providing an opportunity to employ contractors who are affected by reductions in the upgrading programme.

In summary, it can be seen that while individual contractors may experience a greater or lesser degree of work, and there may be variations between locations, the volume of expenditure on maintenance and upgrading work will remain fairly constant between 1979-80 and 1980-81. The trust cannot necessarily guarantee continuity of work for all contractors.

It should be noted that the above relates to property maintenance only and not to the maintenance of gardens which is a separate activity.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

665. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has Education Department Regulation 123 (3), clause 6 been withdrawn and, if not, what change has occurred as a result of the Minister's recent statement on the matter of corporal punishment?

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

1. As there is no clause 6 to Regulation 123 (3) it cannot be withdrawn.
2. There has been no change as the result of rescinding the proposed conditions for administering corporal punishment. The *status quo* remains.

COLLEGE ENROLMENTS

668. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What reductions in enrolments and/or staffing are planned in the Department of Further Education for the garment manufacturing and design area and in which colleges will these reductions take place?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is not possible to give a precise answer as to the reduction in student enrolments in the garment design and construction area in 1981. The student enrolment numbers for the vocational certificate course in stream 2 will be reduced by approximately 475; however, it is expected that there will be a compensating increase in fee-paying stream 6 courses. The reduction in staffing is expected to be 2 full-time lecturers and 15 part-time instructors for the stream 2 course. The increase in stream 6 will require more part-time instructors, precisely how many will not be clear until enrolment figures are known.

The reduction in the stream 2 Garment design and Construction Certificate will be shared between the following colleges: Adelaide Hills Community College, Brighton College of Further Education, Elizabeth Community College, Eyre Peninsula Community College, Kensington Park Community College, Murray Bridge Community College of Further Education, O'Halloran Hill College of Further Education, Panorama Community College of Further Education, Port Adelaide Community College, Riverland Community College, and South East Community College.

COURSE FUNDING

669. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Government require that stream 6 courses be 80 per cent funded from students' fees and, if so, how is this figure arrived at and how many courses fall below the figure?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government has determined that it will make a specific allocation to the Department of Further Education to fund an Enrichment Education Programme (stream 6 courses) on a calendar year basis. The department will be required to reach a level of return of revenue by way of fees charged such that it covers part-time instructor salaries less the Government's contribution for concessions. This new scheme will commence in 1981. There is no set percentage return for particular courses. Indeed, the number of non-paying students will vary between courses. The overall revenue target will, however, need to be met by each college across its stream 6 programme. This Government, like previous Governments, will review the stream 6 fee levels from time to time in order that they are maintained at a level commensurate with the cost of the service provided.

PRISON OFFICERS

670. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Why are prison officers not in receipt of the Public Service 37½ hour week?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The award under which prison officers are employed specifies a number of special conditions, including a 40 hour week. However, prison officers also receive a number of better conditions, particularly in relation to salaries and penalty payments, than normally apply to Public Service positions.

RADIO MAST

671. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What approaches have been made to the Minister's department by the City of Noarlunga concerning the current dispute over the erection of a "ham" radio mast in a residential area at Hackham and what advice or assistance has been given to the council in this matter?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No approaches have been made to the Department of Environment or Urban and Regional Affairs by the City of Noarlunga. The council is empowered to deal with the matter under its Planning Regulations—Zoning.

BEDFORD INDUSTRIES

672. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government make funds available to Bedford Industries to provide access to rehabilitation services for house-bound handicapped people, as suggested by Rev. Jenkins at the launching of the 1980 Christmas Seal Appeal on 30 October 1980 and, if so, how much and when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government has a major commitment to the provision of rehabilitation services for house-bound people through its existing support for Domiciliary Care Services and Royal District Nursing Society. The Commonwealth Government also provides matching funds and conducts the Australian Government Rehabilitation Service at Felixstow. House-bound handicapped people, therefore, already have access to services allowing assessment and the provision of support. It is not the Government's intention to duplicate services already in existence but to add incrementally as resources permit. A recent decision has been to provide additional funds for domiciliary respite in order to provide relief during the temporary absence of a supporting relative. These services will be mounted through existing agencies already working in this field.

LIGHTWEIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS

681. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Premier believe that "lightweight rail systems have a great future in South Australia" and, if so, what action, if any, does the Government propose to take to set up such systems and when and, if not, has the Premier ever had such a belief and, if so, when and why has he changed his mind?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, in some circumstances, but the Government is constrained by financial considerations, and has no particular plans for lightweight rail systems at present.

EDUCATION COURSES

682. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Whom does the Minister propose should "step aside" in accordance with his reply (recorded in *Hansard* on page 159 of 1 October 1980) to a question on possible overlap of courses between the Workers Educational Association and the Department of Further Education, when he said "There are other areas of competition and we think that one of them should step aside"?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My statement was simply to acknowledge that there is competition in some areas which might amicably be resolved. This of course will depend upon the Workers Education Association and the Department of Further Education making submissions to the Committee of Enquiry into Education.

