

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 24 February 1981

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

**STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

**PETITION: SECONDED TEACHERS**

A petition signed by eight members of the Crafers Primary School Welfare Club praying that the House urge the Government to take all possible steps to prevent the erosion in numbers of seconded teachers and support services in the Education Department was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION**

Petitions signed by 201 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 Messrs. Lynn Arnold and O'Neill.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS**

A petition signed by 181 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce a fair and equitable system of rent payments for all Housing Trust tenants was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

**PETITION: WHYALLA WATER FILTRATION**

A petition signed by 2 537 electors of Whyalla praying that the House urge the Government to construct a water filtration plant at Whyalla as soon as practicable was presented by Mr. Max Brown.

Petition received.

**PETITION: HOSPITAL SERVICES**

A petition signed by 4 227 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to locate the proposed Government hospital services for the Northern Yorke Peninsula at Wallaroo was presented by Mr. Olsen.

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. 780, 873, 877, 880, 881, 884, 892, 959, 990, 991, 997, 1011, 1015, 1018, 1026, 1029, 1082, 1084, 1085, 1088, 1089, 1092, 1094, 1096, 1117, 1119 to 1122, 1126 to 1129, 1138 to 1140, 1146, 1159, 1160, 1163 to 1165, 1167, 1179, 1183, 1184, 1188, 1197, 1198, 1212, 1228, 1230, 1232, 1234, and 1238 to 1240.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Government Office Accommodation—State Government Insurance Commission Building,  
Port Adelaide Community College—Headquarters,  
Port Pirie Community Welfare Centre.

Ordered that reports be printed.

**STUDY TOUR**

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the overseas study tour of the honourable member for Playford.

**PAPERS TABLED**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Public Finance Act, 1936-1975—Regulations—Approved of Dealers.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. University of Adelaide—Report and Legislation, 1979.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Harbors Act, 1936-1978—Regulations—Various Charges.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Woods and Forests Department—Report, 1979-1980.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act, 1931-1978—Regulations—Control of Various Barossa Recreation Grounds.

II. Control of Elizabeth Oval.

III. District Council of Snowtown By-law No. 23—Repeal of By-law No. 21.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—Regulations—District Council of Franklin Harbour—Interim Development Control.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J. L. Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

I. Mental Health Services—Report, 1978-1979.

II. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report of the Committee of Inquiry into, 1980.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: I.M.V.S. INQUIRY**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: On 28 October last I announced a wide-ranging inquiry into the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. The inquiry was to be conducted by a three-member committee, chaired by Dr. R. Wells, physician in private practice and formerly Chairman, Capital Territory Health Commission, Deputy Director-General, Australian Department of Health, and

Secretary, National Health and Medical Research Council, with Professor N. Stanley, Department of Microbiology, University of Western Australia, and Mr. J. Burdett, Assistant Commissioner, Public Service Board, as members.

The inquiry was to review and report to me on the structure, administrative arrangements and operations of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and, where appropriate, to recommend changes to current arrangements. The committee has presented its report which I now table.

The committee notes that its recommendations will require implementation by a number of authorities, including the State Government, South Australian Health Commission, the institute administration, universities and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The committee has accordingly edited and consolidated its recommendations into groups to facilitate their consideration by appropriate bodies. In relation to recommendations identified as requiring consideration and decision by the Minister of Health and Government, the committee's principal recommendations are that the institute should continue as a joint medical and veterinary organisation and should be incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act by specific legislative amendments. The committee further recommends that forensic pathology services should continue to be provided by the institute.

The Government endorses that recommendation that the institute continue to be the body responsible for the provision of veterinary pathology services. Similarly, the Government endorses the recommendation that the institute continue to provide forensic pathology services. In relation to the recommendation for incorporation of the institute under the South Australian Health Commission Act, the Government agrees that it is inappropriate for an institute with an annual operating budget of over \$17 000 000, whose services have a significant impact on the cost and quality of health services, to be independent of express Ministerial control and of the South Australian Health Commission, which was established to co-ordinate and integrate health services in South Australia.

The Government believes, however, that incorporation under the South Australian Health Commission Act, as recommended by the committee, while it may be appropriate for a body engaged exclusively in the provision of health services, would fail to recognise adequately the role of the institute as a provider of veterinary pathology services as well as human pathology services; in other words, a body whose role extends beyond health services. The Government therefore proposes that legislation will be introduced later this year which will substantially rewrite the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Act in a manner which recognises the role and responsibilities of the Minister of Health and the South Australian Health Commission in relation to the provision and co-ordination of health services but, at the same time, recognises the unique position of the institute as a provider of both human and veterinary pathology services.

While I do not propose to canvass the provisions of the proposed legislation in detail at this stage, the Bill will provide for a restructuring of the council and definition of the institute's functions along the general lines recommended by the committee. It will bring the institute under Ministerial control and direction, and provide the means of ensuring that the South Australian Health Commission is able to exercise its statutory role of rationalisation, co-ordination and integration of health services. At the same time, it will ensure that the policies and requirements of the Department of Agriculture in respect of veterinary

services are duly taken into account.

With respect to the other recommendations of the committee, which are identified as requiring the attention of various bodies, the Government endorses the tenor of the recommendations and will ensure that effective action is taken to facilitate early consideration by such bodies.

In order to ensure that this occurs, I have asked the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission to consult with the appropriate bodies and establish an implementation team with appropriate representation from those bodies. The team will develop a programme for implementation of the recommendations and will report to me on a regular basis.

In view of the recent retirement of Dr. J. A. Bonnin from the position of Director, one recommendation has already been acted upon. The committee recommended that the appointment of a new Director should not proceed immediately, but should be deferred pending a Government decision on the future role of the institute and pending determination by the council of its position regarding other recommendations in the report. The committee further recommended the appointment of an interim Director for a limited period. The council has accepted the committee's recommendation, and an announcement will be made shortly in relation to an interim Director.

I believe the committee's report provides the framework for restructuring of the institute and development of sound management processes. It identifies deficiencies and makes constructive recommendations to remedy those deficiencies, something which could never have been achieved had the witch-hunt so desperately wanted by honourable members opposite been embarked upon. The previous Government had 10 years in which to act—all we got was inaction; the institute's legislation remained largely in its 1937 form; a report by management consultants was only partially implemented. One can but question the motives of the Opposition in calling for an inquiry as it did last year.

I wish to conclude by placing on record my appreciation of the work undertaken by Dr. Wells, his committee and support staff, and of the co-operation and willing assistance of the council and staff of the institute.

#### MEMBERS' REMARKS

**The SPEAKER:** Last Tuesday, the member for Mitchell, on a point of order, claimed that the Premier had imputed improper motives to the Leader and the members of the Opposition. He then sought a ruling that if, after examining the words uttered, I found them to be offensive, I would subsequently order them to be withdrawn. As the member could not identify the specific words which reflected on members, I could not uphold the point of order, and I also indicated that I would not make a subsequent ruling.

I do, however, wish to reiterate for members a portion of the ruling I gave on Tuesday 1 April last year (*Hansard*, page 1937):

Where remarks are clearly unparliamentary, the Chair will call the member to order and demand their withdrawal. Where remarks are not clearly unparliamentary, the Chair will leave it to the member who feels impugned to raise a point of order. The Chair will then request the offending member to withdraw the remarks complained of. It is in the hands of that member as to whether he wishes to withdraw. The Chair will not enforce their withdrawal.

A further element which I now bring to members' attention is the derogative manner in which members

comment on other members. 'He' and 'she' are not offensive when read in *Hansard* but under some circumstances when spoken have caused, and do cause offence. There have been many other such examples recently; these fall into the second of the categories of my ruling. If a member is distressed by the remarks, he may ask for a withdrawal, but the Chair will not insist on a withdrawal. I hope the fact that another member has felt impugned in some way will cause the withdrawal without any qualification.

If a member reflected on is not in the Chamber, he cannot obviously be distressed by the remarks but if, on subsequently learning of them, he feels impugned, he has the right to seek to make a personal explanation to correct the record. I suggest in this sense that, while defending a colleague is admirable in itself, it is also for that colleague to be offended, or otherwise, and for him alone to take any corrective action.

### NORTHERN WATER SUPPLY

**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, such suspension to remain in force no later than 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr. BANNON:** I move:

That this House condemns the Government for placing minor cost savings above community health and, in view of its failure to:

- (1) maintain the northern water supply in a safe condition;
- (2) advise the Yorke Peninsula residents of the serious situation which was developing in the peninsula's water supply;
- (3) ensure an adequate monitoring programme in particular for the Whyalla town supply;
- (4) proceed with the planned filtration of the northern supply; and
- (5) conduct a comprehensive public information campaign in the current summer season on the danger of amoebic infection;

censures the Government and calls on the Ministers of Water Resources and Health to resign forthwith.

Revelations of the last week have shown the sorry state to which South Australia can be brought, where a Government puts above all else its desire to cut back costs to save Budget expenditures, puts that desire above, in fact, the concerns of public safety and public health, which the Government has entrusted to it. The sorry events which have been revealed over the last week are, I believe, typical of a situation which may well recur in other areas and which may indeed have happened but which has not yet been revealed, because of the Government's attitude and approach in this matter. By its insistence that at all costs services should be curtailed, costs should be cut, manpower should be reduced, the public welfare of South Australia is being put increasingly at risk.

The reduced water monitoring, and the problems that have arisen in this hot summer, are a product of the Government's Budget problems, which it has created for itself, and indeed, have shown public servants attempting to respond to the Government's demands to cut back costs and use less resources, resulting in a situation of risk. We all remember the statements made by the Premier prior to the last election and, on coming into office, the orders he gave to his public servants, the minutes he wrote in

December 1979 and January 1980 urging expenditures to be cut in all ways.

In an attempt to cut into and save in particular on our revenue budget, many vital programmes were terminated, deferred or cancelled. The key one in this instance, of course, is the programme to filter the northern water supply. Obviously, these cuts took place. The programme budgeting yellow book, at page 609, details what finances and manpower resources are detailed for the country water supply and water treatment programme in 1980-81. Manpower numbers were cut from 1 120 in 1979-80 to 1 066 in 1980-81. The largest reduction was in respect of weekly paid employees, those employees who carried out much of the water monitoring activities of the Government.

Revenue account funds for the programme were to increase 4.5 per cent over 1979-80 figures. With inflation increasing costs by about 9 per cent or 10 per cent, that was a cut in real terms of up to 5 per cent. The chief of the capital cuts was the announcement almost within weeks of the election that the northern water filtration programme would not go ahead.

The presence of amoebic *naegleria* in South Australia's water supply has always meant potential problems. Between 1955 and 1972, 13 cases of amoebic meningitis were caused by the pathogenic strain of *naegleria*, a strain known as *naegleria fowleri*, named after a scientist who was working in the Adelaide Children's Hospital in South Australia and who was able to isolate the strain. All of the cases were fatal.

In 1972, an urgent programme of monitoring water supplies and increasing chlorination was begun in order to control the problem. At the end of 1979, an expert committee of the Health Commission recommended that chlorine levels in the northern towns water supply could be reduced so long as the monitoring and publicity programmes were maintained. In January and February 1980, the pathogenic, or deadly strain, of *naegleria*, *naegleria fowleri*, was isolated in the northern water supply for the first time since 1972. Certain measures were taken, but the public was not told. Then, on 24 January 1981, a Whyalla boy was diagnosed as suffering from amoebic meningitis, and he died four days later.

Urgent action was taken by the Government following the identification of that disease. Indeed, the Minister of Water Resources has told the House that action was taken before *naegleria fowleri* was identified as being involved. However, why we are condemning the Government, and why we believe that the Government must be censured, particularly the two Ministers involved, is that these problems were known long before this unfortunate occurrence last month; in fact, the programme had not been adequately carried out. Indeed, there was negligence, which has resulted in this unfortunate situation. It is not sufficient for us to be told what urgent steps were taken after the event; the steps that were taken then came too late.

What has been the response of the Ministers to questions about this matter and the revelations made in the *Sunday Mail* newspaper this weekend? Evidence was placed in that newspaper that had not been communicated to the public of South Australia, and certainly not to this House when questions were asked. Two Ministers are involved, and they have issued joint statements on occasions. Replies to questioning last Thursday by the Opposition showed a certain smugness on the part of the two Ministers involved, culminating in a reply of the Minister of Health, to a question asked by the member for Stuart whether the Minister was fully informed about and satisfied with the water monitoring programme and that

the Government's programme was adequate. The Minister simply said, "Yes", she was, taking responsibility, which responsibility is about to come home to her firmly today.

The two Ministers have been jointly involved but, when the *Sunday Mail* attempted to put the allegations and certain material in documents to the Minister of Water Resources for his prior comment (and it is his committee, and his department carries out the operations), the Minister ran for cover. He did not want to answer questions. In fact, over the weekend, he became unavailable, and referred to the Minister of Health those people who were questioning. She would deal with the matter and answer the questions.

So, while one Minister has attempted to duck responsibility and run for cover, the other has been pushed firmly into the spotlight to try to cover up for the Government. That is a grave allegation, but it is well borne out by the way in which the Minister of Health has handled this matter following the *Sunday Mail* approaching the Government as long ago as last Thursday and drawing the Government's attention to the material it had.

There was plenty of time for a proper and considered response on a matter so urgent, a matter one would have thought the Government was fully advised on. If it was not Thursday evening that the actual documents were shown to the Minister, it would have been on Friday, but there was certainly plenty of time to do something. The first weak response that we got was a hastily cobbled together news release put out by the Minister of Health late on Sunday, 22 February, a news release on which the name of her previous press secretary was not even excised from the top, and the typing of which was obviously done hastily from a number of revisions. That news release was quite misleading; it did not answer the questions that had been raised in the *Sunday Mail*. Because it was apparent that the press and the media in this State would not swallow this sort of flimsy excuse, this sort of reply to the grave allegations made by the *Sunday Mail* from internal Government documents, the Minister was finally constrained, reluctantly, to release the full documents that she understood were in possession of the newspaper.

On the following Monday, eventually, grudgingly those documents were provided. However, the dishonesty continued. While the documents were supplied, the press was steered in the direction of looking at certain conclusions and points in that document by judicious underlining by the Minister. If one simply flicks through this very long and complicated minute, providing tables, graphs, percentages and maps—a minute that takes a lot of analysis and assessment by news reporters attempting to meet deadlines—one finds that they were assisted by the Minister with underlinings of certain key points in the documents.

The dishonesty can be seen quite clearly if one examines this document and looks not at what was underlined by the Minister, but at what was omitted from the underlining. All those parts of the document which raised controversial questions or which highlight the incompetence with which this area has been handled were not underlined. Parts surrounding these passages, key passages that the Minister was quite happy to live with, were underlined, but many key passages were not.

I shall point to a few instances. At page 3 of the covering minute to these documents the following statement is made:

Water treatment processes provide more effective control of amoebae, particularly of *acanthamoeba* species, which are relatively resistant to chlorine.

That is not underlined. Nor indeed is a reference later in that same document to this fact (and I am quoting from

page 4, point 5):

There are indications that water treatment processes provide more important effective control of amoebae, particularly of *acanthamoeba* species, which are relatively resistant to chlorine.

All the points surrounding that are underlined, but not that point. Nor is a later passage underlined in one of the accompanying reports that draws on evidence taken from experiments and sampling at Hope Valley. I quote from page 5, point 5, of that report which is contained in attachment E and which states:

Sampling at Hope Valley before and after the commencement of the water filtration plant suggested that the water treatment process provides more effective control of amoebae, particularly of *acanthamoeba* species, which are relatively resistant to chlorine.

That statement is repeated throughout these documents, and nowhere does the Minister draw attention to it. There is a good reason for that: we have had to sit for week after week in this House and be told by the Minister of Water Resources that water filtration has nothing whatsoever to do with amoebic meningitis, that chlorine is all that we need to talk about, that chlorine treatment is the only answer, and that water filtration is irrelevant. He has said that again and again. The member for Mitchell will deal with this matter later in greater detail.

The Minister has told us that (and his comments have been published in the newspapers in the northern regions) and by doing so, he has suggested that the cancellation of the water filtration plant has nothing to do with the effective control of amoebae in the northern water supply. That is arrogant and patent nonsense, as is made clear in these documents, which state that following those experiments at Hope Valley, in a before and after situation, it was clear that satisfactory disinfection for bacteriological quality was achieved with considerably lower free chlorine residuals.

In other words, not only did the filtration of the water improve its drinking quality, its potability and have all the other beneficial results which some selected areas at the moment are experiencing, but it also made it possible to reduce chlorine levels, one of the things on the grounds of cost saving that the Government was trying to do. It meant as well that there could be more effective control. Let us not hear again the Minister mislead the House in the outrageous way he has. Let the Minister of Health underline that passage in her document. The attention of the media was also directed away by the Minister in relation to the following comment on page 3 of the covering minute:

The report recommends that a reduced sampling programme be adopted for future summers.

An appropriate programme is set out in table 4 of attachment B. The minute continues:

However, there is a need for additional sampling of certain supplies identified as problem areas, for example, Whyalla and Paskeville.

So that problem areas are clearly referred to, Paskeville of course, is at the head of the trunk main leading down the Yorke Peninsula. The minute continues:

Disinfection of repaired or recently laid mains is also recommended. These points will be considered further at the end of the report.

This document was the first real information, the first information in fact, that any of the residents of the Yorke Peninsula towns and Whyalla had that they were defined as a problem area. It is scandalous that the Government, faced with the evidence it had here, which as far back as 11 January 1980, had identified this amoeba at Paskeville, and faced with the statement by its committee that

Whyalla and Paskeville remain problem areas, chose not to take the public into its confidence at any time.

Remember the way in which one can be affected by the amoeba—not through simply drinking the water but through its being forced up the nose in the way in which you might gambol in a swimming pool or even a small child in a bath of a domestic system. One would think that an information programme and advice to people would have been an important method of ensuring that this amoeba did not have a damaging effect. However, not a word was said, and we are told by the Minister that she did not really think that the public should be told, because they might get alarmed—alarmed indeed!

What other matters were left out? On page 4 of the minute, not underlined by the Minister, were the words:

It was suggested that a letter from this department asking that a publicity programme be developed for the 1980-81 season might ensure that a high priority is given to this work.

The committee had laid great stress on a publicity campaign. It was vital, it was urgent, it was important for the summer of 1980-81 as, indeed, it has so proved. There was a minute saying that a high priority must be given to the work, and yet in her report the Minister lamely suggests that she did not get around to it because, for a start, information had to be collected from Western Australia where a case had occurred. A case had occurred in March 1980, but we are talking about the summer of 1980-81, some six to nine months later. It was either the Minister of Health or the Minister of Water Resources who said that there were delays with the Government Printer. The Government Printer apparently had a six or seven month delay in producing the pamphlet. That is sheer and utter nonsense. The truth is that the right priority was not afforded to this campaign. The Government did not want to alarm the public; it did not want to draw attention to the cuts that were being made; and as a result it kept quiet about it and it did not get off the ground.

It has been pointed out that, in fact, the material from Western Australia had arrived at the time that the committee was making that recommendation in April 1980. What other areas has the Minister omitted to detail in the report? There are many; there is the reference to the tests involved. The attention of the press is not drawn to attachment D, which outlines the campaign that it is vital to have. There is no reference to a particular phrase, which is contained in a supporting document referring to the costs involved because, indeed, the Minister does not want to have attention drawn to that aspect of the case. We find at the very end of one of the attached reports the following statement:

The maintenance of the present level of quality cannot be justified, having regard to the availability of staff and financial resources.

There it is clearly spelt out in the document, but not underlined. A whole series of details was underlined above it, in the hope that the reporters would not read that phrase.

Who is responsible for the availability of staff and resources—the Government, and the Government stands condemned on this issue. I come now to the final dishonesty that I will raise in relation to this document, and there are many others. The committee reported on its reasons for looking at reduced chlorine dose rates and a reduced monitoring programme. Five reasons were clearly stated in the document. Indeed, the Minister, when forced to reveal the document, underlined this bit, and it was interesting that she did so. The first reason was the adverse consumer reaction to high chlorine residuals in Mid North towns during last summers. A water filtration programme

can solve adverse consumer reaction.

The second reason was the possibility of corrosion of pipework and fittings. That is a cost factor to be taken into account. My colleague from Elizabeth will deal with an aspect of that. Thirdly, the committee referred to savings in the cost of chlorine. The fourth reason was the absence of cases of amoebic meningitis in Mid North areas. Finally, there was the failure to isolate *naegleria* species which were pathogenic, since the intensive monitoring programme commenced in the summer of 1973.

They are the five reasons and that is the order in which the committee produced them. The Minister's press statement, released before this document, and before she knew she would be forced to produce the second, gives those reasons, but it carefully alters the order to take away any emphasis there might be on the cost aspect. Already the Minister and her Government were feeling guilty about it; they knew how damaging it was. Her press statement does not reproduce the five reasons of the committee in the order that it gave them. Her press statement adduces seven reasons. A couple of extra reasons were thrown in for good measure. Her order is to have as the first reason what was fourth in the committee's list. Her second reason is fifth in the committee's list, and her third reason is first in the committee's list. Then she puts in a new reason, then the second in the committee's list, and then her new one, and right at the bottom, as a sort of after thought, she refers to savings in the cost of chlorination. That sort of manipulation indicates the way in which the Government has so dishonestly handled this exercise.

Let me come to something that has not yet been talked about in the discussions in the press, or in public, over this issue, and this is the whole question of the adequacy of the monitoring programme. I have here detailed sheets outlining the monitoring programme for amoebae from the week ended 22 November 1980 until 3 January 1981—the deleted readings that were made in all the northern water supply points on chlorination residuals on organisms, on amoebae and on the presence of *naegleria*. These documents reveal a very sorry state of affairs, indeed. I point out that we have information only up until 3 January this year.

What was happening during January and February from that date? I call upon the Minister to release those documents and details to this House, showing what was happening at that time, because the evidence revealed that in this early part of one of the hottest summers on record, with temperatures very high throughout November and December, the monitoring programme was not only reduced but was being very inefficiently and ineffectively carried out because of the stringencies imposed by the Government.

Let me deal with the question of the identification of the *naegleria* species of amoeba and point out that *naegleria* may be identified in the water supply, but that does not mean that it is necessarily the pathogenic *naegleria fowleri*. Whether it is or not can be determined only by tests carried out at the I.M.V.S., tests that can take up to three weeks to complete. It is very hard to identify the amoeba that causes death and disease, and hard to say whether the *naegleria* identified include *naegleria fowleri*. The test is a very crude one. It involves literally forcing water taken from the sample tests known to contain the organism up the nose of a mouse and seeing whether the mouse dies of amoebic meningitis. If it does not, *naegleria fowleri* is not present; if it does, clearly we are in a dangerous situation.

Because of that, whenever *naegleria* is detected in the water supply, it is a matter of some urgency to have it

tested, to ensure that the water supply can be cleared. It is a matter of some urgency to change the chlorine levels as necessary. These documents show that *naegleria* indeed was present throughout the water supply on many occasions during those months and weeks. We are talking about the period from 19 November to 2 January of this year.

Let me mention some locations that are not the concern of this motion. At Port Augusta West, *naegleria* was identified on 3 December, at Lochiel it was identified on 2, 9 and 22 December, at Snowtown on 2 and 9 December, at Warnertown on 16, 22 and 30 December, and at Brinkworth on 31 December. So, many points outside the area of danger had seen the identification of the *naegleria* species.

Let me turn to Yorke Peninsula. I suggest that what I am going to say should be listened to most carefully by the member for Rocky River and the member for Goyder, whose constituents are affected by this aspect of the Government's appalling performance in this area. Let us recall that the documents the Minister has released show that, for the first time since 1973, *naegleria fowleri*, the pathogenic genus, had been discovered in the Paskeville water supply twice, a matter of some concern. One would have thought that the identification of any *naegleria* from Paskeville onwards and around that water supply would have been a matter of the utmost concern during the extremely hot summer of 1980-81, the one we are experiencing at the moment, because it is in those conditions that the amoeba flourishes. The documents reveal that the *naegleria* has been present throughout this summer. Nothing was said about it by the Government, there was no stepped up information campaign, and no action was taken except periodic reductions and increases of the chlorine levels.

Let me turn to the Paskeville town supply itself, in which *naegleri* was identified, the same supply in which *fowleri* had been found a few months earlier, on 28 November, 12 December and 19 December. Weekly sampling was taking place, and on each occasion *naegleria* was identified. The reports note that the mains were flushed and disinfected on 24 December, two weeks after the *naegleria* had been identified in the Paskeville town supply and in one other location with which I shall deal in a minute.

The reports note that the mains were flushed and disinfected, yet still, after that action was taken, on 2 January both Paskeville town supply and Paskeville No. 2 main showed the presence of the *naegleria* species. There is obviously something very wrong with the water supply in that district, putting people in that area at grave danger. Port Broughton, incidentally, had identified *naegleria* on 28 November, 5 December and 2 January—a similar situation.

Let us go down the Peninsula a little to the town of Minlaton. Minlaton, as the Minister's documents released to the press revealed, is monitored monthly. The documents we have, as I say, cover a period less than two months, so for the first three weeks the Minlaton water supply was not monitored at all. Let me break off at this point to say that it seems to be quite outrageous that the monitoring had not been increased throughout the Yorke Peninsula water supply system in the face of the evidence at Paskeville, and I would like to hear the explanation for that. Let us return to Minlaton. The first occasion on which Minlaton water was monitored in this period was 10 December 1980, the only reading of the period. That reading showed that *naegleria* was present in that town's water supply. What was the reaction? Was it an instant re-looking at the water supply and stepping up the frequency of sampling? No way at all, because the rest of the

documents show that at least, from the period when it was identified at the monthly check on 10 December, until 2 January not one further reading or test was taken at Minlaton. The public was not told that. This is an example of negligence.

Let me turn to Whyalla. All sorts of comforting noises have been made about Whyalla. The Opposition has been accused of scaremongering and of panicking. We are told that there was no reduction of chlorine level in the Whyalla water supply. If that was so, I ask the Minister why these documents show that chlorine was decreased at Lincoln Gap on 26 November 1980? First, I would like to know why that is shown on the charts when the Minister assures us that no decrease took place in the chlorine levels of the Whyalla water supply. Secondly, how can the Minister assure us that the Whyalla water supply was monitored adequately, when these documents show that on at least two weeks no monitoring whatsoever took place at Whyalla.

The Minister for Water Resources told us it occurred weekly—"Weekly", the Minister of Health echoes. These documents show that in the week ending 22 November and the week ending 20 December 1980 no monitoring took place at all—the sheet is blank. Was this any cause of concern? Well, it is true that on the other occasions, *naegleria* was not isolated at Whyalla, but it is also interesting that on no occasion were the chlorine residuals included in the table. How much chlorine was in the Whyalla water supply? We do not know, because it was never tested. There is a blank—not a blank, the letters "n.d." and those letters stand for "not determined". It is determined for just about every other water supply, but not for Whyalla.

What is wrong with the programme? What is wrong with the Minister's surveillance of that programme when that can occur? There are other examples of slackness. The colony count was not determined on 25 November. The temperature was not even recorded on 13 December. These documents point to a quite shoddy performance, again under the stringency of the Government's costs. This has raised far more questions than it has answered, but I think it has highlighted the gravity of this action and the need for this Government to take stock of itself and to ensure that at least two incompetent Ministers are got rid of immediately.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I am inclined, when I listen to the Leader of the Opposition, to recall the lines from Macbeth: "Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." What the Leader has said this afternoon demonstrates, if any demonstrations were needed to anyone with any degree of common sense, the absolute futility of using selected leaked Government documents and building a case against Ministers on the basis of those documents, and those documents alone. The Leader has demonstrated his ignorance of the context in which those documents were put together. He has made statements and allegations that cannot in any way be substantiated. He has cast the most severe aspersions on the water and health authorities of South Australia, who are recognised throughout the world, not only in this nation, as being pre-eminent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the Minister please resume her seat. The Leader was listened to in silence from the benches opposite. He was not, on some occasions, helped by assistance from his own side. I ask that all members from the Opposition side listen to the Minister and other speakers from the Government side likewise in silence.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Leader, in attempting to bring down two Ministers, has cast the most dreadful aspersions on the South Australian water and health authorities, who are recognised not only throughout Australia but also throughout the world as being pre-eminent in the field of control of amoebic meningitis. I ask the House to bear that in mind in the light of all that the Leader said and in the light of what I am about to say, because it is important and central to government that the advice that Ministers are given is advice upon which total reliance can be placed, particularly in scientific matters. In this House today, we are dealing with a matter that has, in essence, a scientific basis. I ask the House to take that into account, because it is central to our argument.

I take issue most strongly with the Leader's contention that the Government has put above all else, in the matter of control of amoebic meningitis, the desire to cut back on funds. Nowhere is there any evidence whatsoever to substantiate that allegation. No instruction was given by the Government: no instruction has ever been given by the Minister of Water Resources or by me as Minister of Health indicating that financial considerations should in any way be a factor taken into account by expert committees considering water safety. Not one member opposite could substantiate that allegation, yet the Leader stood up in this House and said, in essence, that amoebic meningitis occurred in Whyalla because this Government ordered cutbacks in water safety. That is a most outrageous assertion, and one that cannot be substantiated. It is an assertion to which I take the strongest exception on behalf of the Government.