NEWSPAPER MICROFILMING

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

1. Which South Australian newspapers held by the State Library have been placed on microfilm, or will be microfilmed in the near future and for what years of publication?

2. What is the cost of this project and what additional funds are required for the completion of the programme?

3. Does the Government have any proposals before it to extend the programme to the microfilming of non-metropolitan newspapers such as those held at Burra and other centres?

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

1. Adelaide Chronicle 1839-1842; Adelaide Examiner 1841-1843; Adelaide Independent 1841; Adelaide Morning Chronicle 1852-1853; Adelaide Punch 1868-69, 1878; Adelaide Times 1848-1858; Colonist 1835-40; Compass 1906-1911; The Country 1893-96; Die Deutsche Post 1848-1851; Frearson's monthly 1875-1884; Frearson's Weekly 1878-1884; Friths Bulletin c. 1913; Irish Harp 1870; Lantern 1874-76; Lutherische Kirchenbote 1888; Mercury & S.A. Sporting Chronicle 1849-51; Gadfly 1906-1909; Gumeracha Guardian 1870-71; Owens Weekly 1908; Pictorial Australian 1885-1895; Pinnaroo Border Times 1911-1940; Port Pirie Advertiser 1898-1924; Port Pirie Advocate 1885-1898; Port Pirie Gazette 1876-1884; Port Pirie Standard 1889-1898; S.A. Chronicle & Colonial Record 1852-1853; S.A. Figaro 1877; S.A. Magazine 1841-1842; Whyalla News 1940-63; Adelaide Observer 1843-1879, 1901-1931; Southern Argus (Strathalbyn) 1866-1950; Northern Argus (Clare) 1869-1950; Mt. Barker Courier 1880-1950; Transcontinental (Pt. Augusta) 1914-1950; Murray Pioneer (Renmark) 1895-1950; Register 1836-1931; The News 1923-62; The Advertiser 1858 to date (may need to be refilmed because of poor quality of existing film); West Coast Recorder 1900-1942; Kadina and Wallaroo Times 1865-1922; Recorder (Port Pirie) 1899-1915; Border Watch (Mt. Gambier) to 1950; Yorke Peninsula Advertiser 1872-1922; South Australian 1838-1851; S.A. Gazette and Mining Journal 1845-1852; Burra Record 1876-1900; Peoples Weekly (Moonta) 1890-1966.

Papers numbered 31-36 will be microfilmed this year with a camera purchased with funds provided in the Estimates of Expenditure and operator's salary and consumables paid from trust funds. It is estimated that \$21 000 will be spent from trust funds this year for this purpose.

2. It is estimated at this rate of microfilming it will take six years to complete all South Australian newspapers. At today's prices the project will cost approximately \$126 000. It is intended to complete the project by the sesquicentennial.

3. The Burra Record is being microfilmed at the present time and the six year project will complete all the South Australian non-metropolitan newspapers held by the Library. The Libraries Board has in fact, extended the programme in 1980-81 by purchasing the additional camera and spending an additional \$21 000 per annum on the project. This has more than doubled the previous rate of microfilming.

WINEGRAPES

694. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the Department of Agriculture made any supply and demand estimate for winegrapes for the 1981 vintage and if so, will these estimates be made public and if not, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Department of Agriculture has not made any supply and demand estimate for winegrapes for the 1981 vintage. These estimates cannot be made until the Australian Bureau of Statistics (A.B.S.) releases information probably at the end of January 1981 on the area and production of principal grape varieties for major grape growing areas within Australia.

AGRICULTURAL PUBLICATIONS

695. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Department of Agriculture intend to continue the publication of—

- (a) *State of Agriculture*;
- (b) *Rural Market Outlook*; and
- (c) *Farming Forum*,

and if not, what are the reasons for cancellation and what would be the cost savings if such a decision is taken?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Department of Agriculture has not made any decision to discontinue publication of any one of the three publications to which the honourable member's question referred.

MEAT RE-INSPECTIONS

697. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the agreement between the Minister and the Victorian Minister of Agriculture to abolish re-inspection of meat mentioned in answer to question No. 404 come into force by 1 January 1981 or whenever the suspended sections of the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980 are proclaimed and if not, does the Minister intend that all meat entering South Australia should be re-inspected?

2. Has the Minister discussed with the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture the possibility of a similar agreement to abolish re-inspection and if so, what is the result of those discussions and if not, does the Minister intend to initiate such discussions?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Negotiations on this matter are in progress. No agreement has yet been reached.

2. The matter has not been discussed with the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture but it is my intention to do so.

ECONOMICS AND MARKETING BRANCH

700. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How much of the work of the Economics and Marketing Branch of the Department of Agriculture has been let to outside contract?