Let us look at the facts. The Leader said there were terminations, referrals and cancellations of Government services. There may well have been, in some services to which priority could not have been given, across the board, and I will not detail those, but, in respect of water safety, there has been no termination, no referral and no cancellation whatsoever of the water safety programme in any of the northern towns. There has been a modification on health and safety grounds of some of the actions and procedures that had been in train since 1972.

The Leader has made a number of errors in his assertions, and I will deal with some of them. In the first instance, he referred to the fact that an expert committee of the South Australian Health Commission recommended that the levels of chlorination and monitoring in the northern towns be reduced. Let me enlighten the Leader. The committee was not an expert committee of the South Australian Health Commission. It consisted of officers of the South Australian Health Commission, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. That expert committee, which was a standing committee established by the Labor Government, has not altered since, although its composition in terms of membership might have altered. The principal people on the committee and its role have not altered since it was established by the Labor Government. The committee met in 1979 to review the chlorination and monitoring programmes. Let me tell the House the factors that were taken into account. The reading by the Leader from the documents that were leaked to him took no account whatsoever of these factors. The Leader conveniently listed five factors. In fact, there were more than five.

Unless the Leader has read through every official document on this matter, which I am certain he has not (although the Minister of Water Resources and I believe that we have), he is not in a position to speak definitively about the factors taken into account. The first and most important factor, rated top by health and water safety

authorities, was the absence of any case of amoebic meningitis in South Australia since 1972. That is the first thing that must be considered. The second was the absence of pathogenic amoeba from reticulated supplies in Mid North areas since 1972. In those eight years, not one piece of evidence of a pathogenic amoeba had been discovered. The third (and the Leader glosses over this in a manner which I believe we may in future have call to remind him of) was the significant adverse consumer reaction to high chlorine residuals in Mid North towns during the summer months, since the commencement of higher chlorination, bearing in mind that those chlorination levels are approximately four times the common residual level in the Adelaide water supply. Another factor which the committee took into account (and this again is one which the Leader and his Party, who are so concerned about health, should bear in mind) was the high doses of chlorine to which organisms were subjected at the booster injection points of the Port Pirie and Port Augusta systems. In addition, it took into account the evidence of corrosion in pipework and fittings, which, apart from other factors, may have enhanced the difficulty of water quality control.

The Leader leaped to a false conclusion when he was referring to pipe corrosion. He assumed that the Government was anxious only to avoid incurring further costs. Let me simply advise the Leader that corrosion of pipes in itself is a factor which makes the ensuring of water safety control difficult indeed. I ask him to bear that in mind as one of the factors which had to be weighed in the balance, not by the Ministers but by the expert committee when it came to its conclusions.

Naturally, the expert committee also took into account the other actions taken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, including the flushing of mains and slug dosages of chlorine. In addition, there were other chlorination points near the origins of the water supply. The consequential savings in the cost of chlorination were certainly mentioned by the committee. Any responsible committee would obviously identify any savings or, alternatively, any costs which were inherent in its recommendations, but there is no evidence anywhere on any official document, let alone one that the Leader has laid his sticky little hands on, to demonstrate that there was any instruction by the Government or that the Government had even the slightest concern about the cost of this monitoring programme, other than a responsible concern for proper financial management. Nowhere ever has an instruction been given to cut costs in respect of water safety.

The Leader accuses the authorities, in effect, of negligence and what he described as a shoddy performance. That is the Leader's opinion of the health and water safety authorities in South Australia. Let me give him the opinion of someone from outside this State who has endured similar anxieties in respect of amoebic meningitis. I refer to the situation in Western Australia in March last year and to a press statement dated 1 April 1980 issued by the Hon. Ray Young, Minister of Health for Western Australia. This was an absolutely unsolicited comment from the Western Australian Minister of Health. During the outbreak there, the Western Australians called on the South Australian authorities for assistance, guidance and help. Following the provision of that assistance, guidance and help from this State's water laboratories, the Hon. Ray Young said:

There is no doubt that the South Australians had had more experience than anyone else in the world with this sort of circumstance that the disease confronted us with here. We could not have obtained better or more prompt advice at the beginning of the crisis, eight weeks ago, than that which the



visiting South Australian microbiologists gave us at that time. They are the people whom the Leader of the Opposition is accusing of shoddy performance and negligence, and I take strong exception on behalf of the water and health authorities of South Australia to that kind of insulting innuendo upon which the Leader of the Opposition can place no basis whatsoever.

The Leader went on to say that my news release was misleading. That news release was compiled with the assistance of senior people in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the South Australian Health Commission. There was not one misleading statement in that press release. There is nothing which the Leader can refute, it is based on sound fact, and it was carefully checked. If the Leader wishes to be so petty as to complain about the kind of typing services which one can obtain on a Sunday afternoon when senior officers, who are not stenographers, are putting a statement together, I accept his criticism, but to me it is footling and means absolutely nothing. The Leader of the Opposition said that there is a reluctance on the part of the Minister of Health to release documents and that there is judicious underlining (as he puts it) by the Minister of certain sections of those documents. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider: if a Minister releases a document publicly, obviously every word that is in that document can be assessed by anyone who has access to it. The underlinings were in respect of principal points which the committee had considered. I agree that I could have omitted all underlinings, and I could equally have underlined everything, but I chose, because I know that the press work under deadlines, to highlight key points which the committee had taken into account.

It seems to me that the criticisms of that underlining are simply without foundation. The Leader acknowledged that I had underlined matters which he thought perhaps, if I wanted to put the best face on the matter, I may not have underlined. I think that in itself indicates that I was underlining principal points. As to the Leader's reference to *acanthamoebae* in the minute from which he quoted, again he demonstrates his ignorance. We are not concerned here with *acanthamoebae*—we are concerned with *naegleria* species which is susceptible to control by chlorination. Until and unless he has a better scientific knowledge—I would not expect him to have such knowledge; I do not expect as Minister of Health to be familiar with all these details—he would be well advised to leave these scientific matters to the experts.

The Leader went on then to refer to filtration. I will leave to the Minister of Water Resources the task of dealing with the question of filtration, and I think by the time my colleague has done that the Leader will be sorry indeed that he raised the matter at all. However, from a health point of view let me say (and this cannot be refuted by anyone—not by the Leader, not by his colleagues and not by any health authority: and that is the truth) that filtration will not eliminate the risk of amoebic meningitis. Certainly, filtration will improve the quality of water, but it will not eliminate the risk of amoebic meningitis. The sooner the Leader gets that truth into his head and absorbs it, the better it will be.

The Leader went on to deal with the Paskeville situation, and I would like to comment in detail on that, because it is important. Temperature tolerant amoebae were isolated from the water supply at Paskeville on 11 January 1980, 15 February 1980, and 28 March 1980. It is important to realise that all pathogenic amoebae will survive temperatures of 44°C; however not all amoebae which survive at 44°C are necessarily pathogenic. Hence, temperature tolerance is not an absolute test for

pathogenicity. The isolate has to be injected into mice in the way that the Leader described to prove its pathogenicity.

The I.M.V.S. confirmed the first isolate as pathogenic on 26 March 1980, and the second on 14 March 1980. The third isolate was confirmed on 25 April 1980. On confirmation, the chlorine dosage was boosted each time. During this period January to March 1980 there had been increased bacteriological contamination in the Paskeville town supply. This was thought to be due to an interruption in chlorination and the admittance of water from open storage for balancing purposes and because of leakage.

Officers of the E. & W.S. Department conferred with Health Commission officers when the confirmation of pathogenic strains in the Paskeville system was revealed. Having regard to the increased chlorination and monitoring, and especially to the approaching cooler weather, it was agreed that there was no need for additional publicity likely to cause unnecessary alarm.

That was the advice I was given by the Chairman of the Central Board of Health. In respect to the Leader of the Opposition's allegation that there was a 'cover up', let me remind him that steps were taken to notify hospitals and medical practitioners in the area, and the memoranda which were sent out in respect of that are on the record. If the Leader wishes to see them, I would be quite pleased to show them to him.

May I also refer the Leader to the debate which took place in this House when his Party was in Government in the early 1970's. May I also refer the Leader to the comments made by his former Leader (the Hon. Don Dunstan) about the irresponsibility of people who generate public hysteria on a matter which certainly has the capacity to arouse a high level of public anxiety. I think it would be instructive to the Leader of the Opposition to read that debate. If he did read it, he would know that I could stand here now and read almost verbatim the former Premier's speech in an urgency motion on this topic. The principles on which he based that speech were essentially the same, namely, that a Government is bound to take the advice of its expert authorities. Even at that stage, South Australian authorities were well respected in respect of water safety, and in the intervening years they have gained more experience than anyone else in the world has gained on this matter.

Let me refer to the Paskeville situation. When it was known that pathogenic amoebae had been isolated at Paskeville, the Chairman of the Central Board of Health came and advised me of that fact. He advised me orally in the first instance, and I later received confirmation in writing. He outlined the factors which had been taken into account by the expert committee in taking action in respect of Paskeville. The report of the review meeting of 27 September 1979 was presented to the Central Board of Health at its meeting on 8 November 1979. I stress now that I am talking about the Central Board of Health's role in this whole procedure, not just in relation to Paskeville. The Central Board of Health raised no question or objections to the recommendations of that expert committee. The fact that it raised no objection signifies its agreement to it.

The Central Board of Health is the body established by this Parliament to determine and ensure the safety of water supplies in South Australia. Sections 96 and 97 of the Health Act allow the Central Board of Health and local boards of health to control water distributed for drinking purposes that is considered to be polluted and likely to be injurious to health. Decisions of the Central Board of Health when taken under Statute are not referred to any other person for confirmation. Not for one



moment do I deny full Ministerial responsibility for matters which are administered under my portfolio. Not for one moment does the Minister of Water Resources, or the Government, deny responsibility for these matters.

However, I do point out to the Leader and his colleagues, for their edification, that there are statutory requirements that have to be observed. As Minister, I have no power to direct or control the Central Board of Health. It is true that if I wanted, as a lay person, to override or reject the advice that was given to me, there would probably be avenues that would have to be explored through this Parliament. Certainly, I could not, as Minister, reject the advice of that board.

I would like to ask the Leader, if his motion is to have any substance whatsoever, would he be good enough to advise the House what he would have done in these circumstances? Would he have overridden the advice of experts? Would he have had a crystal ball and said in September last year, "We are going to have a summer of heat that is unprecedented since the 1930s; we must ensure that the chlorination levels at Whyalla are increased; we must ensure that the promotional programme is bumped up; we must ensure these things because I, the Minister, know more than the experts and authorities who have had years of experience in this field." If that is what he is trying to tell the House, I suggest that he would have no credibility whatsoever with anyone.

The Leader referred to publicity programmes. I would like to give a history of these. With a greater understanding of the cause of this disease it was possible in 1972 to mount a publicity programme, which has continued ever since. Its basis was the avoidance of entry of water into the nose, proper maintenance of swimming or paddling pools, and the avoidance of head ducking in baths or when drinking from taps. I stress these matters, because we are talking about the safety of a supply, and also about a very rare disease. Whenever this occurs governments with the best possible will and capacity have not been able to control or eliminate it absolutely. This disease has been known to occur in Czechoslovakia, Florida and New Guinea, and there is not sufficient known about it to eliminate it. But we know that a certain degree of personal responsibility needs to be exercised in respect of water and in regard to amoebic meningitis.

Posters and pamphlets were prepared and widely distributed throughout schools, local government, health surveyors, public swimming pools and other community sources. Medical officers and health surveyors from the then Department of Public Health, now the South Australian Health Commission, visited and explained our understanding of the disease to meetings of citizens and local councils. As no further cases occurred after 1972, the programme's intensity was gradually reduced over the next few years, when the Leader's Party was in Government. I stress that. However, the pamphlets and posters have always been available on request, to community outlets in the three affected towns.

After the reviews in September 1979 and April 1980, it was considered necessary to redraft the text of the pamphlets and posters, and to present them in a more attractive manner. In place of a single pamphlet, two pamphlets were produced—one for the public, and especially for schoolchildren, and a second for adults, especially for teachers, giving information about the disease.

Owing to the work load in the Health Education Unit (and incidentally this Government has upgraded the resources to that unit, a matter which was not taken account of by the previous Government), there was a delay in producing these new pamphlets, so that they were

not ready for distribution at the beginning of the 1980-81 summer season. I freely acknowledge that; it is a well-known fact. However, supplies of the old pamphlet, which was still technically correct, and still available, were distributed.

The new pamphlets were available shortly after the diagnosis of amoebic meningitis in January. The health promotion and health education unit has been conducting an active campaign in the northern towns, especially in Whyalla. Three part-time educators have been employed to give lectures and explanations to schools and citizen groups in the area.

I do not deny for one moment that the matters the Leader raised are important in terms of the subject, but the manner in which he has raised them is to be deplored. He has been selective and has failed to understand the context of the matter. He has been downright insulting to public servants and health and water authorities. I would say that his rating with the people who really know about this disease and its control would be at the absolute rock bottom. So, I might add, would be the rating of those sections of the media that covered this story with an extraordinary disregard for their irresponsible actions, in terms of arousing levels of public anxiety, which, in themselves, are dangerous to mental and emotional health in the towns of northern South Australia.

There were very many errors, some perhaps minor, in the Leader's speech. He referred to the water supply to Whyalla as going through Lincoln Gap. He appears not to recognise that that part of the pipeline provides for the industrial needs of the B.H.P. It does not go to the town of Whyalla and is not part of the reticulated supply used by the people of Whyalla.

I have kept the Mayor of Whyalla informed of these matters continually. Every time there has been a report in respect of finding amoebae, or any other matter to do with the water supply, I have telephoned her and spoken to her. She acknowledges to me that at no stage was the level of chlorination or the monitoring level reduced in Whyalla; not since 1972 has there been a reduction of any kind in the level of monitoring of chlorination in Whyalla. There has been no need, because the levels set in 1972 and maintained ever since have been maintained on the basis of pathogenic amoebae never being discovered there, and of the Whyalla supply, which goes under the gulf and which is consequently not exposed to the high degrees of heat to which the Port Pirie and Port Augusta supplies are, not needing the same high levels of chlorination. There was not a word in the Leader's speech about the unprecedented hot weather, or the prompt and immediate response provided by health and water authorities in respect of the hot weather.

I condemn the Opposition for the way in which it is handling this matter. It has a great deal to answer for. When I think of the people of Whyalla and the other northern towns in a state of high anxiety as a result of the fervour whipped up by the Opposition and sections of the media, it is disgraceful that this sort of thing should be allowed to happen. If the Leader wants tabulation in detailed form every time a pathogen is suspected in the water supply, he is no doubt prepared to live with the nervous tension and hysteria generated in every town. Surely it should be sufficient for this House to place its confidence in the water and health authorities of this State, and in their ability and responsibility to continuously ensure that those supplies are safe. I absolutely deplore what the Opposition has done in respect of this matter, and I move:

That all words after "House" in the Leader's motion be deleted, and that the following words be inserted in lieu

thereof:

[This House] endorses the continuing actions of health and water supply authorities in maintaining the safety and integrity of South Australia's water supply, particularly in northern towns and the Yorke Peninsula, and it deplores the recent irresponsible and alarmist attempts to create unwarranted anxiety within the community.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I support the motion. Before developing some of my arguments, I need to deal with some of the matter (because that is all it was) put forward by the Minister of Health in answer to the very serious and grave charges made against the Minister of Health and the Minister of Water Resources which have been supported by evidence put forward by my Leader. It boils down to this: if a Minister concerned has knowledge of a matter, has the power to do something about it, and fails to take the necessary action, clearly there is a *prima facie* case of negligence. No member would quarrel, I am sure, with those three principles I have put forward, and I will show that both Ministers are guilty on those three cardinal points. Therefore, the motion is entirely supportable and should be supported by every decent member concerned with the welfare of the people of South Australia, especially those members living in the North of the State.

We heard the Minister of Health put forward a lame excuse that, when information had come forward to the bodies for which she has direct responsibility containing details of cost savings which may be made in the health area, a vital area, the quality of the water available for all purposes in the North of the State, the Government had issued no instruction and had put forward no minute to order this to happen. What a ridiculous argument from a Government which was elected on the following principle in relation to water resources. This Government put forward the first five points in its policy and platform as follows:

A Liberal Government will seek to arrest increases in the price of water and encourage the saving of water.

The cost factor. The second point was as follows:

This Liberal Government will review the method of charging for water and sewerage services with a view to correcting existing anomalies.

Again, the cost factor. The third point—and let the Minister laugh now—was as follows:

Rationalise and effect economies in the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Again, the cost factor. I believe that all members would agree that the water treatment branch is located in that department. The fourth point was that the Government would:

Require the Engineering and Water Supply Department to undertake its construction work in accordance with the general principles of competitive tendering.

Here again, the cost factor. I need not go on, although there are others, but nowhere is there mention in that document of the northern towns water supply, which was a known project—not a word. Let the Minister of Water Resources laugh at that, if he can.

I was referring earlier to some of the matter put forward by the Minister of Health. She said that the action which had occurred recently was justified, as it were, in her opinion (that was what we were being given), because there had been no amoebic meningitis since 1972. The Minister really was saying that the previous Government's programme in that area had been safe and satisfactory and had resulted in a satisfactory quality of water to the northern towns. The Minister apparently overlooked what she was really putting forward.

In trying to chide my Leader, the Minister said that scientific matters should be left to the experts, and she challenged the Leader to outline to the House what he would have done in a similar situation. I am prepared to outline to the House what I did in a similar situation as a member of the previous Labor Government in South Australia, when I had the responsibility now carried by the Minister of Water Resources. That is a fair response. The matter of the northern towns water supply came to my attention in 1979, when I was Minister. It came directly to me at that time. I was aware of it before then, as were many other members of the House, because it had been an ongoing discussion for quite a few years. I asked the Director-General, Mr. Lewis, to put before me and to outline to me all the known parameters and factors available. He did that in an excellent way, and probably in as good a way as that whole area could have been covered. There is no doubt about the integrity and ability of the Director-General of Water Supply. It is not the Director-General who is being asked to resign, but the Minister, because the Minister has the responsibility in this area, in this House at least.

I made the decision. The Director-General did not say to me, "You should do this, Minister", or "You should do that, Minister." I made the decision that the time had come for this project to go forward. With Cabinet Government, the next step is to take the matter to Cabinet. I did that, and Cabinet agreed that filtration of the water supply to the northern towns should get first priority and would be in the election policy. It did not appear at all in the policy of the Liberal Party at that election. The announcement was made by the then Premier, Des Corcoran, who had formerly been the Minister, whose standing and whose rating in the community, amongst experts as well as ordinary members of the community, was such that no-one would doubt that, if he said in his election statement that the project would go forward, that it was necessary, then it would happen. But what happened in October 1979, within weeks of the election? I quote from a report in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 3 October. The heading was "Libs may axe Labor plans", and the report stated:

The Minister of Water Resources, Mr. Arnold, said that the \$25 000 000 filtration project had been referred to Treasury for consideration in the light of the many financial commitments facing the State.

There we see the cost factor aspect again, even as early as October 1979—not the desirability, not the necessity; not "Is it safe? Is it healthy?" but all on a cost-factor basis. In the same report, the Minister said:

The Government was aware that the quality of water supplied to the area was generally unsatisfactory. It would act to improve it as soon as the economy permits.

Once again, we hear about the cost factor. The whole point of the matter before the House is which should have primacy: the cost or the public interest. That is the difference in the philosophies of the Parties. There are areas where cost must not be allowed to be the only factor to decide what happens.

The only thing I can think of was that at the time the Minister was under pressure from other members of the Cabinet, or even from the Premier. I am prepared to allow for that. The Cabinet system does not indicate clearly who took the decision, so the Minister can have that small consolation, if he wishes. Let us examine the kinds of argument put forward by the Minister since then to justify that (at the very least) regrettable decision taken by the Government of the time to defer that project.

The Minister has said that no funds were provided by the previous Government. Let us put that argument to bed

once and for all, because, if that was what the Minister was arguing, I ask him to read the 1977-78 annual report of the Engineering and Water Supply Department which was presented to Parliament and in which at page 17 the following statement appears, under the aegis of the Minister of the time and the Director-General of the time:

A feasibility study on water treatment for northern towns was completed and a report in the form of a working paper prepared. The report looks at the water quality problems in the northern towns region in some detail and examines the range of options for complete and partial solution.

I ask the Minister to explain to the House how that operation took place within the Engineering and Water Supply Department without the expenditure of any funds and yet received that prominence and was approved in the report of the Auditor-General for that year. Clearly, cost has been a predominant factor in this matter from the day that members opposite took Government. One can see the hysteria that they created at the time of the last State election about alleged waste and the cost of Government and Government services influenced themselves. Not only did it at the time have an effect on the people of the State, who failed to perceive that they were in receipt of good Government at that time, but it has also affected the clear thinking that the people of this State are entitled to expect from the persons who are the Ministers of the Crown and who are put there by the people.

The Minister was at some pains to suggest that in no way does filtration of the northern towns water supplies have any effect on the question of making safe the water concerned by chlorination. If that is the Minister of Health's viewpoint, and is also the viewpoint of the Minister of Water Resources, may I refer him to the report on water treatment for northern towns produced within his department and dated September 1979, as follows:

Particulate and organic materials in the water necessitate heavy chlorination to ensure that there is an adequate chlorine residual in the distribution system. As a result of these factors, bacteriological quality does not satisfy accepted standards. In addition, heavy chlorination causes tastes and odours, and necessitates alkali dosing to control pH.

On page 2 of that document, the bottom paragraph on the left hand side of the page states:

Full water treatment—  
referring to northern towns water—  
would be needed—

it does not say "suggested"—

to ensure removal of suspended matter and organisms from the water, thereby permitting more effective disinfection—  
those are the words in the report—  
with lower doses of chlorine.

That was one of the reasons I believe it was time to do something about the difficulties connected with the circumstances I outlined to the House when I was faced with this matter not long ago.

I want to return briefly to the position of the Minister of Health in this matter. The Minister was scathing in her attacks on the Leader, and questioned his rating with the experts—if he dare query the efforts of experts. What about the experts who said that thalidomide was all right? What about the scientists who said that it was quite satisfactory to use that drug? Who were the persons who discovered it was not all right? Would it be accurate to describe them as lay people—the victims? The Minister of Water Resources does not seem to find it quite so amusing any longer. The position in this matter is exactly the same. Of course the Minister cannot in any area have all the technical knowledge and expertise, but a Minister is supposed to be in possession of a brain and a feeling of

responsibility to the people of the State (for which a Minister receives the salary he gets).

For the Minister to suggest, as occurred last night on television, in more than one instance I am told, although I saw only the one programme, the news, that she was powerless in this area because a statutory authority was concerned and that she is only a poor Minister is nonsense and, I suggest to the House, an insult to it. In other words, the Liberal Government composed of X number of Ministers has X number of rubber stamps. Is that all that is being put forward, that whenever a matter comes before a Minister the Minister is the one who has the stamp locked up in one of these safes, on which they have changed the combinations, and who gets out the stamp and says, "O.K."? Clearly, that is a nonsensical proposition to put forward, and for no other reason than that the Minister ought to resign. There is more to this matter than riding around in a nice white car, having people open the door for you and getting first go at the goodies at social functions that the Minister is opening. There is the matter of standing up and having a bit of what used to be called "intestinal fortitude" and relying on one's own judgment in the matter in order to ensure on behalf of the people of the State that there is safety in the matter concerned or that it is for the benefit of the people concerned.

What happens if a Minister does have this courage and has the temerity to throw away the rubber stamp and take on the body concerned? What is the worst that can happen? The Minister's education might well be improved, because that Minister had the guts to say, "I am not sure about that; I want you to demonstrate that to me in a clearer way." Who can suffer from that kind of behaviour? If the Minister did not know, obviously the Minister will know after a further demonstration is provided, and there would be no real problem. If the body concerned had any view of the Minister after that that was other than in accordance with what I have just outlined, there is something wrong with that group of people. It has been pointed out that they are experts, that they are intelligent people, that they are well qualified, so one would hope that one of their qualifications would be the ability to recognise that the Minister cannot be expected to know everything and is perfectly entitled to call for further explanations, more demonstrations, more proof, and so on. That facet alone demonstrates that the person concerned is not fit to be a Minister, and on that ground also stands condemned.

If anybody in this House wants to know why I am putting forward that thesis, I will read the following from the annual report of the Central Board of Health. This document is signed by Dr. K. J. Wilson and Mr. J. M. Blandford, for the South Australian Health Commission. It is a statement to the Minister and is addressed to the Minister, the Hon. Jennifer Adamson. The first words on that document are as follows:

The Central Board of Health is a statutory body responsible to the Minister of Health.

That is signed by the officers of the Health Commission. My understanding of the word "responsible" I outlined to the House in my earlier remarks. There is no doubt whatever that the Minister has been guilty in this matter. Maybe it was a matter of ego and a reluctance to venture into an area where one's lack of knowledge would have been displayed, but that is not an excuse that can be accepted when one is appointed and sworn in as a Minister to do one's best on behalf of the people of this State. I ask all members to remember that point when this matter comes to a vote.

The Minister went on to say that her actions in the matter as a whole (and I am mindful of your earlier ruling,

Sir, but sometimes it is very difficult to avoid the use of the pronoun) included notification to hospitals and medical practitioners in the Mid-North in relation to the disastrous readings that were occurring in the Paskeville water supply. One is almost tempted (and I say this not in any other sense than representing my true feelings) to ask why funeral directors were not also notified. Hospitals and doctors are on the end of the scene.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I ask members who profess such interest in the matter before the House to explain why the persons most concerned in the matter, those who might well contact this fatal disease, were not notified. Contracting this disease is not like getting a cold or a runny nose, or breaking a leg: people die from it, and in most cases those people are children who are not readily aware of the way in which the disease is contracted and the dangers in which they can unconsciously involve themselves. If ever there was a need for special publicity, this is it. The lame excuse that we were given was that there was a need to collect information. I remind the House that on 18 April 1980 a letter was sent from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the E. & W.S. Department to the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission (and I believe that that body is responsible to the Minister—I do not suppose we have to get a quote on that and prove that it is responsible). That letter, immediately after the paragraph referring to Whyalla and Paskeville, stated:

With regard to the public information campaign, it is understood that your health promotion unit is proposing to review strategies which are currently used, including the pamphlet *Prevent Amoebic Meningitis*. In view of recent isolations of *naegleria fowleri* in the Paskeville water supply, it is requested that this work be given priority to enable the launching of an effective campaign for the 1980-81 summer season.

There are no ifs or buts about it. What priority was it given? From April to November, it never got off the ground. That was the priority given! The Minister has not denied being aware of the publicity area. She has admitted to the House that there was a delay. That was put forward in a very quiet way, almost like her saying, "I went home and forgot to pick up my tennis racquet," or something like that. In a way, the Minister was saying, in regard to an area where every person was at risk (let us be fair and say that there was a possible risk) from a very serious organism that causes death in most cases known so far, "There was a delay. I tried to get it going, but it never got off the ground." That is an absolutely inexcusable performance from the Minister.

Let us leave out responsibility. Ministers are supposed to do something besides open fetes and christen new buildings, as I said before: they are required to exercise decisive behaviour on behalf of the State and get things done. That was not a very hard task. The Minister gave no satisfactory explanation for what is almost criminal negligence in a matter as serious as this. I believe that I need do no more in respect of the Minister of Water Resources than point out the direct coupling (no pun intended) that has occurred between the Ministers. Joint statements have been issued on more than one occasion. Reports have been made to the House and the people of South Australia, issued under the joint authority of the Ministers. Therefore, if one Minister is guilty (as I have clearly shown) of negligent performance, failure to deliver, almost taking money under false pretences, then the other Minister also is guilty. I find no amusement in this matter, but it seems that the member for Mallee is amused—somewhere in this State are people who are

related to a boy who is no longer alive.

I am not saying that that occurrence could have been avoided, but can the Ministers concerned say that in no way was the water supply responsible? I do not believe that that is an unfair question. Neither of the Ministers has put forward that claim, nor can it be dismissed. So, if there is a doubt in that area, it could be argued that the Ministers must front up and accept that point. I know that other members will wish to speak on this subject, because it is of great importance and concern. I wholeheartedly support the motion, and I believe it is in the best interests of the State if the two Ministers front up and recognise their failure to provide the actions and performance that are accepted requirements for a Minister of the Crown in this State. I support the motion.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources):** Over the past week, we have seen a deplorable exhibition from the Labor Party in relation to this important subject. Not only is the Labor Party's performance regarded as deplorable in South Australia, because of the fear that it has endeavoured to generate in the minds of children and adults in this State, but it is also recognised as such in other parts of Australia. The Opposition's conduct was deplorable, because the action that has been taken was ill founded, and has been based on limited knowledge and on documents that have been handed over, presumably, to the member for Elizabeth. The Labor Party has embarked on an exercise, aided and abetted by the *Sunday Mail*, that has instilled fear and trepidation into the people of South Australia. This is a deplorable exhibition, and I believe that the people of South Australia recognise it as such.

I will refer to one or two matters which were not touched on by the Minister of Health and which clearly indicate that, if the Leader believes for one moment that he has any technical knowledge in this area, it can be clearly demonstrated that he has no understanding of how a very vast water distribution system, such as the Morgan-Whyalla scheme, operates. The Leader referred to the lowering of chlorination at Lincoln Gap. The Minister of Health indicated, for the Leader's information, that the domestic water supply for Whyalla does not go through Lincoln Gap; in fact, it cuts across the gulf from Port Pirie. What the Leader does not understand is that the variation in dosage rates (and the Leader, if he is prepared to listen, may learn something) occurs for the purpose of obtaining a residual level. That is what is important—the residual figure of either .5 or .3 milligrammes per litre.

The Leader has clearly indicated that he just does not understand how the chlorination of a large water supply operates. I would have thought that he might seek sufficient advice from technical people to enable him to speak with some authority on how the system actually operates. In view of the contempt in which he has held senior officers of the Health Commission, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and also the State Water Laboratories, I will be surprised if he can ever gain any information from those officers again. The manner in which he has castigated those senior officers is an absolute disgrace. As the Minister of Health has said, they are recognised around the world as being the top authorities in this area.

Mention has been made about the recognition from Western Australia of the services supplied to that State by South Australia. I have the following letter which was received by the Premier from the Premier of Western Australia:

I should like to express on behalf of the Government and people of Western Australia, our very great appreciation for

your prompt and valuable help in our investigations of the recent occurrence of amoebic meningitis in this State which sadly resulted in the deaths of two young people.

**Mr. Keneally:** What is the date of that letter?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** 12 February 1980, and it was written immediately following the assistance given by South Australia to the Western Australian Government. The letter continues:

Our request for the assistance of your experts was made at midday Saturday and by Sunday afternoon they were in conference with our representatives in Perth. The two officers involved, Messrs. R. Walters and B. Robinson of your Engineering and Water Supply Department, have provided advice to our Public Health Department in connection with the identification of the organisms involved and to that organisation and the Public Works Department in connection with measures necessary for their control.

Their advice has been extremely valuable and has resulted in expediting very greatly our investigations and the implementation of control measures. Furthermore, their modesty, knowledge and authority went a very long way in allaying public anxiety. I should be grateful if you would also pass on my thanks to Messrs. Walters and Robinson and to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who made arrangements for their movement to this State.

That letter was signed "Charles Court, Premier of Western Australia". I also have a letter from the Department of Health and Medical Services in Western Australia, signed by the Commissioner of Public Health and Medical Services, written at the same time to the Chief Chemist of the State Water Laboratories in South Australia. The letter states:

I wish to thank you most sincerely for the readiness with which your department responded to our appeal for help during the recent amoebic meningitis scare. You will probably appreciate the near hysteria which the media attempted to, in fact almost succeeded in creating. Apart from the invaluable help Reg Walters and Brett Robinson gave to our laboratory people, their calmness, assurances and confidence in various media presentations went a very long way towards allaying public anxiety. One of my worries obviously was how the State Health Laboratory Services would react to their presence without "taking" from that laboratory's ready compliance. I am quite sure it was Reg and Brett's diplomacy which permitted a successful co-operation.

There can be no higher commendation of the officers, in which this Government places complete faith, than that expressed in the letters received from the Western Australian Government and Department of Health and Medical Services. The attitude that has been adopted in South Australia by the Leader and by other members is deplorable, particularly the attitude of the member for Whyalla with his statement that the Government is playing Russian roulette with the health of people of South Australia.

*Mr. Max Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** It has been clearly identified that the level of chlorination at Whyalla has not been changed since the time of the Labor Government and that in fact it has been boosted by this Government. On what basis the Opposition and the member for Whyalla (and his outrageous statement which was totally irresponsible, and I only trust to goodness that the people of Whyalla and the people of the Iron Triangle towns will see it as such) made their statements I do not know. That type of action has done nothing at all to help the situation. In fact, the safety of the water supply of Whyalla has not been altered in any

way whatsoever.

As I tried to explain to the Leader of the Opposition, who probably has some difficulty in understanding these sorts of matters, the dosing varies, depending on the quality of the water in the system, to arrive at a residual level of chlorine in the system. If the dose is not varied depending on the water quality, the result will be a higher residual value than has been designed and recommended. That factor is the precise reason why variations occur, to allow for the variation that occurs as a result of water quality from time to time.

The member for Mitchell referred to water filtration and to what the previous Government was going to do about it. It is interesting to note that that report in which he places great faith and which he brandished in this House a few moments ago, was a very preliminary report prepared under pressure by the E. & W.S. Department because of the State election at that time. In fact, when we came to Government, the first thing that was required was that a proper investigation and in-depth study be made of that proposal. The filtration programme was not scrubbed. It was deferred to enable the E. & W.S. Department to carry out a proper investigation and study, which should have been carried out prior to the quickly prepared release made for the benefit of the last State election.

As I have said before, clearly it is one thing to provide expenditure from the department's recurrent account, which is a minor amount, but any major capital works programme in South Australia must be built into the Loan works programme of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The previous Government made a paper promise, with no funds provided for the actual capital works to take place. As I have said before, there was no substance to that proposal whatsoever. It was an election gimmick, which the present Government has thoroughly investigated. It has decided to proceed with that project on the basis of the strong evidence available that it is desirable in the interests of the people concerned to improve the quality of the water.

I also point out that the water to which we are referring in the Morgan-Whyalla system is the same water used by the majority of people throughout South Australia, not just by those in the Iron Triangle towns. The water is used from the Victorian and New South Wales border, from the moment it enters South Australia. In fact, a lot of consumers of Murray River water actually take their water supply from further down than Morgan, and so the quality of water in the Morgan-Whyalla main is in many respects, often better than the quality of water used by residents in South Australia farther down the Murray River.

Water filtration is highly desirable, and that is why the Liberal Government in late 1969 and early 1970 decided to proceed with water filtration in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, with the knowledge that there would be increasing quantities of water supplied to the metropolitan area of Adelaide from the Murray River in future years. I point out to members that the rural areas of South Australia mainly derive their water from the Murray River, not just from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline but also from numerous pumping points operated by the Government and also privately. If the Leader is not aware of that, he should make a study of it to find out that many places in South Australia would very much like filtered water, particularly when the source is the Murray River. The Government decided on a water filtration programme after a thorough investigation, which was not carried out prior to the 1979 State election. A hurried document was then prepared under pressure by the department for the then Government as an election gimmick. It can only be classified as an election gimmick, because the Government

of the day provided no capital works funds to undertake this project in their five-year Loan works programme. If it was serious, an allocation of funds would have been made for that vital project.

The water supplied to the Iron Triangle is exactly the same as the water supplied to most consumers in South Australia but it travels a greater distance through a surface pipeline and thus picks up a far greater temperature during the height of summer. This temperature is the key factor in the development of *naegleria fowleri*. This interesting subject has been considered by the health authorities and the E. & W.S. Department since 1972. They were trying to find out why *naegleria fowleri* had not been detected at Whyalla. The reason would probably never have been known, had it not been for the recent instance. One could speculate and hypothesise for a long time as to just why that happened. If one refers to temperature alone, the area that should suffer most would probably be Woomera, but the amoebae have not been detected at Woomera. The reason for that is that the temperature of the water in that pipeline during the height of summer is probably so great that it virtually wipes out any *naegleria fowleri* that years ago would have passed Port Augusta.

It is also interesting to note that the recommendations and the reduction that occurred in the chlorine levels at Port Pirie and Port Augusta have been extremely successful, and, what is more, no *naegleria fowleri* have been identified in either of those two towns, so the recommendations of the expert committee, which were accepted by the Central Board of Health, have proved to be perfectly correct.

The Minister of Health has referred many times to the responsibilities of the health authorities and the Central Board of Health in maintaining a water supply system throughout South Australia which is safe to all consumers. When *naegleria fowleri* or amoebae have been detected in the system, corrective action has been taken within a few hours and the *naegleria* have been eliminated from that water supply system. It usually takes three or four weeks after the amoebae have been detected in the system to determine whether or not they are pathogenic. The system is rendered safe within a few hours of finding any amoebae. To make a broad statement about three weeks after the system has been rendered safe would do no more than the member for Whyalla has sought to achieve and has achieved successfully—to instil fear in the minds of the people of South Australia, particularly those people in the Iron Triangle. That fear is instilled more in the minds of children than in anyone else's mind, so the honourable member has a great deal to be proud of. I trust that he will go down in history, if for nothing else than for having achieved that claim to fame.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** He wrote a pretty good study tour report.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Yes. I think the people of Whyalla are quite capable of assessing the worth of the member for Whyalla, simply by reading his overseas study report.

Further comment was made by the member for Mitchell in relation to publicity material. The publicity material which has been available all the time and which is still available is perfectly correct. The fact that the department is upgrading that material in no way nullifies the correctness of the material which has been available for some years. It is not as though there was no programme of awareness; that material was there. It was available and had been distributed many times. It was there for any organisation or body to request from the department at any time.

I believe this whole matter has been a genuine beat-up

as a result of collaboration between the Labor Party and certain sections of the media and, as has been indicated, the same sort of thing occurred in Western Australia. This was highlighted in the letters which I read to the House earlier this afternoon.

As I said at the beginning, I deplore the action that has been taken by the Opposition, in that it has endeavoured in every way possible to undermine the financial stability of South Australia, and the fact that South Australia's is recovering. Since it has been unsuccessful in undermining the recovery of South Australia in that direction, it has adopted a principle now of trying to instil unwarranted fear in the minds of the public. What is more, since this Government has been in office we have heard a great deal about the down-turn in Whyalla and the surplus housing in that city. As I understand from information which has been made available to me, Whyalla is now going ahead at such a rate that there is once again a shortage of housing in that city.

**Mr. Max Brown:** What a lot of rubbish that is!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** If the honourable member is unaware of that, I suggest that he seek information from within his own electorate. He will then find that in actual fact the city is progressing, despite his actions.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** There are only two words which can describe the lamentable defence put up by these lame-duck Ministers this afternoon, and those two words are "not convincing". They have been absolutely (I was going to use the word "terrible"), appalling in the way they have trivialised this whole issue, to the extent that the Minister of Water Resources finished up discussing housing in Whyalla. As if anyone could see the relevance of that subject to this quite crucial question before the House this afternoon. This debate is different from all of the other motions of no confidence that have been moved since I have been a member of this Parliament. All of the other motions that have been moved that I have seen in this House have been a criticism of some general or specific incompetence alleged against a Minister or the Government.

This matter does not fall into that category. This allegation is substantiated by documentation that Ministers and their departments have acted in such a way that has led to the health of a large number of citizens being put at risk. There is no getting from that simple fact. That makes this debate rather more serious than is possibly normal for debates of no confidence, yet in these circumstances we find that the Premier, in complete breach of the traditions of this House, has not taken part in the debate. Further, he has not even chosen to be in the Chamber to hear his Ministers' attempted defence this afternoon. That is how much he cares about the health and well being of the people in the north of the State. It may be said that it is a wise judgment by him to distance himself from the recklessness of his Ministers, because that is all it is.

When these matters first came to light there was no direct indication that Ministers had been made fully aware of the circumstances exposed by these documents. But that is no longer the case. Both Ministers have indicated in their comments today—and in the case of the Minister of Health, in her comments last Thursday, that they knew of the fact that, as a result of cost-cutting measures carried out by this Government, the health of people in the northern towns was put in jeopardy. Both Ministers have sought to pooh pah cost-cutting as the basic reason for the present situation. Anyone who cares to review the documents sent out by the Premier to his Ministers, asking

them for reductions below the 1979-80 expenditure level of as much as 3 per cent in real terms, cannot be in any doubt that every public servant in this State was under pressure to cut corners and costs, whatever the price might be.

Should anyone doubt that, he need only go to those minutes that the Premier sent out on 17 December 1979 and 4 January 1980. When one looks at the way the public servants acted in the Health Commission and in the office of the Minister of Water Resources, one finds, not surprisingly, that we have a circumstance where the cost-cutting was the basic reason why they decided to cut the programme carried out in this area. If we look at a document dated 14 August 1980, from the Chief Chemist of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it says at the bottom of page 4:

The South Australian Health Commission has agreed to a reduction in the extent of the present monitoring programme. A proposed schedule of sampling for 1980-81 will significantly reduce the allocation of laboratory resources to this routine work. Savings of approximately \$50 000 per annum are indicated.

Further, we see in relation to a document from the Senior Microbiologist to the Chief Chemist, at page 2:

Cost savings for reduced chlorination: The acting operations engineer has advised that the savings to the department, following reductions in chlorination dose rates, will be \$40 or \$60 per day at peak flow. This is an equivalent saving of \$5 000 to \$7 000 in a full year.

So far, we have saved \$57 000 as a result of this exercise. Finally, page 3 of the document from the Senior Microbiologist states:

Long-term monitoring from amoeba is not required to assist potability of water generally. The maintenance of the present level of monitoring cannot be justified having regard to the availability of staff and financial resources.

I came across some very interesting information in relation to that matter. Presently, in the water quality laboratory at Bolivar there are seven positions vacant, and a similar number of positions at the water testing level, which should be filled. The result of this is that the number of tests on water in South Australia has been reduced from 80 000 per annum to 50 000 per annum, a significant reduction. This was at a time when the committee, which the Government has sought to hide behind this afternoon, recommended that a reduced chlorination programme be undertaken as part of a package, including increased water testing and, most importantly, a greater publicity programme. I refer to the publicity campaign, because there has been an enormous amount of mumbo jumbo spoken about it this afternoon. We have had the incredible spectacle of the Minister of Health, who knows more about publicity than about anything else (and in this case she has shown that is not all you need to run a department of State), as part of a press release, dated 22 February, saying:

Although it was intended to launch a positive campaign with the new material before the beginning of this summer in view of the recent Western Australian experience, planning of the campaign material had taken much longer than expected. This was due to a decision to redesign the printed material and to change the presentation completely. However, sufficient quantities of the old pamphlets, which were still technically correct, were available, and supplies were forwarded immediately when the case occurred in January.

She has failed to tell the people of South Australia that the publicity campaign which had been demanded by the committee also involved radio spots on the northern town radio stations. No mention was made of that in the flow of comments and statements that she has made over this

matter. The fact is that, as a cost-cutting measure, this Government decided not to proceed with the publicity campaign which had been part of the package recommended by its own committee and on which it has relied so heavily this afternoon. The Government stands condemned for that. There has been no mention of the radio spots advertisement campaign. That campaign was not undertaken because of the cost factor. This penny-pinching Government has put the health of the South Australian people at risk because of its crazed view on economics: you must save, regardless of the cost in social and health terms.

I think that is an appalling situation. It would be very interesting to know why the Government did not increase the amount of chlorine throughout the whole of the northern regions during this summer, because it has readily admitted on dozens of occasions in the past few days that the hot weather increases the risk of amoebic meningitis. Why did it not take action to try to overcome this problem, in light of the very hot weather?

Not only did it not take action (and this is a point not made so far in the debate), but, as far as Whyalla is concerned, we have the ridiculous situation of this pathetic Minister of Water Resources trying to criticise the Leader of the Opposition for not knowing the technical details of this business, and falling into the trap of saying patronisingly, "You see, what is really important is the level of chlorination at the point of use." He did not tell this House that in Whyalla there have never been, since he has been in Government, tests at the point of use of the chlorination level. Let him deny that to the people of Whyalla.

It is a great pity that this Parliament is meeting in a relatively isolated situation in Adelaide, because there is no doubt that the arrogance shown by Government Ministers, and by the Premier in not coming into this House for the debate and breaking the conventions of the House by not taking part in the debate, would have been brought to account if the debate had been held in Whyalla or Paskeville, or one of the towns in the districts of the member for Goyder or the member for Rocky River. There is no doubt that this Government would not have acted in such a contemptuous fashion over this matter if the debate had been held in one of those towns. It is regrettable that Government members have been able to sit here and act so contemptuously this afternoon. I think that, when some of the constituents of the member for Eyre, the people at Whyalla or on Yorke Peninsula, hear of the Government's performance on this matter in the Parliament this afternoon, and more particularly when they start to understand how negligent and how reckless this Government has been in playing with the health of the people in the North of the State and Yorke Peninsula, a great amount of recrimination will be focused upon the members representing those areas.

**Mr. Keneally:** And how they vote.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** And, more particularly, how they vote on this motion. I was amazed to hear the Minister of Health moving an amendment. It is so outrageous that I can hardly speak. She moved this amendment:

This House endorses the continuing actions of health and water supply authorities in maintaining the safety and integrity of South Australia's water supply.

I wonder whether the parents of the boy in Whyalla would agree with that. This contemptuous attitude on the part of the Minister in seeking to turn the debate round, rather than express her concern and her possible action in future in this matter, has shown this Government as having no concern whatever for the people of Whyalla. There is no



doubt that it has shown no concern for those people. It has sought to score debating points by reference to the question of Lincoln Gap, and the question whether or not water from the Lincoln Gap reservoir is supplied to Whyalla.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Minister says that it is not. It is supplied to the B.H.P. plant, it is the water supply for the B.H.P. plant, and all the thousands of people who work in that plant shower in that water. Let the Minister deny that. They do not matter, of course. They are industrial cannon fodder, not the toffs of Whyalla for whom she would be showing her concern. They do not matter, and they are not of concern to this Minister. That is the contemptible approach on these matters that these Ministers have shown this afternoon, and it is all the more reason why they should resign their portfolios. They have shown negligence and, in the face of that, they are showing contempt for the people of the North of this State and of Yorke Peninsula.

Another aspect which does her no credit is the way in which the Minister of Health has sought to hide behind the Central Board of Health. Thank goodness the Premier has come into the Chamber. He has missed the lamentable way in which his Ministers have sought to defend themselves. He did not stand up to defend them. Perhaps he realises the error of his ways now that he sees how the debate is going, but it is a bit late for him to take part.

The Minister of Health has sought to hide behind the Central Board of Health, claiming that she was powerless to act because the board had made certain recommendations. The board's recommendations in such matters are only minimum recommendations, and for her to seek to hide behind them and claim that she was powerless to act is a complete and utter fabrication. It is interesting that now both Ministers, by leaving the Chamber, are showing their contempt for the processes of this Parliament.

I believe that the circumstances in which we find ourselves today are very grave indeed. This Government has shown contempt for the people of the North of the State by absolutely throwing out initially the question of filtering their water supply. This would have assisted, and there is no doubt of this scientifically, in the control of amoebic meningitis in the North of the State. In those circumstances I believe that the Government showed contempt for those people right from the beginning. This is quite interesting, and it will interest the member, wherever he comes from, the bearded fellow—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable member to refer to members on the other side of the House by their correct titles, and not by innuendo.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If the honourable member had made more impression on the House—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:**—I am sure his name would have come more readily to mind. The circumstances of this Government's performance in this area are such that I understand that, as a result of its reversal of policy, as a result of its deciding belatedly, after the death of the boy in Whyalla, to filter water supplies to Whyalla and the North, it is now going to renege on its undertaking to filter the Happy Valley system. I am sure that members who represent districts in the south-east of the metropolitan area, including the member for Brighton, will be interested to hear that that is the case.

This Government is now proposing to set back the filtration of the Happy Valley water supply for a number of years so that it can filter the water supply in the North. I do not disapprove of the decision to filter the water supply in the North, but that should not be a reason for setting

back the filtration of the Happy Valley system. This Government shows scant understanding of State finances and the problems involved, and this is another example of which we will no doubt hear more about in the future.

I have a few specific questions which I would like to put on notice for this Government, because the Minister of Health, showing her usual adroitness in dealing with the press, has managed to skip over the real issues in this matter. I doubt whether she will be able to get out of it after this afternoon, but there are some matters which should be looked at. My questions are as follows:

Did the B.H.P. recently replace corroded water pipes at a cost of \$300 000?

Did the B.H.P. make representations to the Government requesting a reduced chlorine level in order to conserve its pipes? If so, what was the Government's response to such request?

It will be interesting to hear the reply to that. My questions continue:

What factors caused the Government to reduce the aimed for free chlorine residual of 0.5 milligram per litre of chlorine in the distribution mains at Port Augusta and Port Pirie, when these levels had been found necessary in the past?

For the whole of the period from 1972 to 1979, we had a system that worked. The Minister was only too happy to point out that Sir Charles Court said we had the best system, blowing his bags, and saying how good it was.

And we did, but this Government tampered with that system, and that is the real issue. I am particularly interested to note that one of these documents on which the Minister acted states that isolation of amoebic meningitis usually occurs at low free-chlorine residuals less than .5 milligrammes per litre. I would like to know the answer to that question. I would also like to know, since the distribution of chlorine was found to be poor at Wright Street and Agnes Street, Port Pirie, why were steps not taken to improve the position in Port Pirie. I would also like to know, as *naegleria* species were isolated from a significant number of samples of reticulated water at Whyalla, location No. 39, why no step was taken to improve the chlorine residual in the reticulated system at that stage, prior to the suspected case of amoebic meningitis?

I would like to ask why, when Whyalla had been identified as a problem area (and that is shown quite clearly from these documents), over a short period, recommended in the report by Messrs. Robinson, Lake and Walters, the intense sampling recommendation No. 2, had not taken place? Why was the publicity campaign for 1980-1981 not carried out? We have not heard the reason for that, and it is about time the Minister accepted the responsibility for canning that, because if she is not careful the information on that matter about the cost problems will, in fact, come out.

I was also interested in the Minister's comment dealing with that matter—that they were waiting on information from the West. If one has a look at the documents in this matter one can see that the information had already arrived from Western Australia, so that is a further untruth in this sorry tale. I simply conclude this series of questions by asking why, if the aim of this testing programme was to identify the chlorine levels at the point of use, this was not done in Whyalla. Why was the reticulation system in Whyalla not tested?

The only point at which tests were conducted in Whyalla was the point where distribution started, not the point of use, and that question, too, ought to be answered. Finally, the Chief Chemist reported to the Health Commission, the E. and W.S. Department and the I.M.V.S. that the following action should be agreed upon:

Certain supplies identified as problem areas will require more detailed investigation from time to time. Currently, more detailed surveys at Paskeville and Whyalla are in progress or proposed.

Why were they never carried out?

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** They were.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The documents do not show that additional sampling was done at Whyalla, and I would like to hear why that is so.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** You didn't steal all the documents.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Minister might contemptuously say that we stole all the documents. I suggest that the Minister go and tell the people of Yorke Peninsula, and the people of Whyalla, that, because they are very pleased that at last the incredible deceit of this Government has been brought to public light and attention. My friend and colleague, the member for Mitchell, said earlier in the debate how absolutely extraordinary it was that this Government notified hospitals and doctors in the Little Cornwall area and Yorke Peninsula area and did not even tell the people who were subject to risk—the wrong end of the line, as he put it. That is about the same as the approach of the Minister of Health in dealing with the pamphlets. What she said about the pamphlets is absolutely ridiculous—it took from April, apparently, until now to get new pamphlets printed. If an election were held in this State tomorrow, it would not take her long to get a pamphlet out, I bet.

**Mr. Whitten:** They would have been printed yesterday.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes. That is the contempt in which she holds the people of this State, and it is about time that she was exposed as such. She knows all about publicity and that sort of thing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take it that the honourable member is referring to the honourable Minister.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes, I am referring to the Minister.

**Mr. Mathwin:** "She" is the cat's aunty.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If she is, that is the honourable member's view, not mine. I conclude my comments by referring to the position of the members for Eyre, Rocky River and Goyder. Their position in this debate is quite crucial, because they, by now, must feel decidedly uncomfortable about the negligence and reckless way that their Ministers, elected by them, have gone about this matter. If their constituents were in this House and able to vote on this motion, I have no doubt which way they would be voting. Whilst one can understand, I suppose, out of Party loyalty, their careers and the like, that they would feel some reluctance about their position, nonetheless, for them to have agreed (which they apparently have done) to the moving of the amendment by the Minister of Health is absolutely extraordinary behaviour, because that amendment says that those who support this amendment endorse the continuing actions of the health and water supply authorities in maintaining the safety and integrity of South Australia's water supply. It is patently obvious to anybody who has sat through this debate this afternoon that this Government did not maintain the safety and integrity of South Australia's water supply in the northern towns, on Yorke Peninsula and in the Little Cornwall towns. That was not done. Paskeville is the lead town in the distribution system for Yorke Peninsula. That has not been done, and for those members who represent those areas to vote for that amendment this afternoon would be the utmost in hypocrisy and would show a complete disregard for the interest, welfare and health of their constituents, those people they have been sent here to represent.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** We have been subjected this afternoon to a certain amount of petty nitpicking and simulated concern from members opposite. I suspect that it is entirely generated by a desire to attempt to destroy two of the most effective Ministers this Government has, the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Health. This is nothing new, because attempts which have been made by members opposite to destroy the reputation, standing and good name of both of those Ministers, particularly of the Minister of Health, have been intense and disgraceful. A great deal of pettiness has been shown. It was pettiness that was typified by the Leader's criticism of the typing, underlining and rearranging of the points and bits and pieces which he dragged up as being some sort of support for his case. They were typified even further by the member for Elizabeth, who is now departing the Chamber. I would have thought, after all the self-righteous remarks he made, that he would at least have stayed in the Chamber to listen to what the Premier had to say. The fact is that the member for Elizabeth, in criticising the fact that I have not already spoken in this debate, knew perfectly well that I was to be the third speaker on this side and that the two Ministers who have spoken were properly to speak before me and that my name was down after his.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It has never happened before. Since you have been in the Parliament, the Premier has always led.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I find that a most extraordinary statement. All I can say is that it does the member for Elizabeth little credit, but neither did his speech do him any credit. It was shot through with inaccuracies, generalisations, and statements that are not based on the truth, and I will give some examples. For instance, the member for Elizabeth claimed that the Minister of Water Resources informed the House that Whyalla water was not monitored at the point of supply. That claim is false, because the Minister made abundantly clear that the variation of chlorination at Lincoln Gap occurs because of varying water quality to maintain a constant level of residual chlorine in the main. That is something that the honourable member did not mention, deliberately trying to destroy confidence.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Not at the pipeline.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There is a chlorinator at Lincoln Gap on the Morgan-Whyalla No. 1 pipeline leading to Whyalla. To pick up the other point the honourable member made (and I was listening not only to my own Ministers but also to him), I point out that there is a chlorinator on that pipeline leading to Whyalla and B.H.P., and the employees who use that water for their ablutions are using water that is safe. The member for Elizabeth went on to support the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition by saying that reduced water monitoring occurred because of the costs involved. That is totally false. The water monitoring programme was based entirely on the professional and expert judgment of officers of the Health Commission and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and on the advice of a committee that was set up by the previous Government. Presumably, not even the member for Elizabeth could find fault with that.

The honourable member also supported his Leader in saying that manpower cuts for country water supplies occurred in monitoring programme areas in the weekly paid area. That is absolute nonsense. The cuts that were made were on construction. The construction work was given out more to the private sector. There has been no

change in the monitoring operations because of manpower cuts or budgetary cuts.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** I have increased manpower.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Indeed, the programme is on the increase. The vacancies at the State Water Laboratories were mentioned by the member for Elizabeth. It is a matter of trying to read rather too much into a little bit of information and putting one's own construction on it. That is obviously what the member for Elizabeth has done. There are about seven vacancies at the State Water Laboratories at present, but this is entirely due to changes outside the monitoring programme. This matter is subject to the normal procedures for reclassification and refilling of those positions. There was no deliberate reduction in establishment. The normal process for filling those vacancies is already in hand.

A number of other matters were raised, but time will not allow me to discuss them. Some matters were glossed over or misrepresented by honourable members opposite. I must make the following points. It is quite obvious from the nature of the motion that the Opposition has changed its ground from its stated position as publicised in the weekend press. It was a matter of some interest that the Opposition gave notice in the press that it would move a motion of no confidence, and it was quite clear from the remarks made at the time and the story that was written that that motion of no confidence was to be in relation to the water supply of Whyalla. There was no question of that. I must say that the earlier claims made in support of such a no confidence motion, and made publicly, have now been refuted, and very well refuted. Indeed, if the reporter from the *Sunday Mail* had taken the trouble to read the *Advertiser* (that very good journal) of Saturday morning, he would have found the answers to many of the suggestions that were made.

The fact is there was no lowering of the chlorine level in the water at Whyalla and there was no lowering of the frequency of testing of the water at Whyalla, and that can be seen quite clearly from the documents that were made available by the Minister of Health not only to the Leader of the Opposition but also to members of the press. Quite obviously, the Opposition has been forced to widen its motion and use a different tack. The Mayor of the City of Whyalla now accepts that there was no reduction in chlorine level and that testing was being carried on in exactly the same way. The reports that we read were mischievous, irresponsible, totally lacking in responsibility, and caused a great deal of unnecessary and unwarranted concern in the community. In defence of that journal, I can only say that undoubtedly it was influenced very heavily by a member of the Opposition. It is to be condemned that such an activity should be engaged in.

Stimulated through the Sunday press, this motion of no confidence has been changed from a motion of no confidence in relation to the water supply of Whyalla to a motion in regard to northern towns; obviously, the Opposition hoped that people would read Whyalla into the category of "northern towns". One only had to listen to the speech of the member for Elizabeth, which was prepared, to know that he was talking about Whyalla. It was hoped, by this motion, that Whyalla would be read into the northern towns category, and I believe that that is a most deceitful approach. I repeat that the *Sunday Mail* used exactly the same deceitful approach last Sunday. We in South Australia have the benefit of one of the finest water supply departments in the world. It is not surprising that we have that water supply department and health department, and I can refer to all the experts who guided successive Governments in their management of the

State's water supply. We have a very fine and capable group of people.