2. Is it intended to let further work to outside contracts during 1980-81?

3. What is the nature of the work that has been let or is intended to be let out to contract?

4. What is the cost of such contract work for 1980-81?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil.
2. No.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

PORT GERMEIN JETTY

704. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it the Government's intention to repair the storm damage suffered by the Port Germein jetty and, if so, what work is programmed, what is the estimated cost, and, when will it commence?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In view of the extensive damage caused to the Port Germein jetty, and the high repair cost, officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors will meet the District Council of Mount Remarkable on site to discuss all aspects relating to the repairs. A recommendation on the extent of the repairs and the scheduling of the work will be made following that meeting.

A.N.R.C.

705. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is the Minister aware of the intention of the Australian National Railways Commission to reduce the number of transcontinental passenger services, particularly during the mid-winter months and, if so, what adverse effects on tourism in South Australia would such action cause and what representation does the Minister propose to make to A.N.R.C.?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Australian National Railways Commission is continually monitoring all services in an endeavour to minimise uneconomical operations. Over the last few years, patronage on transcontinental services has been falling during the winter months and so this is one area under review. No decision has been made at this time to reduce current services.

In terms of tourist impact, the proportion of visitors travelling by rail to South Australia is extremely low and the transcontinental service represents only a small fraction of the total. Therefore, if the service were to be reduced, the overall effect would be negligible, based on present trends. In any event, it is likely that traffic from a cancelled service would be transferred to another scheduled service in the case of holiday traffic.

BODY SCANNER

708. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:—

1. Does the Government intend to make funds available for the installation of a "Cat Scanner" at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

2. What is the estimated cost of a "Cat Scanner" at 1980 prices and what would be the estimated cost of installation?

3. Where would this equipment be specifically installed at the hospital?

4. Is this type of equipment in use in any other private or Government hospital in South Australia and, if so, where?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. This matter is under consideration at the present time.

2. \$940 000 including contingency and fees. The estimated cost of installation is \$40 000 including contingency and fees.

3. Within the Radiology Department at the hospital.

4. A whole body scanner is in use at Flinders Medical Centre and a head scanner is in use at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. A whole body scanner is operated by a private radiological practice in North Adelaide.

LIVER DISEASE

709. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:—

1. What is the incidence of liver cirrhosis in South Australia for males and females (by age) since 1975 and what are the mortality rates in each category?

2. What are the major contributing factors in this disease?

3. How much money has been allocated for research and treatment of this disease by the Government in each year since 1975?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:—

1. Incidence and mortality rates per 100 000 of liver cirrhosis in South Australia by age and sex since 1975 are as follows:

Year	Sex	0-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
1975	M	—	11.5	46.5	46.3	40.7
	F	—	5.9	12.8	19.1	7.5
1976	M	0.5	11.5	42.4	44.5	32.1
	F	0.3	4.4	1.7	34.7	19.5
1977	M	0.8	13.1	38.4	36.9	33.3
	F	0.3	0.1	7.2	21.3	14.0
1978	M	0.5	6.9	34.2	43.6	35.2
	F	0.3	0.3	8.6	14.7	8.4
1979	M	1.3	8.2	46.6	57.0	56.8
	F	0.5	0.4	7.2	14.7	12.6

2. Cirrhosis of the liver is a condition of increased scarring of liver substance with disorganised regeneration of the remaining liver cell masses. It is a complex disease, the basis for which is diffuse death of liver cells. The major cause is chronic alcoholism and it is usually held that absolute or relative malnutrition may be a contributing factor. On a world-wide basis, the commonest cause is the form of cirrhosis seen in under-developed countries and

viral hepatitis may be a significant contributing factor. More rarely, cirrhosis may follow intoxication with industrial chemicals or drugs and may be associated with certain metabolic disorders such as Wilson's disease.

3. No specific research project concerned with cirrhosis of the liver has received Government support, but research into cirrhosis is being actively conducted in teaching hospitals and in the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

CHRISTIE DOWNS STATION

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

1. When will the upgraded railway station at Christie Downs be built?

2. Will it include an overpass or underpass and, if so, will this be designed as a ramp instead of steps and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is scheduled for completion by November 1981.

2. There will not be an overpass or underpass.

MEMBER'S LETTERS

717. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In the light of the copy of the Minister's letter to the member for Salisbury dated 11 June and provided by him on 15 October 1980 in full answer to letters dated 23 April and 6 October 1980, to what was the Minister referring when he wrote on 20 October 1980 "I am having this matter investigated and will write to you again as soon as possible"?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: My letter to you on 11 June 1980 answered in full the question you raised in your letter dated 23 April 1980. When your letter on the same subject dated 6 October was received, a standard acknowledgement was prepared. However, one of my officers, on perusing the file, realised that you had probably not received my reply of 11 June. This was confirmed with your electorate office by telephone resulting in a duplicate copy of my letter of 11 June being forwarded to you. Regrettably, the prepared acknowledgement was inadvertently overlooked and subsequently posted to you on 20 October. As the matter has been finalised, this acknowledgement should be ignored.