**Mr. Mathwin:** The member for Mitchell said you shouldn't take much notice of them.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That does not say much for the member for Mitchell. Those people have developed their expertise, as the member for Hartley would well know and would confirm if he were here, because of something that has become traditionally a way of life in South Australia. How often has it been said that we live in the driest State of the driest continent in the world? Water is of immense importance to us. It is our lifeline, because on the water supply of South Australia depends the future existence and development of this State. Fine experts are available to advise us in the most responsible way that they know how. I have already made the point that the particular committee was appointed by the former Government, and I make the further point that successive Governments have taken its advice, regardless of extraneous matters, over the years. I now quote from a speech made by one of my predecessors on 7 March 1972, as follows:

There is no suggestion that has come from technical officers which we have not carried out.

Those were the words of Don Dunstan, and they could equally have been the words of Thomas Playford, Steele Hall, or Des Corcoran, because that is the way in which the water supply of this State is monitored and cared for. I think that the Opposition could have chosen a far more politically sensitive area than this to ventilate in this House. The attempt that has been made to use a most tragic situation in Whyalla for political ends is most unfortunate. The South Australian public has every reason to have the utmost faith in the experts who are advising the Ministers of the Crown in their duties, and I believe that this motion, which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the Opposition, cannot in any way be supported.

It is a direct criticism and condemnation, not of the Ministers but of the senior public servants and the senior advisers who have served this Government and successive Governments very well indeed. I cannot in any way countenance the motion as moved.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Whyalla has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I make it quite clear that the Chair has the responsibility to give every member the opportunity to speak. On the list provided to me, the member for Whyalla has the next call. If the member for Whyalla does not respond to the call I will call the next speaker.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** First, I want to deal with part of what the Premier has said. He began his speech by saying that the Mayor of Whyalla had said that she now accepts the situation which developed in Whyalla. I want to go on record in this House and say that she is the only person in Whyalla that does accept it.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Whyalla has imputed words to the Premier which the Premier did not say.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Minister will know that there is an opportunity for correcting the record in another manner.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The people of Whyalla do not accept the activities, or the non-activities, of this Government. I also want to say (and I am quite sure that the member for Eyre will be pleased about this) that I express my appreciation of his non-assistance in this

matter because I believe that if he had paid some attention to this episode the people would have been further up in arms. The Minister of Water Resources embarked upon a course of opposition to Labor Party members' comments, which he said were deplorable and exhibitionist, and he referred to my remarks quoted in the press. I wonder whether the Minister would go to the city of Whyalla and explain his point of view to the people there.

The Minister said that Opposition members were exhibitionists, and so forth. I refer to an editorial in the local newspaper from Whyalla. Nobody could brand this paper as other than conservative. It is certainly not exhibitionist; it certainly does not try to belittle anyone, but simply plays a conservative role. After reading the editorial of that newspaper one can only come to the conclusion that the people of Whyalla are particularly concerned about this situation. In view of the comments we have heard this afternoon that the Government has never gone back on the levels of chlorination, etc., I shall read the editorial, which was directed to the Minister of Water Resources or to the Minister of Health, as follows:

Weren't you a bit hasty when you rushed to post a reply to a correspondent's accusations in the metropolitan media last Saturday? Or were you being facetious? You said, we quote, "It is by no means certain that mains water was the source of the amoeba that killed the boy."

**The Hon. Peter Arnold:** What?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** That is what the Minister said in his first press statement, namely, that it was by no means certain that mains water caused the amoebic meningitis. If he did not say it, he referred to it. Three days later, the Minister for Health released the results of tests which indicated that the outbreak "could have been" as a result of mains water. While this was going on, a situation existed whereby the Government went out of its way to say that the amoebic meningitis which killed the lad in Whyalla was caused by a public swimming pool. A series of examinations were made, and it was found that swimming pools were not the cause. Then there was a public outcry that in fact it was caused by a backyard swimming pool. All sorts of demonstrations occurred, and it was suggested that we must close down backyard pools, and do this and do that. In due course it was found a backyard pool was not responsible.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The Minister of Health can say what she likes now. She has gone on record as saying that. We found out that the amoebic meningitis germ was in fact in the water which we obtain through the normal reticulation system. Of all the issues that have been brought before this House over the years that I have been here, I feel that this is the most important. Whatever comes out of this debate, I sincerely hope that we proceed with the water filtration programme and that something positive is done to keep the people of the whole State, not only those people of Whyalla, informed of the amoebic meningitis problem that we have in our water reticulation system.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I have only a minute to summarise the issues of the debate. I do not believe that the Government has come to grips with the material we have presented, particularly with the major allegations made which were based on the monitoring sheets presented to this House. Of course, that is the crux to their performance on both the Yorke Peninsula water supply and the Whyalla water supply—indeed, Whyalla and its water supply has been central to this debate.

Despite what the Government says, at no time have we attempted to decry a system which has worked so very

effectively in South Australia for so long. It has had a great success rate. It has been magnificent for some eight years, but, under the cost constraints imposed by the Government, by the pulling back of that programme we have been exposed to risk. It is only by that exposure being revealed at Whyalla that something was done about the matter.

In conclusion, I refer to the debate that the Premier mentioned—and it was good to see him finally enter the debate and defend his Ministers. On 7 March 1972, when this issue was before the House, on a motion moved by the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, in the course of his remarks he said:

The public has a right to know what is going on . . .  
He went on to say:

. . . full information should be given.

So much for stolen documents and misinformation. He concluded as follows:

Communities today demand to know more about their public health risks and the measures being taken to combat them. It is absurd to say that people should be told only what the Government thinks they should know, and that is what the Government seems to be doing now. This is not good enough.

I throw those words right back to the Minister on this occasion.

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the Chair is "That the amendment moved by the Minister of Health be agreed to". Those in favour say, "Aye"; those against, "No". I think the Ayes have it.

**Mr. Bannon:** Divide!

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Divide!

*While the division bells were ringing:*

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that, under Standing Orders, if a member calls "Divide" against the ruling of the Speaker that member is then required to vote against the ruling of the Speaker. I put to you that the Minister of Health called "Divide" when the decision of the Speaker was in favour of the Ayes. It is my contention therefore that she should vote with the Noes.

**The SPEAKER:** I accept the statement made by the honourable member for Stuart that the honourable Minister of Health did call "Divide", but the Chair had already responded to a call for division from the Leader of the Opposition. All members will be perfectly aware that the course of events was a call from the Leader of the Opposition and subsequently a mouthing of the same word by the honourable the Minister of Health. The response was in relation to the Leader of the Opposition.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Glazbrook. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (23)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr. Glazbrook. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended carried.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr. LEWIS (Mallee):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I claim to have been misrepresented by the member for Mitchell during his speech in the preceding debate. During those remarks the honourable member impugned me but not other such members as the members for Ascot Park, Elizabeth, Stuart, Napier, Spence, Adelaide and Florey, all of whom smiled or giggled during that debate. I did not impugn them, as I have been impugned. If my memory serves me correctly, the honourable member said of me that:

I find no amusement in this matter, but it seems to me that the member for Mallee is amused. Somewhere in this State are people who are related to a boy who is no longer alive. I am not saying that the occurrence could have been avoided.

The subject of my apparent mirth at that time was certainly not the remarks of the honourable member or the subject matter before the House. In no way did it relate to his wit or the lack of it (less than complete by more than half, one might say). On recollection, I find that he said (and he may have thought my mirth related to this):

... out of a direct coupling—no pun intended—that has occurred between two Ministers. If one Minister is guilty of negligent performance, failure to deliver, taking money under false pretences, then the other is also guilty.

I did not find that amusing either.

#### WORKERS COMPENSATION (INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers Compensation (Insurance) Act, 1980. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I move:

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

Late last year Parliament considered and passed legislation to protect the rights of injured workers arising under the Workers Compensation Act in the event of certain insolvencies. This legislation came about mainly as a result of the collapse last year of Palmdale Insurance Limited with outstanding claims for workers compensation payments in excess of \$2 000 000. The resulting Workers Compensation (Insurance) Act 1980 provides for the establishment of a Statutory Reserve Fund from which approved payments will be made in the event that:

- (a) an insurance company becomes insolvent and is unable to meet its liabilities under the Workers Compensation Act;
- (b) an employer exempted from the requirement to hold workers compensation insurance subsequently becomes insolvent; and
- (c) an employer has failed to take out insurance in accordance with his obligation under the

Workers Compensation Act and is unable to meet any claims made against him.

The new legislation further provides for the scheme to be financed by a levy placed upon the premiums paid by employers for workers compensation coverage or, in the case of an exempted employer, upon the premiums that the Commissioner of Taxation assesses would have been paid had there been no exemption. The levy is treated as an addition to the stamp duty payable under the Stamp Duties Act 1923-1979 and is prescribed by regulation.

In view of the important financial implications of the legislation to the various individuals and companies disadvantaged by the inability of Palmdale to meet claims under its workers compensation policies, every effort was made to bring the legislation into force as soon as possible. The Act was subsequently proclaimed to operate from 23 December 1980 and an advance of \$500 000 made to the fund by the Treasurer as provided in the Act. The General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission recently advised me that as of 9 February 1981 over \$335 000 had been paid out to 28 companies in settlement of some 56 claims under the legislation, and it is anticipated that a further \$400 000 will have been expended by the end of this financial year. These figures vindicate the Government's initiative in setting up the scheme, with obvious benefits to those who were suffering financially as a result of the Palmdale failure.

However, there have arisen some administrative problems in respect to the funding of the scheme. Throughout the discussions held with interested organisations during the formulation of the original legislation (which I outlined in some detail when introducing that Bill), it was generally understood that the levy prescribed under section 4(3) of the Act was to apply to all workers compensation premiums falling due after the commencement of the legislation. With that intent in mind a levy of 1 per cent was subsequently prescribed by regulations which came into force on 1 January 1981. However, when a proper interpretation is placed upon the inter-relationship of the provisions of the Workers Compensation (Insurance) Act and the Stamp Duties Act, the Commissioner of Taxation is required to add the prescribed levy to the stamp duty which is currently due with respect to premiums payable under policies of workers compensation during 1980. In other words, the levy would be a retrospective levy, based on last year, rather than on 1981.

This is contrary to the intention of the Government, which was that, whilst insurers would collect the levy on insurance premiums from 1 January 1981, the amounts so collected would not be payable to the Statutory Reserve Fund via the Commissioner of Taxation until January 1982. Unless the legislation is amended, insurers collectively will be required to outlay in advance payments to the fund totalling over \$800 000. This would obviously only further aggravate the difficulties currently being experienced in the industry. The effect of the first amendment proposed is thus to defer payment of the initial levy until 1 January 1982. Subsection (5) of section 4 of the Act currently provides that, if the amount of the fund exceeds \$5 000 000 on 31 December of any year, then no levy shall be payable in the following year. Two problems of timing arise from the present provision.

First, insurers need to know some weeks before the commencement of a new year what level of levy they should collect on workers compensation premiums paid during that year. Accordingly, it is proposed to make 31 October the datum point. Secondly, insurance companies will collect the levy throughout a calendar year in anticipation of having to pay the sum so collected to the

Commissioner of Taxation in January of the next year. If, on 31 October (or on 31 December as is currently specified), it is determined that no levy will be payable in the next year due to the funds exceeding \$5 000 000, under the current provisions insurers would be left holding the moneys already collected on premiums paid by employers. The effect of the second amendment proposed in this Bill is therefore to introduce a one-year lag such that, for example, if on 31 October 1983 the fund exceeds \$5 000 000, there will still be a levy payable in January 1984 (based upon premiums paid in 1983) but no levy will be applied in January 1985. Insurers will therefore know what individual insurance premiums need not be levied in 1984.

Apart from the two amendments already outlined, the Bill contains a consequential amendment to subsection (6) of section 4. This concerns the arrangements for collection of the levy from employers who have been granted an exemption by me as Minister from insuring against workers compensation claims under the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1979. I recognise that the proposed amendments are somewhat of a technical nature, but assure members that they are essential to clarify the original intent of the legislation and to facilitate its smooth operation. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments shall be deemed to have come into operation immediately after the commencement of the principal Act.

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act. The present subsection (5) is replaced by two new subsections. New subsection (5) provides that the additional levy is to commence on 1 January 1982. New subsection (5a) provides that if on 31 October in any year the fund exceeds \$5 000 000, there shall be no additional levy in the year commencing 14 months after that date. Consequential amendments are made to subsections (3) and (6).

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### URBAN LAND TRUST BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 2 696.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of Opposition):** This measure is one that the Opposition will oppose at all stages, because we believe that it represents a major attack on the public regulation of land and land pricing policy in this State. The Land Commission of South Australia has been a remarkable success story, whatever attacks have been levied on it over the years by an Opposition that fought very hard indeed to prevent its establishment. By its establishment, we were able to avoid the excesses of the urban land boom which occurred in most places in Australia and which is now bedevilling New South Wales, and Sydney in particular, at the moment. By its operation, we have been able to ensure the regular and orderly development of land through times of enormous difficulty brought about largely by the escalating interest rate.

This Opposition and the Party I lead are very much in favour of home ownership, and we believe that one of the roles of Government is to ensure that home ownership is put within the reach of ordinary people of ordinary and modest means within our community. If in fact urban land prices had escalated in the way in which they escalated in other States, many more people would find such housing

out of their reach. Proper land management policies flow on into the rest of the housing sector of the community. What a Housing Trust has to pay for land, what development projects it can introduce on behalf of rental tenants and those in need, is governed by the general context in which it operates. It is hard indeed to find anyone, apart from those who sit on the Government benches, even in the private sector, saying that the Land Commission has failed or being able to point to any area in which either its method of operation or its costs have been anything but of benefit to the State in the difficult times that the land and housing markets have been through in recent years.

The Opposition will oppose the Bill, because members on this side believe that it is simply introduced as some kind of ideological commitment by the Government, a Government that has failed to recognise the benefits that have flowed from the establishment of the Land Commission. We believe further that it is in a broader interest to oppose it, looking at the general position of the State's finances and the problems caused to them in recent years, in the past 18 months or so, by this Government. I believe that the Government is acting improperly, possibly even illegally, in introducing this legislation to affect an organisation established in partnership with and with the agreement of the Commonwealth. We have heard no report at all from the Minister on the financial negotiations with the Commonwealth and their implications for this State. So, we will move contingently for a Select Committee to examine this matter thoroughly, to examine the claims and allegations made by the Government about the operations of the Land Commission, and to examine in particular negotiations with the Commonwealth and their implications for this State. To do other than that, we contend, would be totally irresponsible.

This Bill is designed to tear down a major social and financial reform which has worked for the benefit of everyone in our community. It is designed to destroy a Government initiative which has benefited thousands of young couples in this State. It is part of a plan to dispose of public assets, something that the Government is clearly bent upon doing in so many areas. We have had before the House a Bill in which the Government proposed to dispose, at bargain basement prices, of a major public land holding asset at Monarto. We have seen in the press reports of Government plans to sell off anything that appears to be profitable, such as the Frozen Food Factory. We have seen plans by the Government to ensure that, wherever it can gain cash for something, it will do so, no matter what the long-term cost to the community.

We should no longer be in a position, surely, where we see the public estate as something to be raided and squandered. The Government has responsibility, not just to its short term of office, but to the longer perspective and to the community over a longer period of time. Such legislation as this is part of a pattern of squandering our public assets, at great cost to future generations in South Australia. In future, there will be a need again for an upgraded Land Commission, and it will be far more costly and far more difficult to establish at that time of need because of what the Government intends to do with it by means of this Bill. Who will benefit from this? It will not be the public purse or the Treasury, or the people seeking to buy developed land and homes. The only persons who will benefit, as we see it, are special interest groups in the private sector whom this Government feels it must protect and assist, at whatever cost to the general interest of the community.

The South Australian Land Commission was established in 1973, and it was complemented by a system of urban

land price controls. It was introduced as part of the implementation of the 1973 State election promise by the then Dunstan Government to halt the land price spiral. There was at that time a very inefficient and speculative land market developing in Adelaide. We had had warnings from experience in Perth and in the Eastern States that this could get totally out of control. The private or profit market in land, which the Government seeks to advance and allow to run riot by means of this dismantling, had clearly failed the community. In its report to the Government, the Working Party on the Stabilisation of Land Prices diagnosed three major deficiencies of the private market in land. The first was the spiralling prices which threatened home ownership, putting it well beyond the reach of the ordinary couple, and the rapidly increasing interest rates of recent months have added to the problem of general prices of land and homes. The report said that high prices were caused by the failure of the market to produce a sufficient stock of serviced allotments to meet demand and at the right time. On occasions, there is a surplus; on other occasions, a scarcity. The result was a major impact on prices.

Secondly, it identified haphazard development and the leapfrogging of subdivisions which resulted in scattered development, with tracts of unused land between subdivisions, with no thought to their development or purpose in the overall planning sense. The result was the costly provision of public utility services, increased travel times, and lack of various other social amenities. This cost the State money, as well as affecting the lifestyle of the people living in it.

Finally, it diagnosed the high risks associated with individual subdivisions. The risk of failure pushed up the required selling price in order to provide an adequate return on capital. The Working Party concluded that only by the establishment of a public land commission could these major drawbacks of the private market in land be overcome. In particular, it concluded that only a public land body could build up a large enough stock of serviced allotments to have a major effect on prices, to hold them down. This need to hold a stock of allotments is particularly relevant to the Bill, because the Government has criticised the Land Commission, in the current situation, for over production. Without such a stock—one of the basic reasons for establishing the Land Commission—there is no control whatever over prices.

The reasons given by the Government for criticising the Land Commission have continued to change, but they have had one thing in common: they have constantly attacked and criticised the Land Commission. The Government Party fought a guerilla warfare over it through the Upper House to try to restrict its powers and prevent its institution. Essentially, most of the arguments used are false arguments, and many are simply contrived after the event. A political decision has been made by this Government to dismember the Land Commission, and no matter what facts or figures are adduced against the proposal, it will proceed to do so because politically it feels that it is absolutely necessary to dismember it.

The arguments they construct are arguments constructed from that basis, not from a basis of rationality. While the arguments are false and have been demonstrated to be false (and both I and the member for Mitchell will be looking at those arguments during this debate), they have obviously been effective in harming the Land Commission in the community at large. We must remember that the Land Commission operates in a commercial environment, and the sort of publicity and criticism that the former Opposition has promoted, particularly through this House, must have had some

effect in scaring off potential home site buyers, making them a little uneasy about the viability or future of the Land Commission and Land Commission blocks—an irresponsible tactic, but one which probably had some marginal effect. It is hard to gauge the extent to which it had an effect. No doubt there is evidence of it. The Land Commission itself felt constrained to say in its 1979-80 report:

Adverse media comment and uncertainty over the Liberal's review of the South Australian Land Commission have harmed South Australian Land Commission marketing.

Of course, that is one of the interesting ways in which this Government, while in opposition, went about harming public enterprise, by creating doubt and uncertainty, particularly in the minds of its potential customers—a pretty scurrilous tactic, but one, of course, that can work commercially if that is the basic premise on which you are operating, the basic premise, that is, of destroying or winding down the Land Commission.

I can refer specifically to a statement made by the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, on 23 August 1979, when he claimed that the South Australian Land Commission had a \$200 000 000 debt. His cure was that the Government should sell off South Australian Land Commission broad acres. This proposition talks about the Land Commission being a "land bank". How could the South Australian Land Commission, in a scaled down form, as envisaged here, be a land bank without broad acres? Yet, the Premier wanted it sold off. Once in office, the new Government announced a committee of inquiry into the South Australian Land Commission, and the Minister said it was to report by the end of November 1979—an urgent inquiry, in other words, was to be undertaken. In announcing the inquiry, the Minister said:

The South Australian Land Commission is to be restructured so that it competes with private land developers in an open market.

Immediately, major questions were raised by that statement. It was an inquiry in the sense of getting to the actual facts and operation of the Land Commission: it was an inquiry which the Government had commissioned to view to restructuring the Land Commission. Its findings, in effect, were pre-empted by the statement of the Government that the Land Commission was to be restructured. So, one option open to any inquiry which was to report that the Land Commission was operating successfully, that there need be no great concern over the level of debt, was closed to that committee by the way in which the Government established it and the statements with which it surrounded it. I think it is more important to note that the Minister's statement highlights the confusion in the Government over what it had planned to do. There is really only one way in which the Land Commission can compete with private land developers, and that is for it to be a land developer itself. That is the very thing that this Act aims to prevent. It is certainly difficult to see how a land bank could compete with the profit sector in the open market, as the Minister suggests. It will be very interesting to hear the Minister's explanation on that point.

The Bill departs markedly from the Minister's statement. It contains no powers whatever of Government competition with private land developers, because it includes that public sector land development role. So, again we find that the Government has changed its thinking. During the inquiry, the Commission and its staff were treated very shabbily. The Government did not really want to know about them or their views. Information about the inquiry and about its direction was clearly withheld. Contact with the Government was virtually kept to a minimum, because the Government did



not want its doctrinal conclusions about the Land Commission spoiled by some facts being presented to it by the commission.

In support of that, of course, I can point to a letter from one of the long-term Land Commission members with an enormously high reputation in Australia in the field of urban planning and development—Mr. P. N. Troy, of the Urban Research Unit of the School of Social Sciences in Canberra. His term expired, and it was obvious that the Government was not going to let him continue in his position. He wrote a letter (in a sense, a sort of cry from the heart from someone who had been involved with this body and seen it traduced for so many years) to the Minister on 26 May last year. I will quote one section of that letter to illustrate the point I have been making, as follows:

In preparing the Cabinet submission (assuming there was one) no request was received by the commission for information or comment relating to the committee's summary recommendations or any of the allegations made against the commission. At no time since taking office has the Government accepted the commission's offers of information or briefing on the draft report or the summary recommendations. At no time has the commission been advised of the Government's decisions in advance of the public announcement of those decisions. At no time has the commission been given Ministerial direction by the present Government on matters of general policy, even when the commission has sought such direction.

The letter then goes on to analyse the extraordinary statement issued by the Minister in a news release of 8 April completely misrepresenting the Land Commission's position, completely confusing its role and, in fact, displaying, I suggest, total ignorance by the Minister about what the true facts of the Land Commission's operations and financial position were.

Why would the Government do this? Clearly, one can only return again to the point that the Government did not want to know because it had already decided what it was going to do—it was going to get rid of the Land Commission. It was going to honour promises made to certain sections of the private sector while in Opposition. There was an interim report, which was referred to in the letter from which I quoted. I have been informed that the report concluded that there was no urgent need to review South Australian Land Commission financial arrangements. I would like the Minister to confirm or deny that that is so, with, I would hope, an accurate quotation from that interim report.

Was there an urgent need to review the financial arrangements because of the great financial disasters brewing, as the Government had been suggesting and had kept talking about in Opposition, or was the evidence to the contrary? Probably much to his dismay, the first interim report to the Minister indicated, in fact, that the then Opposition had been grossly exaggerating the position. Then there were the final recommendations for Cabinet. Just where did they come from? Who framed them? Did they come from the Minister or the Minister's office? That is certainly not the belief of those who have been involved in this issue and observed the nature of the recommendations.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Who are you referring to?

**Mr. BANNON:** The people who have been attempting to disentangle the Government's mishandling of this whole question of the Land Commission.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The people responsible for the report?

**Mr. BANNON:** I am talking about the people who have been involved with the Land Commission at all stages and

those who are concerned about its future in the urban affairs area. They believe that those recommendations emanate from the Minister of Housing and Local Government's office, not from the Minister who is handling the Bill in this House. Let the Minister deny that. Let him tell us who actually framed the final recommendations, which were framed without reference to any particular report and which certainly were not giving effect to the recommendations of any report.

There seems to be no final report. Was there a final report document, or was there simply a list of recommendations with no arguments and no case to back it up? Let the Minister come clean about that aspect of this whole sorry affair. Were all members of the committee of inquiry happy with the report and with Mr. Hill's recommendations? Was the Under-Treasurer satisfied? Again, let the Minister come clean on those matters. It appears that responsible public servants, faced with the facts of the Land Commission's operations, could not have been happy.

In announcing the report, not at the end of November 1979 but on 9 April 1980, the Minister said that the commission would be ordered to sell all its developed allotments and that disposal was to occur such that market values were not upset. Presumably, the argument was that a large volume of forced Land Commission disposals would push market prices down and reduce private profits. Then, in almost the next breath, the Minister claimed that the Land Commission could not trade out of its difficulties without lifting land prices beyond desirable levels. On the one hand, he said, "Get rid of a large volume of assets at a pace that won't upset the market values", presumably at a pace that would keep the levels low, and on the other hand he suggested that land prices needed to be lifted to allow the Land Commission to trade out of its difficulties. There is some inconsistency, but, also in regard to the questions that will be asked by others on this side, I hope that a full response will come from the Minister that goes beyond the fairly trivial points that he made in his second reading explanation.

After the release of the report and these recommendations, the Premier tried to make people believe that Land Commission obligations were a burden born by all in the community. He claimed that the debt was a burden, because it passed through the State Budget. This was both wrong and misleading, and I suggest that it was probably another indication of lack of financial knowledge rather than a deliberate attempt to mislead. The facts are that the South Australian Land Commission obligations are not a burden on the State Budget, as the Premier claims. There is a clause in the Joint Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement in respect of the Land Commission that provides that the Commonwealth will meet book losses, and this occurs only if the Land Commission operates within the provisions of the agreement, stating the purpose, structure and functions of a land commission. So, the Land Commission, under that agreement, is protected, but clearly it is also required to carry out specific functions.

The Premier again repeated his claim that \$200 000 000 was involved in the Land Commission debt and tried to use this existence of debt as an argument for shedding the land development function. The argument was apparently that the Land Commission land development activities had created the debt. The problem regarding this Government claim was that the debt had been incurred almost wholly as a result not of land development but of the land banking function. The purchase of substantial broad acre parcels was the major cost incurred by the commission, so, if it had a massive debt, it could not have incurred this because

it was developing land but because it was holding land as a land bank. The Government now suggests that this is a valid role for the commission to play. When that fact was pointed out, the argument was hastily dropped, and we have not heard much about it since.

The Government's appointments to the Land Commission to fill vacancies during 1980 reflect both its constituency and its attitude to the commission. Whatever the integrity of individuals appointed (as we said at the time), if people are appointed from the private development sector with a brief to dismantle a body or organisation, that appointment is bound to be viewed with suspicion by the general public. Those appointments have done nothing to increase public confidence or to make the public feel confident of the Government's desire that the Land Commission should be well managed, and that its policy should ensure its success. Rather, it seems that the appointments have been made with a view to the commission's dismantling, with as much benefit to the private sector as possible.

Let us turn to the Minister's second reading explanation. Two main arguments are put forward in regard to dismantling the commission. The first is the continually increasing debt burden. The Minister referred to \$94 000 000 as the debt and said that this was largely in relation to the value of assets. As I noted earlier, he claimed that the Land Commission could not trade out of a situation in which it had such a large debt. In talking in this way, the Minister is using strictly commercial criteria by which to judge the commission. He is forgetting that, written into its terms of reference and its functions, the Land Commission has social obligations. For instance, it must provide community centres, it must ensure a balanced development and a mixture of functions, obligations that do not apply in the same way to the private developer who may be working in these fields. Those social obligations cost money, and so they should. This is the reason why we have a body such as the Land Commission to ensure proper and balanced development, to give an example to the private sector, and to put some pressure on it to comply in a similar way.

Aside from that point, a debt was always envisaged in the Commonwealth-State agreements. Debt is basic to the land banking function. It is a very long-term activity. Potential urban residential land has to be purchased well in advance of need if the urban element in broad acre prices is to be kept to a minimum. It is only in this way that the cost of home sites can be kept down. Because purchase occurs well ahead of need and before the sale of serviced home sites, the initial cash flow must be small. It is in the nature of the operation. The long-term assessment of the financial viability is something very different from the short-term way in which the Government is looking at the situation. Incidentally, the Premier is very happy to talk about lead times for private investment projects, but he ignores lead times in the case of public enterprise, such as the Land Commission.

The Commonwealth-State agreements were tailor made for land banking, despite the Minister's claims. The long-term loans were provided at the bond rate. It is cheap money. Repayments of principal and interest were deferred, and interest was capitalised into debt. The commission was enacted in 1973, but debt redemption was delayed for 10 years: it is to begin in 1983-1984. It should be pointed out clearly in this place that the Minister is being quite hypocritical to base part of his case on a book loss by the Land Commission. One of the ironies of this talk of profit and loss is that the Liberal-dominated Legislative Council forced an amendment to the Act in 1973, which provided that the commission could not make

a profit, so whether or not the commission wanted to operate profitably, it was envisaged that it should not.

What more effective way is there to reduce the cash flow of an organisation than to impose that prevention on it? How better to put it in a position where it allegedly cannot trade itself out of a financial situation? The South Australian Land Commission's own studies show no difficult financial problems. In its 1978-1979 report, it was stated, in response to public comment to the effect that it may not be able to meet future obligations, that it had prepared a comprehensive cash flow analysis. It showed projected revenues would be sufficient to accommodate comprehensive Commonwealth debt redemption. Does the Minister dispute the findings of this comprehensive rejection of the commission? Let him produce the evidence and the refutation of those figures instead of talking rhetorically about massive debts.

He should certainly clear the air and tell the House what is wrong with those projections, and the Government's projections, the counter-projections, which it has made and which, one assumes, indicate that the situation is very grievous indeed, ought to be open to public scrutiny and set against the assessment of the Land Commission itself. Arguments that the Land Commission's finances are poor ignore the fact that at 30 June 1980 it possessed short-term assets in the form of investments and cash in hand of some \$18 200 000. These could have earned a higher return if permitted by the Government to be invested.

In addition the commission has developed land on hand which is valued at \$22 300 000, and grant money is still owed by the Commonwealth to the Land Commission for land provided for reserves as part of a separate joint programme. Those facts do not point to an institution on the point of bankruptcy and in a grievous position. Perhaps the Minister could tell the House how much Land Commission obligations have risen as a result of bond rate rises, due to the failure of the Federal Government to keep down interest rates. In view of the Minister's emphasis on the private sector, it is perhaps fitting for a word about the Land Commission's financial obligations to come from the private sector. In the *News* of 29 April, Mr. Martin, Managing Director of West Lakes, criticised the Land Commission and was reported to have said that, because of delayed interest payments, it was in a privileged position. The Government cannot have it both ways: either there was some privilege, some financial advantage, in delayed interest payments as perceived by the private sector, or there was not. The Minister simply shoves that sort of argument under the table, and says, "No, the commission must be wrong; it is in major debt; it is on the point of collapse, and it must be restructured as a matter of urgency". Let the Minister produce the evidence in this place.

The second argument for the Bill is that the Land Commission exceeded its charter and that it never really operated as a land bank. The Minister claims (and he quoted passages from *Hansard* or from election policies):

The Land Commission did not make land available to private developers as promised by Premier Dunstan in 1973. The Minister surely does not believe that the Land Commission has not at any time acted as a land banker for the private sector. Clearly it has acted as a land banker for other bodies, such as the Housing Trust, but it is also operating under the legislative charter. Has the Minister forgotten that amendments were made by a hostile Legislative Council, which agreed to that section (section 12 (1) of the Act), which laid down that the functions of the commission which were not to be restricted to a land bank, whatever he alleges Premier Dunstan said. In fact, it included the power to manage and develop or redevelop

land. It is in the Act that was passed through the Upper House. Also, the Commonwealth-State agreements which specified the functions of the Land Commission include that particular performance.

The Land Commission activities must be within the terms of the programmes which are agreed by both the Commonwealth and State Governments. The Minister tries to substantiate his claim that the Land Commission exceeded its charter, by quoting Premier Dunstan and saying that in most cases the Land Commission's land will be privately developed. I think his interpretation of that statement is totally misleading. The fact is that a great deal of Land Commission land development or servicing activities has been carried out by private contractors. The private sector has participated to a large extent in the Land Commission's activities and operations. Let the Minister deny that and produce figures which say that that is not so.

The Minister claims that the Land Commission land development activities have had an adverse impact on private investment. Does he mean by that that, before its establishment, the developers were securing excessive profits? One can only argue that the Land Commission's activities in this field would ensure that prices were kept down, as envisaged under its charter. Surely the private land development industry can stand a bit of public sector competition. We can relate that to the Minister's announcement in October 1979 that it was going to compete with private land developers in an open market. Opponents of the Land Commission have claimed that it misread the market and over-produced allotments, and that that caused major financial problems. It is easy to criticise in retrospect, and if mistakes were made they were certainly shared by most of the developers, if not all, in the private sector. The Land Commission, as part of the land market, was certainly affected by the market turn-down, as has been pointed out on a number of occasions. Private developers, as is the case with the Land Commission, base their production levels on forecasts of demand made by the Indicative Planning Council, a body with a large private sector component which forecast levels of demand for building blocks which in the result were far too high. So everyone was caught up in that problem. It was not just a case of the Land Commission's being involved or over-producing.

I pointed out earlier that the key recommendation of the 1973 report on land prices was that there was a need for the creation of a stock of allotments, if prices were to be held. The question the Minister must answer now is how the demand for serviced allotments can be matched by an adequate supply, if the Land Commission cannot hold any developed blocks in the future. How can the Minister guarantee that the supply will correspond to the demand in the right areas and at the right time if the S.A.L.C. allotments are disposed of. Effectively, the Government is simply removing one of its major instruments of control and regulation of this important market. What the Government is doing is in fact prescribing a recipe for sharply increased land prices at a later date. The performance of the private market anywhere in Australia (in fact, in the world) indicates that it is incapable of controlling prices and holding them down. That is why we need the intervention of a body such as the Land Commission.

There is a direct link between the two main arguments to which the Minister resorted, for, if the S.A.L.C. cannot produce and sell developed allotments, this will reduce its ability to generate a cash flow and service its financial obligations. If the Minister is very concerned about the financial state of the S.A.L.C., far from curbing its ability to operate he should be advancing it. So, the Opposition

contends that we need full, complete information on what agreement has been made with the Commonwealth to ensure that, if the State of South Australia breaks its agreement, we are not going to be financially disadvantaged.

What is happening in other States where negotiations are taking place with Land Commissions? What sort of amounts could appear to be at risk? We have suggested that the Commonwealth could ask South Australia to pay over \$18 000 000 which is held in cash and current assets that I have already mentioned. It could ask for the proceeds from the sale of developed allotments valued at \$22 000 000. We have no guarantee that we will get as good a deal as Western Australia and Victoria, which are clearly troubled as far as their urban land bodies are concerned. Those bodies are not in the strong position that ours is in. What sort of deal will they get, and can we not insist on a similar deal with the Commonwealth?

The Government wants to rush in, dispose of and get rid of, and not explain to the public. Let us have a Select Committee, and let us look at all the facts which have not yet been presented and try to get to the bottom of whether the Land Commission is of financial and social advantage to this State, as we believe it is, or whether it is not.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I oppose this Bill in total. The whole affair can only be described as little short of scandalous. In 1979, when the Land Commission was operating successfully within its charter, a campaign was launched, not openly by the Liberal Party but by a private development group, which was subsequently joined by the Liberal Party, to make an attack upon a body which until that time had been responsible for making it possible for thousands of young people in this State (and not always young people) with limited means to become home owners through the provision of suitable developed land at a price they were able to meet.

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

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Before the dinner adjournment, I had time only to point out that this matter began in 1979 with a scandalous attack on the Land Commission by a private development group. Amongst the arguments put forward by that group at the time was the suggestion that in some way the Land Commission had a monopoly on the development of building blocks in South Australia. By no stretch of the imagination, in 1979 or now, can that be said to be a correct assessment of the commission's position. It holds a little more than a quarter of the available allotments in the growth areas of Adelaide, just over one-third of the residentially zoned broad acres, and one-third of the broad acres already zoned for future living. How that can be considered to be holding a monopoly is beyond my comprehension and that of any reasonable person.

There is no doubt that, by its very existence, the commission has been able to introduce a strong element of competition which must be of great benefit to the people who need land at reasonable prices so that they can become home owners. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that it was clear from the documents surrounding the establishment of the commission that its principal function was to be the assembly, holding and management of large parcels of land for development by private enterprise. He tried to bolster that erroneous statement by referring to remarks that the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, had made. The Minister would be well aware that statutory bodies operate as they are allowed to operate by the provisions of the legislation governing their

operation. There should be no need for me to draw his attention to the Land Commission Act, 1973, which has not been amended. I draw to the Minister's attention section 5 (2) (f), which states that the commission shall have the powers, duties, functions and authorities conferred, imposed or prescribed by or under the Act. Section 12 (1) (b) provides that the functions of the commission are, among other things, to manage and develop or redevelop the land so acquired.

The statement put forward by the Minister in the second reading explanation is incorrect. From the date of the Act, that power has been contained, and properly contained, within the legislation. The Government made a wrong summation, when it was in Opposition, in an attempt to gain power, in relation to the Land Commission. If what is now proposed in the legislation before us were not so sad, one could almost feel some satisfaction that the Government has been hoist with its own petard by the actions commenced by private development interests in this State, willingly supported by the then Opposition, the Liberal Party, resulting in some depression of the activities of the Land Commission which are not to the benefit of the people of this State or to the Liberal Government of the day.

Some of the problems which were said to exist but which did not exist at that time have been created by the Government's actions. The annual report of the Land Commission for 1979-80 referred to a so-called restructure, under the heading "Review of activities" and, if the Minister were to have a chance to write his second reading explanation again, I think he might correct it in the area to which I referred earlier, because the report of the committee set up to look at the activities of the Land Commission suggests, as one of the most important changes, the removal of the power to plan and develop residential allotments. The power has been there all the time. It has been properly exercised by the commission, yet we have the Minister saying that that is not what it is there for.

The committee made its final recommendations to the Government in March 1980. We do not know what those recommendations were, but we are told that the Minister of Planning announced a number of changes in the future role of the commission on 9 April 1980. I cannot call them recommendations, but one of the changes the Minister announced was that, in selling its existing stock of developed allotments, the South Australian Urban Land Trust should use the resources of the private sector as far as possible. If anyone doubted what the Government was about in this matter, I think that would indicate beyond doubt that what is intended is the transfer to the private sector of the possibility of making money in the transaction of land sales. When he replies, let the Minister explain that change.

The Minister has also referred briefly in the second reading explanation to the fact that discussions with the Commonwealth on the re-negotiation of the financial agreement had already commenced. That is very handy. From that, I can deduce no more than can the member for Flinders. I saw the way in which he received that statement, and I received it in the same way. That is great. Here we have a Bill to totally hamstring and emasculate the Land Commission as it stands, a body in existence as a result of legislation in the Commonwealth area and agreements negotiated between the State and the Commonwealth. All we are told is that negotiations have commenced, and yet the Land Commission exists because of the finance made available and the powers given to it in concert with the Commonwealth Government acting in this area.

I suggest to the Minister that the State could well be in conflict with the requirements of the existing agreement, the Loan arrangements, and yet the House has no information on that aspect of the Bill. Nothing has been put forward. Negotiations have commenced, and an activity which was State-wide in a vital area, the provision of building land, with tens of millions of dollars of Commonwealth and State money involved, is concerned. The House is asked to agree to massive changes in the way in which the Land Commission has been able to operate in the past, having its activities severely curtailed, cut down, and limited, and it must almost be responsible to the Minister for whether it gets two tea breaks a day or one.

We are asked to approve all of that without being given any information about what is the state of play with respect to matters between the State and Commonwealth. Perhaps the Minister has that information. He might have done the House the courtesy of giving that information to us in his second reading explanation. I argue that the State could well be *ultra vires* in respect of the agreement because of what is proposed in this Bill. Are Commonwealth authorities aware of what is proposed in this Bill? We do not know. There is nothing in the Bill, or in the second reading explanation, to tell us that. If the arrangements for repayment of the money were the reason for doing something about the Land Commission, and if they were a worry and a possible embarrassment to the State, then the Commonwealth would be vitally interested. What is proposed in the Bill now is such that the opportunity to get hold of cash to make repayments will be severely limited, yet there is not a word in the second reading explanation to give us information on that area. I hope that the Minister will tell us something about that.

The suggestion, as far back as 1979, was that there were a number of areas in which the Land Commission was not performing in a way which was to the benefit of South Australians generally and of those people who need land for home building purposes. One of the arguments put forward by the private development group was that the main purpose for which the commission was brought into being was the provision of good quality land at low prices, but it said that, despite the substantial advantages which the commission had been given, private enterprise was still providing lower priced land—that was the argument put forward. If that was the case, what were those people bitching about?

If the private developers were providing lower priced land, it must have been selling it flat out, so how was the Land Commission still in the act? That proposition falls on its face without any real effort from me, or from those people who at the time were supporting the Land Commission. At that time, the Land Commission had estates in 12 different locations. One of the factors was that the private sector had to have regard to the land price of the Land Commission when setting its prices. If the argument put forward was that the Land Commission land was too dear, that was not true, either, because the Land Commission never claimed to have the lowest priced land in every case. It had a range of land and style of land in different locations. Wherever the development was greatest, in key areas, and where the pressures on prices were the greatest (for example, at Tea Tree Gully), the commission's average sale price was lower than the average price for all industry sales. Those are not politician's figures; the source of those figures was the Valuer-General's office. Those figures were put forward at the time and ignored by the then Opposition members because, apart from ideological opposition to the matter, they were under pressure from private developers to allow

greater speculative activity in land dealings.

Whilst the Land Commission was there with the kind of holdings I am talking about there was a balance in the system. The way in which land prices were held in this State to a reasonable level, where the increases over the years were of a relatively small nature, was due in no small measure to the activity of the Land Commission and its influence on the land market generally. I have not seen anywhere, in any submission, or heard from the Minister, an argument that land prices in Adelaide were other than stable for a four-year to five-year period from the time the Land Commission commenced its activities. I ask the Minister, in his reply, to tell the House in what other State that occurred. I know that if that were the only thing he had to say there would be dead silence, because he will not be able to point to any other State where that occurred. That position was due solely to the Land Commission.

Another spurious argument put forward by the opponents of the Land Commission, those people operating in a scandalous way in attempting to destroy its credibility and remove it as a competitor from the area in which they hope to make plenty of money, was that there was, they said, an over-production of allotments, which had helped to depreciate the value of the commission's land.

They went on to make even more scandalous allegations that it was proved that the current value of land as presented in the commission's accounts was grossly overstated and that the recent history of failures by finance companies with overvalued land assets pointed to the dangers of such a position. At the time these people were making that statement the Land Commission was in an enviable position. At that time, it had over \$13 000 000 in cash handily placed and ready to be retrieved. There were quite a number of financial land institutions in the private sector that would have very much liked to have been in the same position. We only have to name one or two of those. The Land Commission had no commitments in 1979 of a major nature to meet in respect of loans to the Commonwealth that had to be met before 1983, while having over \$13 000 000 in the kitty safely earning, having been placed in areas approved by the Treasurer—and it was supposed to be in a bad position! I bet that F.C.A. and Cambridge Credit, in earlier years, would dearly love to have been in that position.

Irrespective of that, the allegation that land was being overvalued was scandalous. In those times, the commission was stating the value of its land holdings in accordance with the standards of Australian accounting bodies, and its accounts were never qualified by the Auditor-General. Were the Liberal Party and private development groups saying at that time that the same Auditor-General they now support as a Government was guilty of improper practice in certifying the accounts of the commission? What other conclusion can a person draw from the allegations that were being made?

What happened was that the Liberal Party was pressured into a situation where it had to get on the band wagon, and it is stuck with the fact that it participated in that scandalous series of episodes. Another probably even wilder argument put forward was that the premature development and over-production of allotments in several districts had caused a long-term market problem for the commission and that, in addition, a considerable number of developed blocks had yet to be put on the market. That was the fiction; what were the facts? As I have already pointed out, the commission held just over one-quarter of the residential allotment stock available in the growth areas of Adelaide. One-quarter, not three-quarters, or something that might support a claim that the commission

was in a dicey position.

It looks as though someone else was in a dicey position—the private development sector. It was not the Land Commission. The obvious conclusion one can draw is that therein was one of the justifications, as it were, for the attack on the Land Commission by the private sector. I put the word “justification” in inverted commas, because that sector was in trouble and was squealing like a stuck pig.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** They had every right to.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** They had every right to squeal. Before the advent of the Land Commission, there was open slather. The land pricing report, to which the Leader referred, showed that the ordinary Joe and his wife who wanted to own a house in their lifetime were at the mercy of straight-out speculation and rocketing land prices. Let us hear the Minister say something about prices in other States. Many members know what happened when the Land Commission came into being. People approached me and said, quite openly, “I bought that land in that area to make a quid, and now, with the Land Commission involvement in the area and the competition, I will not make that great sum.” The Minister does not want to talk about it any longer. That was the scene not only on the small scale but also on the larger scale.

There were schemes in which people made investments, and these people, on occasion, had a very high standing in the community. They were involved in a scheme whereby they bought land and for some reason or other were supposed to put their conscience in their hip pocket. They might even have had children of their own. The profit to be made on spurious land value rises would be at the expense of everyone in South Australia who wanted to own his own home. These schemes had exotic names: one that I recall was something “travel investment”. The idea was that land was bought in fairly large parcels and, when there was a shortage of land, because it was held in that way and because there was no alternative, the poor homeseeker had to pay the price. Such a speculator could sell and go for an overseas trip on the proceeds, saying to himself, “What a smart fellow I’ve been. I have made enough money to go for a trip.” Is that the kind of ethic the Minister is supporting by saying that sales should go back to the private sector? Let the Minister deny that that sort of thing occurred.

Those instances were made known to me when I was an ordinary member, so one wonders what the Minister knows. In his present exalted position, he would have all the information on these matters at his fingertips; it would be fed to him. The Minister would know what is in the offing and why this savage attack has taken place on the activities of a body that existed solely to assist those who wanted to be home owners to realise that dream without mortgaging away two lifetimes. Heaven knows, it is still difficult, because of the problem of obtaining finance and the rising interest rates that were sponsored by the Commonwealth, but at least in the land area people had a chance. The Minister is taking that chance away by handing land sales back to the private sector, on the activities of which there is no control.

The Minister will have to answer the question posed by my Leader—how does one provide for orderly development in a city the size of Adelaide and its urban areas without having the control and the power that existed in the Land Commission to make decisions and acquire land for ordinary development? How does the Minister propose to do that? Will he involve people like L. J. Hooker and other groups, and say, “I wish you would organise and do some developing?” What power will the Minister have to do this? We look forward to hearing from

the Minister about the way in which that will be achieved.

I must return to the question of the position of the State, the commission and the loan arrangements with the Commonwealth. For any member to make a decision on this matter, to agree to make the changes proposed (and I am not talking about the fact that the commission will be given a new name—that is not important), he must see that, in some magical way, the Land Commission will buy land and hold it, but must not be allowed to influence its future, develop it, or do anything but function as a feeder to the private sector. In other words, the commission will function to save the private sector capital investment in the acquisition of land. That is proposed for the future of the Land Commission. How will that help the young people and other people that I have mentioned? It is a cynical exercise, a pay-off, an indebtedness to those who assisted the Government to gain office. There is now the necessity for the Government to deliver, because of the performance that helped it get into office. No other connotation can be put on what is proposed. The Bill will hamstring and put strictures on the commission's operations.

We will have an opportunity in the Committee stage to pursue other matters, and my Leader has indicated that he will move for a Select Committee. If ever a proposition cries out for a Select Committee, this is it, because of the murky and scandalous way in which the whole thing began, and because no evidence has been put forward by the Minister in regard to even one home owner or land-seeker requiring a change in the way in which the Land Commission operates. It has been argued that there has been some unfair (and other words have been used) competition in the private development sector, and that this has to change. Those reasons are not good enough for any member to support the Minister and the Bill—certainly, they are not good enough for the Opposition. The Opposition opposes the Bill and all of its provisions.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the Bill. I was one of those who was outspoken in Opposition in suggesting that the Land Commission should be a land bank only. The Government and the Minister propose to follow through that philosophy. I can understand that the other side of politics is not likely to accept this philosophy, but I remember that the former Deputy Premier, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, when in charge of this area, made the point quite strongly that the reason why the Labor Party wanted to set up the Land Commission was so that it would stop people from sitting on large parcels of land and creating a shortage of subdividable land, thereby exploiting the market. That was the fundamental basis of the argument when the matter was first raised in this Parliament. That was the main argument, and that was the purpose of setting up the Commission. It was never suggested in the initial stages that the Land Commission would become, in the main, the developer of land within the State and the metropolitan area.

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** I am talking about when the matter was first promoted, not when the Bill was introduced. The Labor Party, in order to win emotive support in the community, argued that that was the purpose. Subsequently, a Bill was introduced, which contained other provisions. It eventually passed the Parliament. For the member for Mitchell to argue that the sole reason why the cost of land in South Australia is less than the cost in other States is the existence of the Land Commission shows that either he is ill-informed or he has not followed the

circumstances over the years.

South Australia has always had the lowest priced land for building homes in new subdivisions. The Hon. Mr. Hudson used to make the point that if one went 10 miles from the centre of Sydney one paid much more for land than one paid for land 10 miles from the Adelaide G.P.O. Everybody knew that, because Sydney is a much bigger city. That is the sort of argument he used to use to win his point in this place.

What we should be concerned about at the moment is that at the time of the Whitlam Government so much money was made available, not only to create a Land Commission but also to encourage people to speculate in the building industry, that we had an over-supply of housing, to such a degree that we have not taken up all of the leeway some five years later. This is due to the fact that at the same time in this State we had a static population developing, and many of the people of the age at which they would be looking for homes moved out of the State, and people with homes put them on the market and moved out of the State. We know that such a trend takes time to stabilise and stop, as it must be slowed down, stopped and then reversed. That is one of the goals of this Government. That was another reason why there was no room for sales for vacant allotments—because there was an over-supply of houses, let alone allotments.

The Land Commission would know that, in the area of creating allotments, it moved into the field of producing a large amount of allotments. For example, on the north-western side of Manning Road near Flagstaff Hill a subdivision was left idle for months and not advertised. Even though it was fully developed and available to be sold, there was no market. To contend that the Land Commission sold land cheaper than the private sector did is not accurate. If one wants to draw comparisons on similar allotments in similar areas (at Aberfoyle Park, for example), one can buy land from the private sector for \$5 500. That is comparable to Land Commission prices, and the member for Mitchell should know that, because he lives on that side of the city. Everyone connected with such allotments is losing money at that rate. It is not the cost of raw land but the cost of services that is the problem.

When many of us were aged 22 to 25, say, looking for a block of land to build on, roads were not completed; kerbing was not completed; there was no enforcement of underground power regulations; no enforcement of drainage regulations; no enforcement of all the engineering required for roads, as is the case now where road structures are laid in order to carry buses that are heavier than the private sector is permitted to operate. All of those things now have to be met by the developer, whether it was the Land Commission or the private developer. Hence, the cost of putting on these services and the extra burden placed on the developer, regardless of who it was, are the problem. Of course, we now say that it is good, because it takes away one of the burdens on local government or State Government in supplying those services. That may be true—we took the burden off the average taxpayer, but placed it back on every young person who wants to build a house. Those people cannot move into an area with unmade roads, as they previously did, and then have local government put in the roads, services, and so on. The idea of septic tanks in those sorts of areas and a lack of facilities has gone. However, somebody paid the bill, and it happened to be the end purchaser. There are many cases where people would not be making money out of land they speculatively bought to subdivide.

As far as the orderly development is concerned, there

are many zoning regions these days, and local government has control of the situation. More particularly, the trust that is to be created is able to say, for example, that it is prepared to put X number of hectares on the market for private tender for people to develop how they wish within the rules of local government and the zoning regulations that apply in State legislation. At least the trust can decide how much land it puts on the market at any one time, and it can stop expansion in areas where we are not prepared to supply services—where the Government is not in a position to supply schools, public transport, playing fields or reserves. That power will always be there for the trust to decide whether it releases land. No doubt there has been a burden to the State in the long term through the Land Commission, because if it borrowed money it had to repay it and there was no guarantee, and still is no guarantee, of how quickly the land market will pick up so that prices will increase to a point where it is a viable proposition to subdivide.

We still have huge number of vacant allotments, not just in new developments on the fringe of the city but in the inner areas as well. We have houses demolished or renovated within the inner city areas, because people now realise that fuel is a matter of concern. Unfortunately, when these people were forced to move out to the outer fringe areas, we sent those who could least afford it to live in the most expensive place in times of increasing fuel prices. We were all conscious 10 years ago of the fact that increases in the cost of fuel were going to come about. These people were forced out there to those areas and forced to have first and second mortgages. There was no public transport, and in many cases there were no completed schools, so they had to raise money with fund raising efforts to supply some of the facilities for the schools. Even under a Labor Government they were disadvantaged to that degree.

Quite rightly, many of them, the younger people, have now realised that one is better off to move into the inner areas and renovate an old home or buy a home unit, many of which were built in over-supply during the Whitlam era in the mid-1970's. This trend is what has caused the problem in the development of the outer fringe areas, and I think we all realise that even if we are not prepared to mention it. In the mid-1970's inflation rates of up to 20 per cent in the building industry in one year were no real incentive for any person seeking to obtain an allotment for the future and hoping to build in, say, five years time, because if that rate had continued it would have been not 100 per cent dearer in five years time but something like 170 per cent dearer, and that is a massive increase when considering the cost increase that buyers had to face. I strongly support what is proposed. I believe the Government or the trust will have the opportunity to control the situation enough to make sure that development will not take place in areas too early, so orderly development will be able to be controlled. I believe that the trust will be able to look at the type of development that takes place and at the attitudes in regard to profits of those who develop the land, and a steady hand can be used if excessive profits are attempted to be made.

On average, we must look over a long period of time (not just a couple of years when prices may suddenly soar, but over a period of eight to 10 years) at a person developing land and at how long it takes to quit it, and what are the holding charges (for instance, councils are now asking minimum rates from \$100 upwards), water and sewerage rates, and all the other charges, such as interest rates on money invested. The holding costs are high.

One must look at that and not pick one or two years

when there might be a sudden boom in prices and say, "They made all that money", because that is not the case. Many people who moved into that area have become insolvent because they could not carry the charges and the costs involved in attempting to create allotments and hold them on the market.

One area in which the Land Commission went wrong in the early stages should be recorded. It was an obligation that a person who bought a block of land was obliged to build on it within 12 months. So, we set about forcing all the young people in one age group into the one area, which meant that their children grew up together, and the school was at peak capacity for a few years and then dropped off, instead of the old system of allowing people to buy a block and pay it off and build at some future time. By the latter method, we get a mixture of architecture, materials, designs, gardens, as well as social and age groups. People of the same age are not all thrown together, with children of the same age, putting a heavy load on all the services. That was one of the major errors made. I argued until it was changed to a more sensible ruling.

The same obligation was imposed on developers. People were forced to build on the blocks within a period of time, and that was stupid. The Hon. Hugh Hudson, who was the Minister at the time, argued (and no doubt it was his belief in the main) that this was one way of saving the State costs, that water and sewerage had to be supplied, and that if a house was built on every allotment there was a better return in taxes, rates and charges; but he did not look at the social consequences.

**Dr. Billard:** And the school costs.

**Mr. EVANS:** And the school costs and other associated costs, forcing everyone in the same age group into the area at the one time.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Is that so terribly wrong?

**Mr. EVANS:** I think it is. We can see the error of the commission's ways. If people are allowed to develop an area over 10 years or 20 years, the value of the land increases and the style of the houses will change. Some older people will be living in the area, and young married couples will come in with their children. There is always in the older age group someone who is home to keep an eye on the children. Most of the young ones are trying to get two incomes to survive, and we understand that, but without the older people there is no-one to watch the children and to preserve the stability of society. That is one of the social consequences of a bad policy.

In the end, all the houses look alike, they are of similar general design, because they are all built in the same era, and the area is not an exciting one for people to buy into in the future. There is not the benefit of retaining the value of the houses as there would be with a variety of designs and architecture. That has been proven in Adelaide and in the other States. I am glad the policy has changed, but unfortunately we have set the scene for some of these areas, if we are not careful, to be areas where the retail value of the homes will not increase in comparison with the purchasing power, as will happen in other areas.

I support the Bill quite strongly, because it is a move in the right direction. It will not harm markets in this State and there will not be exploitation, because there is some control in the hands of the trust and of the Government of the day.

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I join with the remarks of my Leader and the member for Mitchell on this matter and voice my disapproval of the actions of the Government in dismantling substantially the work of the Land Commission by this measure. Not long ago, the Minister of



Planning told the House that, upon becoming Minister, he asked departmental officers to provide him with information on all the properties or undertakings of his department that could be transferred to the private sector. Obviously, he received a report on the work of the Land Commission, and it is part of his stated programme and that of this Government to transfer the operations from the public sector to the private sector.

I was interested to hear the remarks of the member for Fisher about his distaste for some form of urban control and urban planning. One of the great problems that has bedevilled Australian cities is the lack of urban planning and the willy nilly development that has taken place during rapid periods of growth since the Second World War. Obviously, the orderly control and release to the private sector of subdivided land is important in that regard. To say that those subdivisions are ugly, lacking in design and taste, and that their future values are limited in that way is an insult to the young people in this State and elsewhere who value home ownership.

The fundamental design of the work of the Land Commission was to allow young people particularly to buy their own homes and to experience the enjoyment of home ownership, and we in Australia pride ourselves that so many people own their own homes and enjoy the lifestyle we have all come to accept. What is the record that exists today? In the last few years, we have seen, under the policies of the Fraser Liberal Government, and of the Government in office in this State now, disastrous effects on home ownership, especially for young people. Some 20 000 people are on the Housing Trust waiting list for rental accommodation, the greatest number since the Second World War. According to a recent Government report, 10 000 young people are homeless; 10 000 people are enjoying shelter only by virtue of women's shelters, men's homes, and church homes that provide for the homeless.

We have a disastrous situation in relation to the provision of adequate housing, but here we are denying many young people the right, the ability, to buy land to build their own home, land which is priced out of their reach. One of the frightening things that is occurring in society at this moment is the ability of young people to borrow sufficient money to raise what is known as the deposit gap, and the inability of many financial institutions to lend sufficient money to buy existing homes or to purchase new ones.

We know that the cost of housing and, I predict as a result of this measure, the cost of land will mean that families will not have the ability to repay the loans they require to carry out the purchase of something considered basic: adequate housing. It is a sad event that we have before the House this Bill, which will see the end of the actual subdivision of land by the public sector. I take a contrary view to that of members opposite who talked of the cost to communities in the State for schools and other community facilities.

I think that we live in an era where community facilities must be flexible. We have communities where there are many young families, and that is indeed a very good thing. Such a community can become a very lively and a very healthy community in itself, as children can grow up there with many other children and young people who have families, who can join together in building up a very strong and virile community. That is a good thing. That is to be encouraged, as the community that they build will be there for many generations to come. If school populations fluctuate, schools can be used for other purposes. Often in outer suburban areas, where developments such as those referred to by members opposite have taken place, those

facilities are very much in need, and school buildings can provide for many purposes other than for the education of children. I think we should not dictate the value of orderly urban subdivision as to the basic costs of providing school facilities in the community. There are ways and means around the problem, if it is a problem, and I doubt very much whether it is in actual terms of dollars and cents.

I want to refer just briefly to the agreements that were reached between the Commonwealth Government and the Government of this State with respect to the financing of the Land Commission. There were, as I understand it, three basic financial agreements. I understand that there was an obligation on the State and the Commonwealth, pursuant to those agreements, to have Ministerial consultations with respect to any changes that were to take place. Obviously, the Bill before the House this evening brings about a substantial change to the operation of what was the Land Commission in this State and the approved programmes that were undertaken under those agreements. I will be very interested to hear from the Minister (and I think he has a right and a duty to tell this House and the people of this State before we vote on this measure) the details of those consultations that he has carried out in pursuance of those agreements, what stage they have reached, what are the outcomes of those negotiations or consultations, what are to be the future programmes of the Land Commission in this State, and what effect will they have.

For example, on the cost of subdivided land, undoubtedly this State has an enviable record. One has only to talk to people, particularly from Melbourne and Sydney but also from Perth and Brisbane, to know what a great advantage it is to live in this State and to enjoy land and home ownership. I suggest to the House that one of the major contributing factors has been the work of the Land Commission in maintaining the cost advantage of land in this State. It flows on not just to young people who are buying land and building houses but also to the very cost advantages which this State has enjoyed and on which it has prided itself. It is fundamental to the development and growth of this State that we maintain those cost advantages; we should not throw them away lightly. I think that the Minister has a responsibility to tell us of the nature of those Ministerial consultations that have been carried out, I presume in accordance with the financial agreements that have been reached.

I raise a further matter, which I think was raised by the member for Mitchell earlier in this debate, of the legality of what the Government is attempting to do in this measure. I would be interested to hear from the Minister of the opinions that he may have obtained on the legality of this measure. I notice that there is some reference I think in clause 6 of the Bill, to some of the legal problems that may arise from its passage, but it would appear to me on first reading that this measure is a clear breach of the financial agreement that has been reached between the Commonwealth and the State. I should like to know whether it is now necessary for fresh financial arrangements to be reached between Commonwealth and the State, whether the financial arrangements that already exist will fall, whether moneys due to the Commonwealth have to be returned, whether there is a need for legislation to be passed in the Commonwealth Parliament to approve what, I would suggest, are fundamental changes that are being proposed by this measure. Before I could try to comprehend and understand some of these measures that the Minister is proposing in this Bill, I would need to know the very nature of those discussions and the legal problems that they raise in my mind.

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** I do not wish to speak long at this stage, but I think it is necessary to refute some of the things that have been said by speakers on the other side. In particular, I want to make some comments about some of the assertions, particularly about what is alleged as the beneficial role of the Land Commission during the 1970's in developing land in competition with private enterprise.

It has been alleged, for example, by the Leader of the Opposition that the development by the Land Commission of a large stock of allotments has been to the benefit of the community. The member for Norwood has just asserted that the Land Commission was instrumental in assisting home ownership throughout the 1970's. In fact, home ownership has been declining, but it has been declining right throughout the 1970's, despite the existence of the Land Commission in South Australia. I understand that the peak was reached in the late 1960's, and it has been declining throughout the 1970's; home ownership now represents about 65 per cent, whereas in earlier days it used to be well over 70 per cent.

I further allege that, because the Land Commission during the 1970's did not read the market conditions and continued to bring large quantities of allotments on to the market at a time when the market was contracting, far from assisting young people to own homes, it undermined those who had already purchased their homes, because, in a contracting market like that, to flood the market further, as was done, undermines those who have already invested their funds in their own homes. I know that people in my electorate suffered for this reason.

There are still many in my electorate whose home values have still not recovered to the level of the total mortgages owed on those homes, so they were directly threatened by the market being flooded with the allotments and, as can be seen by the evidence, this has not materially assisted others to acquire homes who would otherwise not have acquired homes. I allege instead that it has simply undermined those who had already acquired homes. I know there are many people who, once they had acquired their homes, found they were trapped because their mortgages, as I have said, were worth more than the current market value of their homes. Those people found that if they were transferred in their jobs, either to the country or interstate, they could not sell their homes and pay back their mortgages.

In fact, they were trapped and some of them went bankrupt. Some of them tried to rent out their homes and to escape in that way. There are quite significant numbers of people in both of those categories in my electorate. These people were hurt by that period of rapid contraction. Although I do not have precise figures, I can remember that in mid-1976 there were just over 3 800 houses approved a quarter (I think was the peak), and that declined in 1979 to around 1 400 houses approved for construction in the quarter. That is a decline, I think, of around 60 per cent or more in the building industry. If one thinks of the consequences of that on the economy, it is quite disastrous, so I think that the flooding of the land market had a disastrous effect both on the building industry and on those young people who invested their futures in the future of the State in the outer suburbs by purchasing their own homes.

**Mr. LANGLEY (Unley):** I have listened to the honourable member who just resumed his seat, and I am sure that he has never been involved in the building industry. I thought that people who could buy cheap land would have more money to spend on a home. So far as the things that happened in his area are concerned, people had to comply with the Building Act. There has been a downturn in building throughout Australia. South Australia has

the cheapest land close to the city.

*Dr. Billard interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** I listened to the honourable member in silence, as he should listen to me, but if I can pick up his interjections I will try to answer them. If the honourable member goes to other States of Australia and inquires he will find that South Australia has had the cheapest land for many years. Under the Land Commission, cheaper blocks were available. Then there was a movement away from building. That is probably why the Housing Trust has so many people waiting for rental homes nowadays. The position is getting worse and worse. Because of the policies of the Government in this State and the Commonwealth Government, people cannot afford these homes nowadays. Part and parcel of what the Land Commission did was give a person the opportunity to build a home, because of the cheaper land available. I am sure that people in other States would be pleased to buy land at similar prices. Not long ago one could buy a house and land in the Hackham area for about \$26 000. Would there be any other State in Australia where a person could do that in a similar area?

The member for Fisher has been consistent about this matter over a period of years. He said tonight that nowadays people had to have two incomes to survive and buy a home. That has not only happened in the past couple of years, but the position is getting worse and worse. People cannot afford to buy a home. Interest rates on loans are increasing all the time.

I can remember when Sir Thomas Playford's Government bought land at Elizabeth and the Housing Trust built homes on it. What is different about the operations of the Land Commission? At Elizabeth, private enterprise was allowed to building only in certain areas, because the area was taken over by the South Australian Government. There are some poor houses out there because, as the member for Fisher said tonight, the designs were not very different. We must house people, and that is a place where the Government of the day did almost the same as is involved with the Land Commission. I would go further and say that, in many cases, houses built on Land Commission land are a lot better than those built in Elizabeth, although I admit that the houses at Elizabeth are older. When the Housing Trust bought the land it sublet the jobs. They were cheap houses. Because of the Land Commission, people were able to build homes and buy their land for as low as \$26 000. It is not long ago that that was the case, but can that be done now?

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The honourable member for Henley Beach thinks he knows everything. The Government is trying to sell everything it can possibly sell (in this case the Land Commission is involved) because it is short of money and has to get that \$20 000 000 back as soon as it can. I would like the Minister to say how much these properties will cost. They were bought, if I remember rightly, for about \$6 000, including all the facilities. I would be surprised if people could buy these blocks now for \$6 000. If I remember correctly, the member for Fisher said that people today had to go for rental homes because they could not afford to build a home. The take-home pay for boilermakers, electricians and people such as that is about \$160 a week, so they are not doing too well. If one rents a home, he must pay \$40 to \$50 a week, which is near the minimum charge. I hope that the Minister can assure me that there will be no increase in the price of these blocks of land from when they were first cut up. The money recovered from the sale of Land Commission land will go back into Consolidated Revenue so that this Government can get out of the mess it has got itself into by granting the

concessions it has granted. The people of South Australia could buy house and land at Hackham for about \$26 000. If they can buy a house and land for \$26 000 under this Government in the future, I will congratulate the Government.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning):** I do not intend going into a great deal of detail about this matter, but I will answer the questions put to me by the members of the Opposition who have spoken in this debate. Before doing that, I want to make quite clear (and I hope from what has been said by members of the Opposition that they will be of the same opinion) that in anything said tonight I am not, as Minister, complaining about or attacking any of the officers involved in the commission at any time. What we are attacking, and what we have attacked, and why we are looking to bring down this legislation, is in relation to the Government's concern about the policies of the previous Government. This has nothing to do with the people who have been involved in carrying out the policies of that Government.

One of the first points made by the Leader was that it would be hard to find people who would say that the Land Commission had failed, or had been unsuccessful. I suggest that the Leader has not taken into account the adverse impact on private development in South Australia that has occurred because of the Land Commission. What about the fact that land development had virtually ceased in South Australia in the latter part of the operations of the Land Commission? What about the enormously damaging impact on South Australia as a place in which private capital can be invested with confidence? What about the lack of confidence that stopped the inflow of jobs to South Australia and led to fewer jobs? The Leader was obviously not interested in the problems being experienced in this State as a result of Government interference in the private sector. Government involvement in the Land Commission was one of many ways in which that Government sought to become involved in predominantly private sector endeavours at the expense of providing opportunities for the private sector and, through the private sector, jobs in South Australia.

**Honourable members:** Hear, Hear!

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am pleased to have the support of my colleagues. Surely the Leader will not claim that all of these facts have not had an adverse effect on the economy of South Australia. The Leader referred to the disposing of public assets by the present Government; he said that we were doing everything we could to dispose of public assets. He stated that the Government would dispose of Monarto land at rock-bottom prices, but I remind him of what I said when the Monarto Bill was being debated recently—the Government does not intend to give away that land at rock-bottom prices but to dispose of it in a responsible manner. The land should be sold at market value, and that is what will happen. The Leader asked how a scaled down Land Commission could act as a land bank without broad acres. If the Leader examined the annual report of the Land Commission, he would see that the commission has sufficient land to last to 1995.

The Leader said that the Premier had stated that the Government would dispose of broad acres, and suggested that the Government would set up a land bank under this Bill. He believed there was a conflict, but I suggest that the answer is quite simple. Facts show that the Land Commission has an adequate land bank at present, with land available into the 1990's. The Leader also said that the Land Commission had acted responsibly, and that Government actions were responsible in relations to the collecting of broad acres and land generally. The previous

Government failed dismally to operate the Land Commission as a land bank in selling off the broad acres to developers, and the Government intends, as a result of this Bill, to restore the commission to its rightful function—to sell off broad acres to private developers. Former Premier Dunstan, in setting up the commission, stated that this should be its role.

We intend to restore the commission to its rightful function. As has also been suggested by the member for Norwood, the Leader stated that the Government was acting improperly (I think that was the term used by the Leader) and possibly illegally in regard this Bill. I imagine that that is the Opposition's justification for its suggestion to set up a Select Committee: I can see no other reason for it. It was clearly envisaged that the principal function of the Land Commission would be the assembling, holding and management of large parcels of urban land, as was made clear in the initial financial agreement. There is no illegality in the Government's actions or in the Bill, and I suggest that the Opposition is flying a kite. The Opposition has had 10 months in which to ascertain the situation and to decide whether the Bill was illegal. I made a press statement on 9 April 1980 indicating the Government's intentions in regard to the Land Commission.

The Leader dealt with other matters concerning the financial agreement. In the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier concerning negotiations in relation to the Land Commission and the amendments in the Bill, the Premier sought the concurrence of the Prime Minister to introduce this Bill to ensure that it would not have an adverse effect on the agreement. It was clearly established and accepted by both parties that this was a matter for the State Government, and that it would not interfere in negotiations that are taking place in regard to the financial agreement. The Leader said that the Premier had implied that the Land Commission debt is a burden on us all and that that was quite misleading. He argued that the Land Commission debt obligations are not a burden on the State Budget, because there is a let-out clause in the financial agreement. The Opposition spokesman on environment and planning made this same point some time ago.

He asked why we should worry as a State, because there was always a let out clause as far as the financial agreement was concerned. I suggest that that statement is the height of folly in regard to State finances and the resources within South Australia. The Opposition should note that the commission incurred a trading loss of \$1 200 000. Although I said this in my second reading explanation, it is necessary that I make clear, as far as the financial situation is concerned, that the commission incurred a trading loss of \$1 200 000 in the 1979-80 financial year and, when provision was made for the depreciation of resources at the end of that financial year, the commission deficiency stood at \$10 000 000.

These losses mean that the commission is not recovering its costs and, if this situation is allowed to continue, the commission will not be able to meet its loan obligations under the financial agreement with the Commonwealth Government. In the event of a short-fall in the ability of the commission to meet these debt obligations in any one year, negotiations have to occur with the Commonwealth as to how the short-fall will be treated. I think we should all recognise that a continuing short-fall, or a situation that allowed a continuing short-fall to take place, would mean that the Commonwealth would be writing off State debts. This would be extremely dangerous in regard to the State's future financial relationships with the Commonwealth, and it would have an undesirable impact on the

programme, which is very important to South Australia. How would we be situated as far as future agreements are concerned, if the Commonwealth was of the opinion that we just took it for granted that, if we could not pay back our debts, that we expect the Commonwealth to make up the difference? Would we be regarded highly in regard to future agreements?

**Mr. Mathwin:** Never!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not think the honourable Minister needs the assistance which is coming from my right.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Leader of the Opposition then went on to say that, as Minister responsible, I had made the point that the Land Commission would be restructured to compete with private development on an open market. I do not see any problem with that, because that is exactly what we are doing, and I do not think we need to apologise for that. The Land Commission will be operated in a way which will allow and encourage healthy private sector competition in land marketing to return to South Australia, and that is what we want. We had it in this State once, and we are anxious to have it back again, and that is what will happen as a result of this legislation. I do not think that anyone could disagree with what we are doing in that regard, because it can only benefit the consumer in the long run.

The Leader of the Opposition quoted from a letter that had been written by a previous commissioner, Dr. Troy. I am not prepared to engage in personal attacks on a commissioner or to get involved in any way. The Leader of the Opposition went on to be critical of the appointment the Government has made. He implied that we had made them to fall into line with our thinking on private enterprise. I point out that we have as commissioners at present Mr. John Roche, who has had great experience in local government and as a private developer, and Mr. Alan Powell, who is recognised as a leading accountant in South Australia. They are two excellent men to fill the positions of commissioners at the time of the new land trust. Now I shall come to the interesting part.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have already reminded honourable members that the Minister does not need any assistance.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Leader of the Opposition referred to the interim report and to the final recommendations.

**Mr. Bannon:** Murray Hill's recommendations.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I will speak about that a little later. The Leader claimed that one of the recommendations that came out of the interim report stated that there was no urgent need to review the South Australian Land Commission's financial arrangements. That is baloney. I shall quote from the interim report, which states:

In view of the changes in circumstances which have occurred since the financial agreement with the Commonwealth Government was made, negotiations should be entered into to alleviate the present burden of interest due to the Commonwealth.

The Leader then went on to discuss the final recommendations, and made all sorts of allegations about the final recommendations being written by the Minister of Local Government, being prepared in the Minister's office, etc. That is not so. Neither the Government nor any Minister interfered with the work of those who were given the responsibility of carrying out the inquiry. There was no interference whatsoever in relation to the recommendations that were brought down. When the three gentlemen who were carrying out the inquiry came

to me following release of the interim report, I indicated to them that, rather than bring down another report, they should in fact bring down recommendations. That is exactly what they did. In the final recommendations in regard to the financial situation they stated:

In view of the changes in circumstances which have occurred since the financial agreement with the Commonwealth Government was made, negotiations should be entered into as a matter of urgency to alleviate the present burden of debt, including interest, due to the Commonwealth.

I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition got that little bit of information from. I do not know who has been advising him on that matter, but he is way off course. The Leader of the Opposition claimed—

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Leader asked me to answer certain questions, and that is exactly what I am doing. If the Leader does not like the answers I am giving him, I cannot help that, but he asked for them and he will get them. The Leader claimed that there was no need to review financial agreements, despite the recommendations I have just referred to of the review committee, particularly when it recommended that this should be done as a matter of urgency. The Leader quoted from the 1978-79 annual report of the Land Commission, saying that the commission will be able to pay future debts. The Leader quoted the commission's cash balance of \$18 200 000 as evidence of a sound financial position.

The Leader of the Opposition does not realise that, in 1978-79, the commission showed a deficiency in its annual accounts of \$1 750 000. Does he not realise that, in 1979-80, it showed a deficiency of \$10 100 000? Does he not understand that a deficiency means that the commission has not for the last two years been recovering all of its costs? Surely he should understand that the commission, therefore, will not be able to repay all of its debts. He is not very good at sums.

The reason for this situation is that the annual capitalising interest burden has far outstripped the increase in value of the land bank. The terms of the financial agreement by the previous Government must be changed to avoid a repetition of this loss, and that is exactly what is happening with the negotiations that are taking place. In 1979-80, the gap between this huge interest cost and land price inflation was large enough to give the Commonwealth a loss of \$10 000 000. If the gap stays the same, it does not take very much thought to realise that, in 1980-81, a loss of the same order could be repeated.

I turn now to some of the questions asked regarding development rights. The removal of the development function has relatively little impact on the financial situation, except for the positive effect of lowering overheads, and I do not think anyone would object to that.

I do not want to say very much more; those were the main points raised. The member for Mitchell made a few points and attacked the private developers, referring to a scandalous campaign by the private developers against the South Australian Land Commission. The Government sees nothing wrong, nothing evil, and nothing sinister about the right of private individuals or companies to make investment decisions on the purchase, development and sale of land in the free enterprise system, with open competition in the market place, nor does it see anything sinister or evil in the right of that person or individual to make a reasonable return of profit on his investment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Government makes no

apology for developers having an opportunity to make profits. That is the basis of the free enterprise system. It is what this Government stands for, and what it will encourage. That is how employment opportunities have been and will be created in this State. I will not spend time apologising for what the Government is doing in relation to private enterprise. The member for Mitchell said that the State is in conflict with the financial arrangements regarding the agreement. Meetings have taken place between the Commonwealth and State Governments. They are now taking place, and they will continue. We have an excellent negotiating team which was very successful in the Monarto situation and which will be equally successful in relation to the Land Commission. Letters have been exchanged between the Prime Minister and the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** In that exchange, the Commonwealth has made it quite clear that the change in the role of the Land Commission under the present Bill will not prejudice in any way the negotiations that will continue over the next few months. The member for Norwood was very emotional in suggesting that we would deprive young people of their own home as a result of this legislation.

**Mr. O'Neill:** You are a long way—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is very much the policy of this Government to encourage young people to have their own houses.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** It is a basic Liberal principle.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is, and one we are proud of and will fight for. Other points were raised by members opposite, but I believe I have covered the major matters.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Very well indeed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! If honourable members continue to interject, I shall start officially warning them.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Opposition has indicated that it does not intend to support this legislation. It is very shortsighted if it adopts that attitude, because this legislation will do more to bring about jobs and stability in South Australia than the Opposition was able to do in its years in office, and members opposite should be willing to support it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Glazbrook. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I move:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

My reasons for doing that are not, as the Minister

suggested earlier, that the Opposition has some doubts about the details of the financial agreements and so on, and that we have had sufficient notice and should have made some attempts to find out. My reason for moving that this Bill go to a Select Committee is that it has not been able to find out as an Opposition. The report of the working party, or the review committee or whatever one calls it, has never been released to the Opposition or to the public of South Australia. The Minister seems to be quite concerned—he hardly put it down the whole time the Bill has been considered by the House, and has kept it very close to his chest. That is one reason for this Bill being referred to a Select Committee.

This is an unequal contest. The Opposition has the responsibility in these matters of representing a sizable section of the community in South Australia, and on a matter as vital as this it seems quite clear to the Opposition that the matter should be referred to a Select Committee. An organisation called the Land Commission has operated to the benefit of the community in South Australia without any doubt until very recent times when, as a result, as I said earlier, of a scandalous attack upon it, aided and abetted by the Liberal Party then in Opposition and now in Government, its future was placed in some (and I stress "some") jeopardy. The question of the advice given to the Minister is extremely important. The Opposition has not had the benefit of that advice at all, and perhaps the only way that matter can be fully aired is for a Select Committee to be held and for the necessary questions to be asked in a bipartisan manner. The Minister cannot object on that basis. A Select Committee is comprised of members on both sides of the House, and could well be chaired by him if he were to agree to it, as he should.

There has been some agreement on the proceedings tonight in respect of times and I am endeavouring to adhere to them. I still believe that in respect of the matters which vitally concern the future of land operations in this State, an area which all members know has been fraught throughout history with speculation, profit-taking and the like, with the small person in the community always being on the losing end, to suggest that a complete change in the operation of a body in this State which has functioned as a balance and a brake on land price increases and speculation generally should take place just because the Minister wants it (and that is the only real reason we have been given—the Government wants it and the Minister wants it) is completely unfair. I suggest to the Minister that he should reconsider if he is in any doubt and agree that there should be a Select Committee on this matter.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment):** I oppose the motion. When the report was first made available it was sent out to some 40 interested groups, bodies and organisations, to the people from private enterprise, to local government representatives, to Government departments, and to people who had expressed an interest in what was happening in regard to the Land Commission.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** As far as I know, there was never a request from the Opposition for a copy of the report.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not Question Time.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I just make the point that 40 copies of the report were made available and people had the opportunity to prepare submissions. Those submissions were reviewed and acted upon. It was, in fact, advertised through the media that people who had an interest in this subject could apply for a copy of the report. There were a number of releases about the report at that

time, and I can see no reason whatsoever why the Government should agree to have a Select Committee on this matter.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Minister just gave one of the most cogent reasons why there ought to be a Select Committee on this matter. The Minister finally informed the House of a matter we had not been told about before, and he had to do a bit of footwork there as well. First, the statement was made that the report was sent out to 40 persons who had an interest in the matter and then, in response to an interjection from me, the Minister changed his tack and stated that it was sent to those who requested it. Sending out is not responding to a request, so straight away there was some equivocation. For the Minister to suggest that the Opposition spokesperson on a matter such as this is required to request that kind of information is absolute nonsense. I would suggest that just fairness in the matter would have dictated that one copy be supplied to the Opposition.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** How many reports did you forward to us when you were in Government?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** When there were matters of this moment—we are not talking about five bob or \$2; we are talking now of a major activity with tremendous sums of money involved.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I would have thought it was a major inactivity.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The people concerned in this State, the present owners of homes and the people who may become future home owners have a vital interest in the matter. What has the Minister to hide that he is afraid to go to a Select Committee? The Minister has pointed out there is no problem with the Commonwealth when he said that the Commonwealth said, "It is all right for us. The legislation can go ahead; there is no problem."

There is no doubt that he has a worry there. Nothing that could come out of a Select Committee could interfere in that way, because the House is the final arbiter, so he has *carte blanche* (that is what we have been informed by the Commonwealth) to do in this matter what the State wishes to do. Those were his words—look it up in *Hansard* tomorrow. If the Minister were to agree to a Select Committee, the Commonwealth would have no objection, the Opposition would have no objection and neither would the people of this State.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Glazbrook.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Establishment of South Australian Urban Land Trust."

**Mr. CRAFTER:** I seek information from the Minister about the discussions his officers have been having with the Commonwealth Government regarding the financial agreement, in particular the financial agreement which was signed on 11 March 1974. Attached to that agreement was a statement of the purpose, structure and functions of the Land Commission to operate in South Australia. Will

the Minister say whether a report has been prepared on the effect that this legislation will have on that statement of purpose, structure and functions and, in particular, how that relates to a further annexure to that financial agreement, in particular a statement of land price stabilisation legislation and what effect this legislation, when read in conjunction with the statement of further structure and functions of the previous Land Commission and the primary function as expressed by the Opposition of its role in land price stabilisation in this State? What consideration has been given to this? Undoubtedly, the Minister has been advised about the effect this will have on land price stabilisation and on those fundamental functions he referred to. Also, I might mention such factors as restoration, preservation and improvement of landscape and buildings of special significance in this State for which moneys were provided. Can the Minister inform the House what is to happen about those fundamental issues?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I believe that the question asked is whether this will change negotiations in any way. I make it quite clear, as I did previously, that we have corresponded with the Commonwealth about this matter. Letters have been exchanged between the Premier and the Prime Minister. We have told the Commonwealth Government exactly what we are doing with this legislation and sought its concurrence to enable us to introduce this legislation so that we were quite certain that it did not interfere in any way with the negotiations taking place. We have reached that agreement, and there is no way that the matters the member has raised will interfere with the negotiations taking place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Terms and conditions of office of members."

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Will all members be appointed for the same term? I notice that there are terms of two to four years. Will there be some overlap to ensure continuity of the operations of the trust?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I believe that the terms are the same.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Disclosure of interest."

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Those who may be appointed to the trust were specified in clause 8. Some consanguinity may occur, if one considers the categories proposed in clause 8. There may not be a quorum in relation to a certain development proposal.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The honourable member will be aware that there are presently three commissioners, and one of those could be in a situation described by the honourable member. I have noticed from the minutes that, where a matter has been discussed in which there may be a conflict of interest or where it is believed that a member of the commission should not be involved, he has excused himself from the meeting. No problems have occurred. We are increasing the number of members from three to five, and I suggest that there will be no problems in regard to a quorum. We were anxious that that clause be included.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** No penalty is prescribed if a member fails to adhere to the provisions of this clause, and I expect that the Minister would not become aware of the situation until after its occurrence, which may be inadvertent. What does the Minister propose in this regard?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** A penalty is not written into

the Bill, and I imagine that the Chairman of the commission, if he was concerned about a matter, if he suggested to a member that that member should leave the meeting, and if that member refused to do so, would approach me and I would take action if necessary.

Clause passed.

Clause 14—"Powers and functions of the trust."

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** This clause provides that land must be acquired with the prior specific approval of the Minister. If the commission acquires land, one would presume that it would be a fairly large tract of land, because the commission is to be a land bank only. How would that be arranged with the prior specific approval of the Minister? I take it that no acquisition would occur unless the Minister approved.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** That is what it means.

**Mr. CRAFTER:** Has the Minister received a report or advice, and from whom, about the effect this Bill will have on land prices in this State, and, if so, what account has he taken of the report? How has such a report been considered in discussions with the Commonwealth?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Obviously, I have discussed this matter with officers of my department. We are anxious that no problems arise in regard to escalating land prices. I believe that the senior officers of the department are able to advise me on these matters. All action taken in regard to this Bill and the consequences of the actions have been made known to the Commonwealth.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (15 to 22) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

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

Motion carried.

## TEA TREE GULLY (GOLDEN GROVE) DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 2694.)

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** In introducing this Bill the Minister said that the principal purpose was to make amendments to the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act that are consequential on the provisions of the Urban Land Trust Bill. I suggest that that is not the principal purpose of this Bill; its principal purpose is to remove the Land Commission from having an active role in joint planning of Golden Grove with the Tea Tree Gully council. In fact, the main function of the Bill is to open up the gates to the private developers. That is well in keeping and consistent with the philosophy we have just had expressed by Government members during the passage of the previous Bill.

If one bears that in mind one could argue that there is little profit in the Opposition's taking a great deal of time putting arguments forward in this matter. The Minister seems hell bent on joining together with other members of the Government in flogging off everything and getting rid of every activity which in the vaguest way may provide a check on the private sector, thus giving it the green light to go for its life. Clearly, the background of the development of Golden Grove land is such that the Land Commission

was well placed, with considerable expertise in development, and so on, so that it could have functioned extremely well in this project. No doubt the Minister will argue that the function can be carried out by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, as proposed in the Bill.

One may be tempted to postulate to the Minister the question of where the additional staff will come from, especially at a time when the Government went to the people on the proposition that there will be smaller government. However, here the Minister is taking on himself additional functions in the very department for which he is responsible. The Government's attitude seems to depend on the time of the day when Government members are speaking and what suits the occasion; their principles are very flexible. I would suggest that the kind of work that might be done in that area is such that some staff involvement will be needed over a considerable period.

The member who sits behind the Minister at the moment made a submission on this matter that I had the pleasure to read when I was the Minister of Planning. The submission read well and was very plausible, but it contained a number of flaws. Perhaps this is not the time to discuss that matter. What the honourable member actually said was, "I, as a person with a direct interest in the area, would like to see the kind of homes that suit me in the area." Any member can promote that idea. I have a very good memory and I assure the honourable member that, if that was not the impression that he meant to give, that was the impression I received, and I can only go from what I read. Certainly there is a good deal of verbiage which one usually finds associated with these types of matters, such as provisions for this and that and what the private sector can do, and so on—a litany which one can almost turn on with taps whenever people of the Liberal persuasion are discussing these matters. I am not suggesting that that makes it all invalid—obviously some of it is valid.

The point I am making is that the honourable member concerned would have some knowledge that there could be quite a bit of work involved as the project develops, or is it intended that it be handed over holus bolus to private industry. That is not the suggestion contained in the second reading explanation. In fact, the role that the Land Commission would have had is to be transferred to the Department of Regional and Urban Affairs. I had a great deal of confidence in the officers who were in the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. I am not sure whether they are still there now, but I imagine that the ones who are there now have similar competencies and integrities. They would not want to have a total involvement in the matter, but would expect to have an active part, otherwise they would not be working in the department. I think this would be the case because, although my time in that office was brief, I was impressed with their genuine interest in developmental matters and in trying to ensure that, when areas are built up, adequate facilities are provided and attention is given to the environment. The Minister may wish to reply that only 1½ hours a month or something will be involved. I do not know whether we would accept that; I suspect that there will be more involvement than that. If there is not to be, we should be told that fact.

This Bill is related to the earlier measure. The philosophies involved in the two matters are such that they go hand in hand. I do not intend to speak much longer on the matter, except to say that it was my understanding that there was provision in the Golden Grove legislation that the Land Commission would be able to make a profit on



its operations, but that that profit would be fed back into the area by way of provision of facilities, and so on. I cannot be more precise than that, because it is some time since I was Minister. I wonder what will happen in that respect; presumably that kind of capacity, as it were, will no longer be available because the private sector will be doing those sorts of function. I take it that the Minister is not suggesting the department will be picking up profit in that way. The Opposition must indicate that it is opposed to the Bill in concept, but at the same time we must be realistic and accept that it is necessary. If the measure introduced into the House earlier passes, then for logic to prevail this Bill should be a companion to that measure.

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** I think it is worth while detailing a few points relative to this Bill. The member for Mitchell stated that it was his belief that it is not a consequential Bill.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** I didn't say that; I said that that was not the most important part.

**Dr. BILLARD:** He thought it went further than simply being a consequential Bill, because it removed the Land Commission from involvement in Golden Grove development. That is not quite true in that respect, because in fact the earlier Bill that we dealt with took the Land Commission from the role of being a land developer and put it in the position of being a land bank.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You should read the earlier Bill. It can still develop, with the consent of the Minister.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Yes, but in this role, as a consequence of its principal role reverting to that of land bank, there would necessarily be consequential changes in the role of the Land Commission in the Golden Grove development. In fact, I point out that this change in the role of the Land Commission at Golden Grove is entirely in line with the attitudes that were put to me on behalf of the Tea Tree Gully Council and in the submissions that were made by it, I understand, at the time the inquiry was set up by the Minister, after the 1979 election, to look at the future role of the Land Commission.

I understand that one of the major points it made was that it felt that the Land Commission should revert to its true land banking role, and that it should not be involved in development, as it was involved and as it would have been in the Golden Grove development; in fact, in other debates I have referred to the problems that arise when we have the owner of land being the developer, as well as dominating and serving the committee that acts in the place of the local council.

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**Dr. BILLARD:** Its officers were the ones who prepared the briefs for the committee, and the Chairman of the Land Commission was the Chairman of the committee. I do not think it would be possible to select a more dominant position for any party than that. It is quite clear that, if such a situation were set up for a private developer, one would have screams from the community; if we allowed a private developer who owned a huge tract of land to be the developer, to have his own staff as the staff serving the local council, with the Chairman of that development corporation being the Chairman of the local council and having such a dominant role, there would be screams from the community.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** That's different. The responsibility would be to the shareholders in that case, whereas there is no such responsibility in respect of the Land Commission or an urban land trust.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I think there are responsibilities to the people in the locality. It is still a quite undesirable situation for one body, the landholder, to have such a

controlling influence over the whole project. It was one of the problems that the council saw. It desired to have closer co-operation at all stages of planning, and what the Government has done now is to establish an office under the same roof as the Tea Tree Gully council. In the attached building, where the display was held in 1979, there is now the Golden Grove Development Office, and an officer of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, who is the Project Manager, works from that office. There is now an opportunity for much closer co-operation with the council at the planning stages, and this is as was desired by the council.

To get back to the main point, the member for Mitchell thought that there was a change in the area involving the removal of the Land Commission. To a certain extent it has been removed, but in a way which I would say was desirable, and for the reasons I have given. Those changes will not threaten in any way the benefit that should flow from that development. If we look at the sort of power that would be removed by this Bill, basically that is the power conferred under Part V of the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, all of those powers are catered for. Section 21 (2) (a) refers to social and physical planning, and the planning role reverts to Urban and Regional Affairs, so that is taken care of. Paragraph (b) refers to the need to provide for buildings, bridges, roads, etc. The Minister has given an undertaking that those responsibilities will be fulfilled in the normal way, with Government departments and authorities fulfilling those obligations, so they are taken care of, and the only remaining one is in relation to amenities.

One of the original reasons why the Tea Tree Gully council was attracted to this development was because it was sold the idea that the profits that would come from it would be immediately ploughed back to provide for all of the community infra-structure for which a council normally has to fork out from its own resources. That was a promise that the Tea Tree Gully council foresaw in the project as first mooted. As we have seen in the debate on the earlier Bill and the figures produced now, those profits were not materialising. In fact, the Land Commission was in a situation where the interest charges on its capital investment were rising at a rate much greater than the appreciation in land value in this area. So, there would be no profits; nevertheless, the facility will still be there for sharing the cost of amenities.

If the council were concerned that suddenly it would have to pay for everything that it did not think it would have to pay for, we can assure it, first, that the original assurance was in a sense a phoney assurance—although the word “phoney” is probably too harsh a word; it was not a real assurance because, in reality, it would turn out that the operation would have losses, and therefore there would not be the funds to provide for the facilities. Secondly, despite that, there is still a means by which these amenities can be provided on a share basis. I understand that the Land Commission has already done this in some other of its developments. For example, at the Aberfoyle Hub, the Land Commission, the local council, and the Education Department each contributed \$150 000, I am told—

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** The Land Commission put up \$160 000 there.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Well, about those sums were provided, to provide a recreation hall. At Craigmore, there was a similar cost-sharing arrangement. This sort of cost-sharing arrangement to provide amenities is still possible under these changes. The only areas in which there may have been concern are covered, and the changes that have been made will therefore be only such as to assist that

development, because they fall precisely in the line of those submissions made by the Tea Tree Gully Council to that inquiry at the end of 1979. For the people of my electorate and the people of Tea Tree Gully, there is no reason to be concerned. The possibility of a high standard development still exists, and I believe it will continue.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning):** I believe that the member for Newland has answered most of the questions put by the member for Mitchell. Very briefly, I believe that the honourable member would be aware that a number of the staff have been transferred from the South Australian Land Commission to the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, as the member for Newland has pointed out, and we have the Golden Grove Project Manager actually with an office at Tea Tree Gully. He is on the site and is able to answer questions and negotiate with local government. The scheme is working very well indeed.

We would want to make certain that we had adequate staff in that regard. As far as finance is concerned, I refer the honourable member to the legislation that we have just been looking at, clause 18 (1) of which provides:

The fund maintained under the repealed Act shall continue in existence under the name the "South Australian Urban Land Trust Fund" and shall be kept and maintained by the trust.

That Bill also provides:

The fund shall be applied by the trust in the performance of its functions under this Act, including the provision of financial assistance for public or community services, facilities or amenities in new urban areas.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You can't have it both ways. You said it wasn't making any money. Which is correct?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** What I am saying is that the fund is there, and the provision is in the Bill for that finance to be made available.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROYAL ENGAGEMENT

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have been informed from Canberra that the engagement is tonight announced of His Royal Highness Prince Charles with Lady Diana Spencer. I am sure that every member of this House and every South Australian would join me in extending to them the very best of good wishes for the future and our congratulations.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

#### HISTORY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Attention is drawn to clauses 18 and 21, printed in erased type, which clauses, being money clauses, cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which are deemed necessary to the Bill.

Second reading.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to establish an authority to co-ordinate and develop the wide-ranging functions and activities of

the differing institutions and organisations concerned with the history of South Australia. The Bill also repeals the Constitutional Museum Act of 1978, as management of that museum will fall to the new authority, which will be known as the History Trust of South Australia.

South Australian history has long suffered from serious neglect. Priceless relics and other records of our past have been lost, destroyed, allowed to deteriorate or kept from public view. Collections have not been adequately cared for and catalogued. Research into South Australian history has been piecemeal and there has been no systematic attempt to inform South Australians of the richness of their traditions through high-quality interpretative displays and publications. This neglect cannot be blamed on any one institution or organisation.

It is true that various bodies have from time to time been charged with responsibility for aspects of South Australia's history, but either their terms of reference were defined narrowly or their historical functions were defined as less important than other responsibilities. Private organisations and individuals have laboured long and mightily but their efforts have lacked co-ordination and have sometimes been misdirected for lack of expert advice. In many areas of South Australian history there has been, frankly, a policy vacuum.

Consequently, when Mr. Robert Edwards was charged with reporting on the future development of the South Australian Museum, his investigations led him to suggest in his first interim report that there was need for a body to co-ordinate historical programmes and to provide adequate resources to care for items associated with South Australian history, including historical Government buildings. Mr. Edwards later convened a State History Centre Working Party, composed of eminent historians and representatives of interested departments, authorities and societies, to examine his proposal. After careful consideration of various options, the working party gave its full support to the proposal that the care of South Australian history be vested specifically in a central agency. This Bill has been framed on the basis of Mr. Edwards's distillation of the working party's recommendations.

The establishment of the History Trust will bring the Constitutional Museum and the Birdwood Mill under this one authority. While the Constitutional Museum will continue to develop its present policies and activities, the reorganisation of the Birdwood Mill will be one of the trust's first priorities. The mill is already an important tourist attraction, with the nation's finest collection of vintage cars. The trust will seek to develop the mill as the National Motor Museum, with accreditation as such from the Commonwealth Government. Meanwhile, the mill's other collections will be carefully catalogued and conserved and the trust will investigate the feasibility of developing a major thematic museum based in the old mill building.

As the foregoing plans show, the History Trust will be encouraged to take fresh initiatives. Thus, consultations will be held with ethnic communities to determine their specific needs and requirements for a South Australian Ethnic Museum. The trust will also be made responsible for a programme of accrediting museums as part of a general obligation to advise the Government on policy relating to all museums other than the South Australian Museum.

Expert advice and other assistance will be made available to museums after their potential and their needs have been carefully assessed. The trust will ensure that private and other efforts are not duplicated, that worthy

projects are encouraged and that the creative energies of the private sector in South Australian history are harnessed effectively. This is especially important as museums are a significant component of the State's tourism industry. Too often one local museum looks very like another. The trust will ensure that South Australia develops a true museum system, marked by diversity and specialisation of its parts.

The collection and conservation of historical material will be one of the trust's main tasks. At present, heritage legislation in South Australia does not extend to portable objects such as documents, pictures and artefacts. This Bill gives the History Trust the power to assume responsibility for such objects and to establish and maintain collections of historical importance in its own right. The ownership, organisation and redistribution of existing collections will, of course, be a matter for negotiation by the trust and institutions holding those collections.

The trust will take charge, as soon as is convenient, of the State's Performing Arts Collection, using the collection's sound recordings as the nucleus for a central archives and bringing together various sound collections at present housed inadequately. Private owners will be encouraged to conserve items of historical significance, and the trust will keep registers of such items.

No central agency exists to answer the many inquiries and requests for help from members of the public interested in South Australian history. The trust will establish an information centre to meet public demand and to take the burden of answering inquiries from the shoulders of staff of other North Terrace institutions. Historical organisations will be able to look to the trust for professional support, while the trust will promote research and foster more and better publications on South Australian history.

The creation of the History Trust has special significance in the planning for the celebrations in 1986 of 150 years of official European settlement. The trust will likewise help South Australians to gain more from the bicentennial celebrations in 1988 and to make the 1980's the decade when not only South Australians but all Australians come to realise that this State has a rich and unique history. The creation of this trust itself serves as an example of the State's tradition of innovation in the arts. No other Government in this country has taken such a systematic and imaginative approach to the many-sided task of fostering the preservation of our past.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal, and clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 5 repeals the Constitutional Museum Act, 1978, and transfers rights, liabilities and employees' status from the Constitutional Museum Trust to the History Trust of South Australia. Clause 6 provides that the Act does not apply to, or in relation to, the South Australian Museum Act, the South Australian Heritage Act, and the Aboriginal Heritage Act. Clause 7 provides for the establishment and basic powers of the trust as a body corporate and subclause (4) provides that the trust shall be subject to the general control of the Minister. Clauses 8 and 9 set out the terms and conditions upon which members of the trust hold office.

Subclause (2) of clause 8 provides for the appointment of a Chairman. Clause 10 requires members of the trust who have any interest in any contract contemplated by the trust to disclose such interest and thereafter refrain from any deliberations under the contract. Clause 11 sets out the remuneration of members, while clause 12 sets out various procedural measures relating to the conduct of trust business. Clause 13 is concerned with the validity of acts of the trust and the liability of trust members.

Clause 14 sets out the function and powers of the trust. Clause 15 provides for the Constitutional Museum to be under the care, control and management of the trust and provides for the Governor to grant land to or place land under the care, control and management of the trust where the land is of historical significance to the State or where it is otherwise expedient for such land to be so placed.

Clause 16 is concerned with employees of the trust. Clause 17 provides for banking, investment and expenditure procedures, while clause 18 sets out the trust's borrowing powers. Clause 19 provides that proper accounts of its financial dealings shall be kept by the trust and that these shall be audited at least once a year by the Auditor-General. Clause 20 provides that the trust will prepare an annual report for the Minister on the administration of the Act and for this to be laid before each House of Parliament together with the audited statement of accounts for the relevant period. Clause 21 provides that no stamp duty is payable on any instrument by virtue of which real or personal property is assured to, or vested in, the trust.

Clause 22 imposes criminal liability on any person who unlawfully damages property of the trust and, in addition, provides for the payment of compensation in consequence of such damage. Clause 23 provides that proceedings for offences against the proposed Act may be disposed of summarily, and clause 24 empowers the Governor to make appropriate regulations.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 18 February. Page 2955).

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** It is with pleasure that I rise to speak on this Bill. I lament the fact that the Minister whose Bill this is is not in the House at the moment. I do not know whether this is supposed to be regarded as a sign of disrespect for me as a person speaking on this Bill or for the Opposition for our treatment of this Bill or what, but I would have thought—Ah! The Minister arrives. It is good to see that the Minister has now taken his place in the House. This Bill does receive the general support of the Opposition.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What sort of support?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The general support of the Opposition. Needless to say, some comments must be made particularly in the light not only of comments by the Minister in his second reading speech but also of comments made by the present Minister of Agriculture with regard to Samcor over the years. I think the attitude that he has taken to the South Australian Meat Corporation has not always been as supportive as this particular Bill is now, for, indeed, this Bill is a supportive Bill for the South Australian Meat Corporation. It does restructure the corporation very well; it does take account of the problems which the meat corporation has faced and tries to build a new structure that can answer those particular problems. The comments that I bore in mind when I read the second reading speech of the Minister included some that he made on 1 August 1973. In introducing his comments on that occasion, he said:

I raised this subject—  
the subject of the meat corporation—

in my pre-election policy speech. I raise it again here today, and I shall keep on raising the subject and the merits of establishing such a proposal until I get results. So be prepared, gentlemen, to be sickened of hearing about it or convinced.

When he was talking about that time he was promoting a concept of, among other things, regionalisation of abattoirs, and I am not going to take issue with that, but I am with some of the other comments he made in passing about the Gepps Cross works of the South Australian Meat Corporation. Among other things, he said:

The Gepps Cross works has proved an embarrassment to the Government and it is certainly a financial burden on a large sector of our meat producing community.

I put that on record now to remind the House, because I will be coming back to that when we take a bit of a look at the figures for the meat corporation in a proper light. On that occasion the Minister also said:

It is ludicrous to continue pouring good money after bad in the indefinite upgrading of the Gepps Cross abattoirs.

Again, I ask the House to remember that later in my comments tonight. I suppose the statement that is the most significant on that occasion was where he said:

I am led to my favourite subject, one that I believe is vital to the interests of the State generally and to meat producers in particular. I refer to the establishment of regional abattoirs—

I have made that comment before; this is the significant part—

and the ultimate abolition of the Gepps Cross works.

I would like to know just what the Minister feels about that particular position now. I might say that he warned the House on that occasion that members would be sick of hearing about it. I do not know whether the House is indeed sick of hearing from the Minister, but I do know by a check of *Hansard* over the intervening years that I did not see too many more references to that, and I would like to know whether it represents a position that now embarrasses the Minister and that he chooses to forget and pretend that he had never said it.

Doubtless, in the answers that the Minister gives in closing the second reading debate he will touch on those matters. In his second reading speech, the Minister referred to a study undertaken by the former Director-General of the Premier's Department, now chairman of the South Australian Meat Corporation, regarding establishing a corporate plan for the South Australian Meat Corporation. There were five aims to the study. It is not my intention to repeat those five aims here, because they appear at page 2953 of *Hansard*. I note that in his speech he does acknowledge that the first three points are dealt with in the Bill, but not the last two. Perhaps it will be worth while reading out the last two. The first is:

To propose a new corporate structure for the corporation's future.

The second is:

To restructure the Port Lincoln works.

I am interested to know what the Minister's response is to that and when we can expect to receive some indication of the results of the study into those two areas. I believe that, obviously, the second part must be of great interest to the member for Flinders, and the first part must be of great interest to all members of this House, because the degree to which the internal structure procedures of the meat corporation can be amended or altered to improve its economic efficiency must be welcomed by all members if it is done in a proper manner.

One of the comments that the Minister made in his second reading speech was that Samcor cannot trade out

of its present financial difficulties. One of the contentions I will be putting later tonight is that, in fact, it is not exactly fair to make that accusation about Samcor. From the statement that it cannot trade out of its present financial difficulties, the first thought that occurs in the mind of those who listen to the statement is that Samcor is based on much the same basis as other corporations, industries and companies, and that indeed it has been unable to face the normal hazards of economic life and of economic uncertainty in the business community that other corporations are able to face. The implicit opinion is that Samcor is at fault, that it is somehow to blame for that. Indeed, that is certainly not the situation. If one looks at the way in which Samcor has been financially structured, the way it has been capitalised, and looks at those figures carefully, one can see that Samcor has been nowhere near the financial problem that the present Government has been wont to suggest.

The Minister went on to say that if Samcor had been placed in private hands one of four things might have happened to it. First, he said, it might have been placed in the hands of a receiver. Secondly, it might have been closed down. Thirdly, it might have been sold. Then he introduced a fourth broad category, which was that it might have been otherwise dealt with. That introduced some vague whimsical thoughts into my mind when I read it. I wondered how otherwise one deals with Samcor, thinking perhaps that the Gepps Cross Works may be being considered for a fair ground, a department store or something like that. I cannot really see what the "otherwise dealt with" meant. It seemed to be just a piece of pedantry on the part of the Minister.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Have you considered that that fourth item might be the proposal the honourable member has in front of him?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Minister cannot say that, because he said "if it were placed in private hands". I do not think that the Minister would provide to a private company the arrangements in the Bill before us. If he is proposing that that is the way he is going to run his ministry, that he will have capitalisation through the assistance of Treasury with the creation of sinking funds that will generate moneys for the maintenance of service works at the abattoir and extend it to private corporations, then he ought to let the House know that. However, I do not believe that that is what the Minister is suggesting, and I believe the "otherwise dealt with" phrase appeared because he could not think of anything else to say but felt he ought to say something.

Of course, Samcor is not in private hands. It is not, in the strictest sense, serving the exact purpose that many private abattoirs serve, and that has been acknowledged by the Minister on other occasions. There are important service work contributions by the abattoirs which just cannot be duplicated easily by a private abattoir facility, so to think in terms of comparing it with what might happen to another privately owned abattoir if it got into what appeared to be the same financial problems as Samcor is quite ludicrous.

The issue of the service abattoir has been paid lip service from time to time, but I do not think it is seriously appreciated just how significant that is. Looking at the capitalisation of the South Australian Meat Corporation, one can see that a substantial part of its assets is involved with the provision of facilities that are only or can only be considered as service facilities. Another comment that the Minister made that concerned me was that with the restructuring Samcor would be able to meet customer requirements in the future. His exact statement was as follows:

A new approach to marketing, by assuming a more positive attitude to customer requirements, is already being developed at Gepps Cross, and a marketing consultant has been engaged for a short period to assist the development of this objective.

I may be being unfair or cynical to interpret that to mean that the Minister believes that Samcor did not have a positive attitude to marketing and to the meeting of customer requirements previously. I may be being unfair to suggest that, but that is the assumption that I have made. If that is in fact a correct assumption of the Minister's opinion, I think that is certainly grossly unfair on the way the South Australian Meat Corporation has operated.

I had the good fortune to tour the South Australian Meat Corporation facility at Gepps Cross in 1978 on a quite extensive tour that covered the northern, southern and western works. I was most impressed by the size of the facility, but what particularly impressed me was some of the initiatives at that stage that were being taken by Samcor to meet consumer requirements (indeed, to stimulate markets that may not already be there) by imaginative and innovative meat processing. It would take too long to list the many examples that I saw on that occasion, but I remember the pre-packaging of frozen meat for the Middle East in packages that were considered useful for customers in that region, and indeed saleable and economical for customers in that region. They were easy to transport, consisting only of meat, no bone, so there was little weight problem and they could be flown much more easily because the return was higher to help pay for the air freight. I was impressed by that approach to marketing and trying to win a new export area for this State.

For anyone to suggest that Samcor has not been involved in trying such innovative areas in the past is to be either showing quite a blindness about what Samcor has been trying to do over the years or deliberately trying to denigrate that corporation. That is not to deny that it has not had any problems, but, as I said, we will look at that more in a moment. Indeed, the Minister himself, on this occasion, has conceded that the reason for many of the financial problems at the accounting level of the South Australian Meat Corporation come from the high interest charges that the corporation has had to pay on funds that it has borrowed for various purposes.

This also comes from the depreciation charges that the corporation must provide for in the accounts. In particular, some of these depreciation charges can be considered non-productive or non-useful, namely the payment of depreciation charges until recently in regard to the western works, which are regarded as among the less useful sections of the works at the Gepps Cross abattoirs. We must look at the significance of that in the accounting structure of Samcor and how it compares with other meat processing works.

What would be an appropriate valuation for the assets? In 1979-80, the assets of Samcor were devalued and depreciated; there were significant write-offs. The figure for the Gepps Cross works was quite substantial, about \$11 000 000, reducing by nearly half the capital valuation of the works. I have considered the reasons for the depreciation of assets that appeared in the books.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The revaluation to a realistic level.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The revaluation is an interesting area to look at. The fixed asset valuation that appears in the accounts already incorporates the depreciation figures that have been deducted progressively over the years since the corporation was established. Over and above the

ordinary annual depreciation has been added in revaluation of the assets. Some of the reasons given for that are quite obvious. They are termed an extraordinary loss as a result of fixed asset revaluation. One can see the reasons why \$11 842 382 was referred to.

Three areas resulted. First, projects capitalised in prior years and funded from various unemployment release schemes are now written off as the board now considers their historic cost is unlikely to be recovered from future operations. The principal project involves the western abattoir to which I referred and which represents a figure of \$1 297 000.

The second area is assets no longer utilised for the purpose for which they were acquired in present or planned operations, now written off or down to a recoverable value from alternative future operations, the principal projects being the northern boning and processing facility and the freezer and cold storage facilities. This involved \$4 500 000, after deduction of the land that would be sold from the meat corporation to the buyers, in this case the Government. Many comments can be made about that.

I can accept the first two areas, but the third is interesting. This involves other depreciable assets in present use, written down in accordance with the board's forecast of the likely utilisation of the plant compared to the present capacity. To what extent does that relate to the entire use of the capacity or exclude the service use of the capacity? To what extent can one imagine at an accounting level that part of that write-off and revaluation that has resulted in a loss has been a transfer of valuation to the Treasury?

The Treasury fund that will be used for the Gepps Cross abattoirs as service works retains what one might call a notional asset. It remains in the hands of the Treasury, and is it fair to think of that as a write-off and a loss to the community? When the accounts were written, we viewed Samcor as a statutory authority, which represented a community interest. I wonder whether the assessment of the write-off, the writing down of the depreciable assets, is entirely fair. It was written down in accordance with the board's forecast of the likely utilisation of the plant. By writing down the assets to a figure of some \$12 000 000, is that a fair capitalisation put on all the assets that Samcor has at the Gepps Cross works? I am sure the member for Flinders will analyse the figures relating to the Port Lincoln works.

The appropriate value of assets must be considered. When we try to look at the lack of return that Samcor is bringing, this is significant. The equity borrowing ratio that the Government has suggested be chosen (four to one) seems to be reasonable, and I am sure that it is in line with other meat processing industries. I have not had the chance to research those figures exactly, but I have no doubt that the Minister can supply examples of other private meat processing plants that fall within an approximate range of four to one in regard to the equity borrowing ratio.

One feature that interests me is the decision that notional income tax rates should be charged Samcor, and notional dividend payments should be charged Samcor. I do not disagree with that. Obviously, if it is to compete with the private sector, there must be a light rate of deduction against Samcor, as all the private companies have to face. It would be unfair if it were otherwise. Likewise, it seems reasonable that, if the State Government is to take over much of the Samcor debt, Samcor should be required to pay a dividend from the operating profits of the meatworks into the Treasury to help offset the natural cost of that transfer of debt.

The decision that that money (the notional income tax and the dividend money) will be paid into a fund to provide whatever maintenance, depreciation, or inspection is required for the service works capacity interests me, because we have accepted the position that the service work capacity of the works should not be Samcor's financial responsibility entirely. Yet Samcor will continue to finance much of that service work capacity by virtue of the notional income tax and the dividend that it pays to the Government. We may say that that is merely a bookkeeping entry, and I accept that that is so. If it does not come from those funds, the service work maintenance charge must come from some other fund. It is interesting to note that Samcor will still finance its own service work capacity, but we need not quibble over that too much.

I refer now to the sale of the 164 hectares of land on Main North Road, which is to be bought by the State Government for \$4 000 000. This will make a significant contribution to the debt structure of Samcor, and it will probably be one of the most significant factors. To that extent, we applaud that decision. We should not lose sight of a consequence of that sale of land in regard to the future use of the land. Statements have been made by Government Ministers and members that that land could be used for industrial, residential or recreational purposes. I am amazed that the member for Newland is not in the Chamber at present, because I have heard reference to the possibility that the zoo that ordinarily would have been sited in his district could be sited on this land.

I am amazed that he is not here to propose and promote that theory. As to the other purposes of the land for industrial or residential purposes, there are some comments that I certainly want to make, and I know other members on this side of the House, particularly the member for Florey and the member for Playford, also wish to raise them. I refer to the entire concept of stock paddock land around the northern area. I have been concerned about stock paddock land for a very long period. Prior to my entry into Parliament and when I was on local council I pursued quite vigorously investigations as to the possible future use of stock paddock land wherever it existed in that area. Members will know that this area of 164 hectares is but a portion of that entire stock paddock land available in the northern zone, most of it, of course, not under the control of the meat corporation. Most of it is under the control of various pastoral companies.

The time is fast coming when definitive statements should be made by the Government as to what it believes the intended use of all that land should be, or of all that land regarded as being surplus to the requirements of the abattoirs and the pastoral companies attached to the abattoirs. To make the rather generalised suggestion that it could be used for industry or that it could be used for residential purposes, or that it could be used for this or that, is not adequate. We need to have a concept plan of the entire stock paddock area in that zone. I know for a fact that this is something that concerns many residents in the electorates that bound that area.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Do you have any views about future land use that might be considered?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I consider that industrial zoning for that land would not be appropriate. Already there is industrial zoned land in my own electorate which is unused and which is well serviced by transport facilities and by rail. However, the land in question is not well serviced. That could result in an over-supply and an acne-like industrial development which none of us would want to support. The potential that it be used for residential purposes, given the right planning and design, could well

be one of the solutions. Naturally, I believe that large sections of the stock paddock land, wherever it exists, should be considered for recreational purposes of one form or another, passive recreation, competitive sporting recreation, or whatever, because we have a golden opportunity to establish one of those green belts for which Adelaide became justifiably famous with the existence of its green belt around the city square mile. I think future generations would look back on us with great derision should we not try to establish some sort of concept of a green belt around the northern zone, using as a base whatever stock paddock land can be alienated from whatever purpose.

I appreciate that it is obviously going to be very expensive to pay \$4 000 000 for land which will be used entirely for recreation purposes. I accept the fact that the whole 164 acres may be too large a segment to consider for such a use, but I plead with the Government that it seriously consider using a large portion of that land to such an end, and that it certainly consider placing industrial development zones in other sectors, next to industrial zones that are at present not being fully utilised, thereby making better use of the transport and other facilities that may be available in those areas. I would suggest, in passing, that those industrial zones in my own electorate are appropriate.

Rationalisation of the South Australian Meat Corporation has been one of the catch cries of the Minister. This is what this legislation is all about. The Government, by the calling for a study by the present Chairman of the corporation, suggests that Government will click their fingers and that rationalisation will occur, it will appear, it will take place. I think that will overlook the fact that much rationalisation has already gone on in the past. One has only to read various reports of the corporation over the years to see the way in which changes have taken place to the structure in an attempt to respond to market conditions, to consumer needs and to State interests. The very existence of the South Australian Meat Corporation is an indicator of that.

We know, of course, that it has not always been the South Australian Meat Corporation; it is a descendant of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. That change was made for the purpose of rationalisation and trying to improve a situation. It was not made merely to delight in a change of name, to keep signwriters and copywriters employed by changing letterheads, truck motifs and various other paraphernalia that goes with corporate insignia. The change took place because it was an attempt to try to improve the situation with regard to abattoirs in this State. It did not stop there; the very history of the South Australian Meat Corporation from its inception until right now has been one of continuous over-view, and of continually looking at whether it is meeting its purpose.

I do not deny that some of the things that have been attempted with Samcor have not worked. I do not deny that Samcor has not realised the full dreams held for it back in the early 1970's when it was established. Hence, the reason we are supporting this Bill, because this is one more attempt to improve the situation. To say that there was no improvement in the 1970's, to say that there was no rationalisation, no attempt to meet the needs of this community, to meet the needs of the consumer and the meat producers, is to deny reality. One can cite just one example: the fact that Samcor in October 1977 ceased its own distribution of processed meats from the abattoirs was part of that process. It was a rationalisation process done on economic costing, on marketing grounds, because of efficiency, and it was decided that it was not appropriate

for Samcor to continue its own distribution of its processed meats. The basis on which that was decided, because the process was so thorough, must have achieved the support of members in this place.

A sad aspect of the matter relates to the employment numbers of Samcor. If the corporation really was that overfed Government bureaucracy that some would have us believe, then, in fact, one would have felt that staff numbers would remain the same at all times throughout the meat corporation's history. Indeed, that has not been the case; staff numbers have fallen dramatically over the years. I for one greatly lament one of the causes for that fall in staff numbers, namely, the live export of sheep to the Middle East, something which I think is one of the principal causes of employment reduction at Samcor. I put on record the fact that I did not support that then and I do not support it now.

The other point that I think should be made is that, to suggest that Samcor is in fact an overfed bureaucracy, a bottomless pit requiring Treasury funds, and a leach on the Treasury system, is to overlook just how much has been achieved in such areas of productivity within Samcor over the years.

I seek your leave and that of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* some statistics on this matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure the Chair that it is purely statistical?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I can, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN MEAT PROCESSED

Kgs of meat processed/employee	Percentage change
76/77 .....	37 829 —
77/78 .....	42 741 +13.2
78/79 .....	46 190 + 8.1
79/80 .....	54 177 +17.3

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** These figures relate to the kilograms of meat processed per employee during the years 1976-77 to 1979-80. Also in the statement is the percentage change that has taken place during the span in each of those accounting periods. The changes are significant. The increase in productivity per employee is highly significant: 13.2 per cent, 8.1 per cent, and 17.3 per cent. They are very promising and encouraging figures; certainly very encouraging if one looks at the increase in productivity as quoted in the national accounts of this country for that same period of time. They are not matched. They are in excess of the productivity increases that industry as a whole has achieved in this country since 1976-77. I believe that that is as much credit to the employees of Samcor as it is to the management. To say that that has not taken place or to deny how important that has been is to be blind or to be cynical in the extreme.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** There is a tripartite sharing of the achievements over the past 12 months, and we recognise the importance of each contribution.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am glad the Minister appreciates the significant contribution that all sides have made to the productivity achievements. Looking back through the reports of Samcor over the years, we can see that comments have been made about how productive or how useful Samcor is. I remind the House of what the Minister said, that the time was coming for the ultimate abolition of the Gepps Cross works, and that it was ludicrous to continue pouring money into it. In October 1978, the Chairman made this assessment on behalf of the board:

The board believes the Gepps Cross works to be operating on an efficient and businesslike basis.

I might suggest, before people take that comment apart

and choose to criticise it, that, if one is to look on the basis of analysis that the Minister of Health used this afternoon, namely, look to the experts in the field, then surely these are the experts in the field, the people who know more closely just how efficiently on a day-to-day production level their facility is working. They just did not say that it was getting on all right or that it was pulling out of a slump. They said it was operating on an efficient and businesslike basis. Similarly, in the 1979-80 report, the Chairman said:

The corporation is fortunate in having a team of managers who are highly motivated and devoted to Samcor's future success. Employees generally have shown an awareness of the corporation's difficulties, and their hard work has not gone unnoticed.

I concur in those remarks, as I am sure would every member in this House.

Coming to the financial accounts side, I believe that it has not been entirely fair to look at the accounts of Samcor and to say that it is in financial difficulties and cannot trade out of them. The basis of analysis has been wrong. We have had it suggested that Samcor has made significant losses over the years. I should like to incorporate in *Hansard* another table relating to fixed assets, interest, and operating results (net interest).

Leave granted.

#### TABLE OF FIXED ASSETS AND INTEREST

Year	Fixed Assets	Interest	Operating result (net interest)
72/73 .....	4.5m	124 461	Dr 0.32m
73/74 .....	7.2m	302 891	Dr 0.52m
74/75 .....	13.8m	705 021	Cr 0.49m
75/76 .....	21.1m	618 880	Cr 0.63m
76/77 .....	27.3m	1 716 441	Dr 0.12m
77/78 .....	24.9m	2 069 151	Dr 2.00m
78/79 .....	24.1m	2 713 997	Dr 0.5m
79/80 .....	24.1m	2 747 589	Cr 1.99m
79/80 .....	12.3m	after resolution	

Fixed assets after provision for depreciation (as included in operating result).

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The operating result that I have included in this table is net of interest. The operating results that are very often quoted in this House are inclusive of interest. Interest payments should have been deducted from it to get a true picture of how Samcor operates in comparison with private meat enterprises. The decision to capitalise money in Samcor now is an awareness of that. If one takes out the interest figures from the operating result, as is only fair, because that is how trading surpluses are analysed for private businesses, one finds that over the 8-year period the net loss at Samcor has been only \$350 000.

I would have to concede that, if Samcor were a private business, it would have lost that \$350 000 and it would have been unable to have paid dividends on its capital, but that figure I have quoted puts a different perspective on the one that is often put in this House. On deducting interest rates, one finds that in 1974-75 Samcor made a profit of \$490 000; in 1975-76, the profit was \$630 000; and, on the same basis, in 1979-80 it made a profit of \$1 990 000. That is a fair way to look at it. Other businesses, when they declare their profit, declare it pre-dividend. That is the figure they use, and they deduct the dividend from that.

Samcor will be placed automatically in a much better position now that what I am suggesting will be allowed to happen to it on an accounting basis. That is no substantial change to the internal structure of the corporation; it is merely an accounting technicality. I have spoken for some time on this matter, and I do not wish to preclude other



members from speaking. I feel that these points have to be made, because Samcor has come in for an unfair and unreasonable amount of battering over the years that neither its management nor its employees have deserved. To the extent that the Bill will try to improve the situation of the South Australian Meat Corporation, we commend it, and support its passage through this House.

**Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River):** I support the Bill, and I shall be extremely brief in recognition of the time constraints on the House at this stage. However, I must make one or two comments in relation to the remarks of the member for Salisbury. In relation to accounting, he defied every accounting principle that anyone in the financial or accounting world would take on board in making his comments. We note, from the Minister's second reading explanation, that there have been accumulated losses at Samcor of about \$20 000 000. Someone has to pick up the tab, and if it has been incurred by a specific organisation it should be accredited to that organisation. No side shifting of the blame will alleviate the responsibility on that organisation, for the taxpayers of South Australia eventually pick up the tab, whatever basis of accounting one applies.

The financial reconstruction, the comprehensive plan invoked by the Minister in this Bill, and the stand-by for slaughter capacity will provide a sound basis for the rehabilitation of the corporation. There is no doubt that it could not continue to operate on an accumulated deficit of about \$28 500 000. That situation cannot be allowed to continue, in addition to that, incurring on an annual basis about \$2 700 000 as a recurring interest bill.

The then Opposition prior to 15 September 1979, was extremely critical of the former Government in its operation of the South Australian Meat Corporation. The previous Government had encouraged Samcor not only to build the southern works but had determined that the northern works be retained as a service facility. Certainly, by any commercial test, Samcor must have been regarded as an insolvent institution. In fact, as the Minister has often said, if it were a private enterprise company it would have been wound up as being insolvent and in the hands of a receiver many years ago. They are the plain facts of the matter on strict accounting principles, and no other principles can be applied to an organisation such as that.

Within 12 months of coming to office the Government appointed Mr. Inns as Chairman of the South Australian Meat Corporation, with the task of designing a plan for the financial reconstruction of the operation. That plan has now unfolded and should receive the endorsement of this House. Certainly it receives the endorsement of those in industry who have sat by in the past eight to 10 years and seen the corporation go further and further into the financial mire, a situation that should not continue.

It will have to become an efficient service abattoirs and compete on a reasonable, but not favoured, basis with private enterprise. Certainly, with the introduction of the meat hygiene legislation (and the honourable member who has just spoken was a member of the Select Committee in relation to that Bill), it was necessary to alter the favoured trading position of Samcor and open up that field to those in private enterprise who, by their efforts and endeavour, were entitled to a share of the market to make their operations as profitable. Additionally, it puts the wood on Samcor to measure up to the real test of financial and accounting responsibility for its operations.

Moreover, there is no doubt that, having the condition placed on the corporation to pay annually a contribution to the State Treasury based on the rate of company

taxation under company law, ensures that it trade on the same basis as a private company. I commend the Government for that provision in the legislation.

The Government has been prepared to grapple with the problem of the South Australian Meat Corporation. The former Government was unwilling to take on the task of looking at the problem squarely in the face and making those restructuring processes necessary to put it on a footing whereby it could trade viably and economically in the future, provided it had the necessary foundation. To that end, the Government, in indicating that there has to be a service facility, has undertaken to contribute \$250 000 each year over the next three years to provide maintenance for the stand-by facility of the northern works at the abattoirs.

I know that those in the rural industry support the move by the Government in restructuring Samcor. Certainly, I lend my support to the Government for its initiative, and particularly for the way in which it has restructured the corporation, and placed restrictions and responsibility on it to measure up, and that will be the real test. I think it has been given a sound basis and footing on which to do that, and I look forward to its being able to prove that, under this new restructuring, it can be a viable enterprise within and serving South Australia. I commend the Bill to the House.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I appreciate the support given this Bill by the member for Rocky River, and I condemn without any reservations the abuse in this instance that was directed to this subject by the member for Salisbury, although he raised a number of salient points whilst taking that opportunity. What the member for Salisbury has done tonight is retrace the history of events that have surrounded the function of the Samcor operation at Gepps Cross. Those remarks cannot be linked with the subject before the House, which is to demonstrate the corporate plan for the future function of that statutory arm of Government, and not for the purpose of retracing its history.

The hardwork has been done by the Government. The corporate plan has been prepared and submitted to this House for acceptance. It has been supported by the Opposition and then, on this occasion, the member for Salisbury has taken the opportunity to abuse not only the undertaking given by his Leader in this instance regarding tonight's programme but also to recap that long distant history of events that he has in his address to the Parliament this evening.

I do not propose to answer the multiple questions that he raised on this occasion. I will have a look back through *Hansard* afterwards, as time permits, and I might even write him a letter and provide some of the replies to the challenges and questions that he raised. However, I think he ought to take note of undertakings that are given with respect to the programme and the function of the House, when we are fixed within a time table to handle the business, and not abuse the opportunities that are given to him in this House. Accordingly, he has denied me the opportunity to reply to a number of matters.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** There's nothing to prevent your going beyond 11 o'clock.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Yes, there is, because I honour undertakings that I make. I do not abuse them, as they have been in this instance. However, that is another matter and cannot be related to this Bill. I do not propose to proceed with it. I propose to conclude my remarks and expect the respect that ought to be applied to this subject to be applied during the Committee stage by members opposite.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

### HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 17 February. Page 2879.)

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide):** I will do my best to fulfil the agreement reached today, and I will not be very long on this Bill. I would like to place on record that this is not the first time since I have been in this House that agreements have got somewhat out of hand. That does not mean to say the word of the Government or the word of the Opposition has been broken. No-one was aware that there would be Government speakers on these Bills; we were not told about that. It is quite clear from what the Minister of Agriculture has said that there are some things to answer. If the member for Salisbury wanted to ask some questions and get some information on that legislation, I think he was entitled to do it.

I do not think the honourable member for Salisbury laboured the question beyond reason. We will try to finish this Bill in a short space of time. I think the first few lines of the second reading speech made by the Minister clearly sum up this Bill, as follows:

The major amendments contained in the Bill are intended to clarify the question of liability in cases where vessels are under pilotage by a pilot of the Department of Marine and Harbors. The Bill also empowers the Governor to make regulations requiring the holder of a licence or permit granted under the principal Act to indemnify the Minister for damage arising from the use of the licence or permit.

I think they are the essentials of this Bill. It is a small measure, but is nevertheless important and effective. It sets out to guarantee and indemnify the Minister and the Department of Marine and Harbors against would-be marauders in circumstances where the Minister or his representative have no control. No doubt it stems from the Chinese vessel, the *Wuzhou*, at Wallaroo some few years ago. It is clear that this is similar legislation to that which may have been introduced in the Legislative Council by the Minister at that time. I know from checking the records today that a similar Bill was to be introduced by the Hon. G. T. Virgo but for the election in 1979. It is consistent with what the Labor Party believed when in Government was necessary to overcome this problem. Therefore, the Opposition supports that part of the legislation.

One last piece of the legislation amends the present powers concerning the leasing of jetties. It is apparent from the way the Minister explains things in the second reading speech that he wants to be able to facilitate and expedite the leasing of certain jetties. As I understand the legislation, it refers to recreational jetties for the purpose of the councils only. I would like some guarantee from the Minister that that is the exact situation. I would be hesitant to support that part of the legislation if it was intended that these provision should go beyond extending it to councils. I have no objection about its going to councils. I know that they will make excellent use of it in its recreational facilities. With that reservation, the Opposition supports this legislation.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Minister of Marine):** I thank the Deputy Leader for his contribution to this debate and his understanding of this measure regarding indemnifying the Minister and his officers. I can give the Deputy Leader the assurances he is seeking in relation to section 80 of the

principal Act, which is amended by striking out the words from the principal Act which deal with jetties being sold at public auction or by public tender. The Bill will facilitate the direct leasing of jetties to councils under terms of the recreational policy. I give the honourable member that assurance and commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

### BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Second reading.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I move:

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

The Building Societies Act came into operation on 17 April 1975, and there has only been one minor amendment since that date. This Bill introduces several amendments which are intended to facilitate building society operations and which relate to the administration of the Act. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Remainder of Explanation

The Bill provides for the establishment of a Building Society Advisory Committee to act as a formal committee to advise Government on a wide range of building society matters. The committee will have a broad cross-section of expertise and will comprise the Registrar of Building Societies, nominees of the Treasurer, the Minister responsible for housing and three persons suitable to represent the interests of building societies.

The committee will report directly to the Minister on matters within its terms of reference. Immediately the committee has been set up, it will be requested to review other sections of the Act which are not subject to amendment in this Bill but which require detailed examination as to the need to introduce further amendments to the Act at a later stage. Provision is made for the appointment of standing deputies in the absence of committee members with the same powers as the member. The establishment of the committee was recommended and is fully supported by the South Australian Association of Permanent Building Societies.

The Act presently provides that the Registrar of Building Societies shall be the Public Actuary or, if he is not able to undertake the duties of the Registrar, the Governor may appoint some other suitable person. The Public Actuary has not acted as Registrar since May 1977 and, accordingly, the reference to him is deleted. The result will be that the Registrar will be an officer of the department responsible to the Minister having the administration of the Act.

Section 12 (3) of the Act deals with the registration of new building societies. The existing section requires that a society seeking registration have a minimum capital of \$500 000 with the proviso that \$100 000 of that sum be capital which is advanced upon terms which prohibit its repayment for 10 years without the consent of the Registrar. These requirements are substantially less than the requirements of corresponding legislation elsewhere (the lowest corresponding figures in any other Australian jurisdiction are \$1 000 000 and \$500 000, respectively). The Bill increases the minimum capital requirements for the

registration of new societies so that a new society seeking registration must have a minimum capital of \$2 000 000, with \$1 000 000 of that sum being moneys which cannot be repaid within 10 years without the consent of the Registrar.

Division V of Part III of the Act deals with the amalgamation of building societies, and the Bill makes substantial amendments to this division. Two or more societies may be amalgamated either upon application or by direction of the responsible Minister. New section 22 sets out the procedure for an application for amalgamation. The application will still have to be supported by the special resolution of both societies involved.

The existing section 21 (2) requires that consent in writing be obtained from the holders of not less than two-thirds of the whole number of shares in each society. This is cumbersome and impractical. The Bill provides that an amalgamation will proceed unless 10 per cent in number of the shareholders of either society object in writing to the proposed amalgamation. The existing section permits the Registrar to approve an amalgamation notwithstanding that requisite approvals have not been obtained and this power is retained.

A major provision of the Bill proposes that the Minister may direct one society to amalgamate with another in circumstances where a society is insolvent or is, in the Minister's opinion, in danger of becoming insolvent. However, the other society must be prepared to amalgamate. This amendment seeks to ensure that stability is maintained within the industry as a whole and that members and depositors are assured that their shareholdings and deposits are secure. The winding up of a building society may jeopardise confidence in the industry as a whole.

This power could be exercised in the case of a society which is trading at a loss due to inefficiencies of size and a smaller society which has suffered a reduction in its operating margin due to its competition with far more cost efficient societies. The amalgamation of such a smaller society with a larger one would give the new society a larger asset base as well as achieving cost efficiencies.

At present, the Act allows the Minister, upon the recommendation of the Registrar, to fix a maximum rate of interest for loans made by societies. The existing provision is inflexible and the proposed amendment will enable different rates to be fixed for different types of loans or loans of different amounts. The Minister has a similar power to fix maximum rates of interest in relation to restricted loans.

The Bill also expands a society's power to raise funds under section 41 of the Act. Provision is made for regulations to be made authorising other means of raising funds apart from accepting deposits or borrowing money.

The present section 50 of the Act dealing with a society's power to make contributions is repealed, and the new section 50 will enable a society, if it so wishes, to make contributions for a charitable foundation which is defined as a foundation that exists or is to be established for charitable purposes. This widening of the power to make contributions for charitable purposes is within the spirit of the Act, and any such contributions are not to exceed 5 per cent of the previous year's surplus or such other proportion of that surplus as may be prescribed. The use of a charitable foundation will provide a society with a separate and efficient body to conduct and administer those matters pertaining to its charitable services to the community.

The Bill enacts a new Division V in Part VII of the Act, dealing with management contracts. A society will be prevented from entering into a management contract

without first obtaining the written approval of the Registrar. A management contract is defined in new section 64a and includes an agreement whereby a society agrees to perform the whole or any part of its functions in a particular manner, or in accordance with the directions of any person or subject to specified restrictions. A management contract also includes an agreement whereby a person who is not an officer or an employee of the society agrees to perform the whole, or a substantial part, of the functions of the society.

It will be beneficial for the Registrar to have the power to review management agreements to ensure that the immediate and long-term effects on the society will not be to the detriment of the society in relation to its financial viability. This amendment has been made by and with the support of the South Australian Association of Permanent Building Societies, which feels that there is a potential for abuse in this area.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts a definition of "restricted loan" in the interpretation section of the principal Act. The definition simply refers to the detailed definition of this term which appears in section 33 and is inserted here simply for convenience. Clause 4 removes the requirement in section 6 of the principal Act that the Registrar of Building Societies be the Public Actuary. Clause 5 increases the minimum share capital requirements of new societies prescribed by section 12 to adequate levels.

Clause 6 repeals sections 21, 22 and 23 of the principal Act and replaces them with four new sections. The principal change is that new section 23 provides for amalgamation by direction of the Minister where a society is insolvent or in danger of becoming insolvent. This has required a rearrangement of the existing provisions. New section 21 provides the two situations in which amalgamation can occur: either on application of two or more societies or by direction of the Minister. New section 22 sets out the procedure on an application for amalgamation. Under subsection (5) the amalgamation cannot proceed if 10 per cent or more of the members of either society object. Section 23a sets out the effects of an amalgamation whether it be an amalgamation on application or by direction of the Minister.

Clause 7 replaces section 27 of the principal Act with a provision that will allow the Minister to fix different rates of interest in respect of different classes of loans. New subsection (3) makes it clear that this section does not apply to restricted loans. Section 33 (4) empowers the Minister to fix a maximum rate of interest for restricted loans.

Clause 8 replaces section 41 (1) with a provision that will enable the scope of societies to raise funds to be widened by regulation. Clause 9 makes a consequential change to section 47 (6) of the principal Act. Clause 10 replaces section 50 of the principal Act with a more detailed provision that has similar effect to the existing section. However, under the new section a society will be able to apply funds to establish and maintain a charitable foundation which is defined by subsection (4). Under the new section the proportion of the surplus that can be used for charitable purposes can be varied, if necessary, by regulation.

Clause 11 inserts a new division into Part III which deals with management contracts. In practice a management contract is an agreement or arrangement whereby one person (usually a society) attempts to control the operation of another society. New section 64a requires that such a contract must have the written approval of the Registrar. Clause 12 makes a consequential amendment to section 74 of the principal Act. Clause 13 enacts new

section 90 which establishes the Building Societies  
Advisory Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 25  
February at 2 p.m.

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

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 February 1981

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## ELIZABETH COMMUNITY CENTRE

780. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. In relation to the child-care course at the Elizabeth Community College, has the Minister now received the "full report" containing a "full explanation and the statistics used in arriving at the decisions" to transfer full-time courses in this area to Croydon and, if so, when, and when will he make it available?

2. If the Minister received the report before 12 October 1980, did he take it into consideration when he personally approved the transfer of the course on that date and why has it taken so long for the report to have been made available?

3. If the Minister did not receive the report before 12 October, how was he able to make that approval when his answers to the Estimates Committee indicated he needed the "full report" in order to completely answer the question about this matter on that occasion?

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

1. I received the "full report" in the form of a minute from the Director-General of Further Education on 10 October 1980. The minute contained statements on anticipated demand in the care giving area, statistics on child care graduates, and a summary of plans for the development of the care giving area. A copy of the report is being forwarded to each member of the Estimates Committee.

2. It was upon this information that I approved the rationalisation on 12 October 1980. Unfortunately, staff did not note my undertaking to provide you with a copy and the delay in providing the report is regretted.

3. Since I received the report on 10 October, the third question posed is automatically answered. I would, however, like to point out that in such an important matter the department, over a period of time, holds discussions with interested parties and verbally briefs me on key developments. I do not commit details to memory and hence when asked for precise information I ask for a summary report from the appropriate Department. This is why I indicated that a full report would be sought.

## MORIALTA TRUST

873. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What are the functions and activities of the Morialta Trust?

2. How is the trust funded and what moneys are received by that trust from the State and Federal Governments?

3. Does the trust allocate funds to other organisations each year and, if so, what moneys have been allocated to each of those organisations in each year since 1975?

4. Who are the directors of the Morialta Trust and what remuneration, if any, do they receive each year?

5. Are the directors full-time or part-time and, if part-time, what are their respective occupations?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows: The Morialta Trust is not a Government organisation nor does it receive Government funds. I suggest the honourable

member directs his inquiries to the part-time secretary of the trust who is located at 47 Hutt Street, Adelaide (telephone 223 7969).

## MODBURY HOSPITAL

877. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the Minister obtain a report on events arising out of an accident which occurred on 8 November 1980 following which two girls were admitted to Modbury Hospital at 12.15 a.m.?

2. Were X-rays taken on the Saturday at approximately 4 p.m., and was a competent staff member on duty to assess the X-ray prints and, if not, why not?

3. At 7 p.m. on the next day, Sunday, did a doctor at the hospital advise that, although he was not an expert on X-rays, he could see that the patient in question had a fractured pelvis?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Two girls were admitted to Modbury Hospital at 12.53 a.m. on Saturday 8 November 1980, as a result of a motor vehicle accident.

2. One of the patients was X-rayed at 2.25 p.m. on the Saturday. Although no specialist radiologist is on duty at the hospital on Saturdays after noon, other medical staff competent to assess emergency X-rays are on duty.

3. No. On the afternoon of 8 November the doctor in charge of the patient recorded in the medical record that the X-ray had shown a fracture of the pelvis.

## ENROLLED NURSES

880. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many enrolled nurses in South Australia are—

- (a) training;
- (b) employed in hospitals;
- (c) required to staff the hospitals; and
- (d) unemployed?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

- (a) 416 as at 31/12/79.
- (b) Approximately 2 659.
- (c) All recognised hospitals have a staffing plan agreed to by their boards of management and the South Australian Health Commission. These figures could be made available for specific hospitals, if this information is required. The staffing plans for hospitals and nursing homes in the private sector are not available.
- (d) This information should be sought from the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Youth Affairs.

## REGISTERED NURSES

881. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many registered nurses in South Australia are:

- (a) training;
- (b) employed in hospitals;
- (c) required to staff the hospitals; and
- (d) unemployed?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

- (a) 2519 as at 31/12/79.
- (b) Approximately 6415.
- (c) All recognised hospitals have a staffing plan agreed to by their boards of management and the South Australian Health Commission. These figures could be made available for specific hospitals, if this information was required. The staffing plans for hospitals and nursing homes in the private sector are not available.
- (d) This information should be sought from the Commonwealth Department of Employment of Youth Affairs.

#### PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

884. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Premier:

- 1. What staff (give details of employee's classification and estimate of weekly hours spent on telexing) operated the Premier's Department telex in mid-September 1979 and what staff now operate these telex machine(s)?
- 2. Have extra telex lines been added since mid-September 1979?
- 3. What was the cost of rental of lines in mid-September 1979 and what is the present cost?
- 4. To which media offices are Ministerial press releases now sent?
- 5. Does the use of telex for press statements hold up the former use of telex for official Government business involving Departmental communications and inter-Governmental relations?

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

- 1. Telex in the Premier's Department is, and was in 1979, operated by the staff of the typing pool. The typing pool, when at full strength, consist of one manipulative officer (MN-2) and three clerical officers, class I. It is estimated that approximately 20 operator hours per week are now spent operating the machines—this is probably an increase on 1979 but no records are kept of the actual time spent operating the machines.

2. No.

3. 1979—\$134.17 a month.

1981—\$165.00 a month.

4. Radio Stations 5AD, 5KA, 5DN, 5AA, 5SSA-FM. Channels 7, 9 and 10.

Australian Associated Press (AAP).

On occasions—*The Australian*, *The Advertiser*, *The News*, *Sunday Mail*, *The Financial Review*.

Various country newspapers and radio stations, if the news release applies to a particular country area.

5. No.

#### I.Y.D.P. GRANTS

892. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

- 1. How many applications for project grants has been received by I.Y.D.P. in this State in 1980-81?
- 2. How much has been allocated to each successful organisation and how many applications were refused and what was the total amount sought by these organisations?

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

1. 49 applications for I.Y.D.P. Project grants have been received thus far by I.Y.D.P. in this State in 1980-81.

2. Three grants have been allocated to the following organisations:

(a) Link Publications has received an I.Y.D.P. grant of \$4 680. Link, which is published monthly, is a forum for people with disabilities and their advocates.

(b) Sexuality and Handicapped Persons Committee of A.C.R.O.D. (S.A. Branch) has been awarded \$600 to stage a 2 day seminar in April for people with physical disabilities and their partners.

(c) Australian Association for Better Hearing have received \$2 000 towards the purchase of audio-visual equipment to instruct hearing impaired persons in lip-reading skills.

No other applications are still under consideration at the present stage. None have been refused by the I.Y.D.P. Advisory Council.

#### KAVEL DISTRICT

959. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Does the Minister oppose the storage of uranium and nuclear wastes or the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in the electorate of Kavel?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Replies are not given to hypothetical questions.

#### SEWERAGE WORKS

990. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Where are all the sewerage treatment works situated and when were they built and brought into operation in each instance?

2. Where are the discharge points for the respective sewerage treatments plants and what are the daily discharge rates in megalitres at each outlet?

3. What is the faecal coliform bacteria criteria per 100 millilitres of water, in water surrounding each outlet and how often since 1 January 1980 has this level been exceeded at each outlet and for what period of time?

4. What is the faecal coliform bacteria criteria, per 100 millilitres of water, for designated bathing areas along the coastline, what are the names of these sites and how often are these areas tested for excesses, based on the criteria of the Government department responsible, of—

(a) faecal coliform bacteria;

(b) surface stains; and

(c) grease deposits?

5. How often have excesses been revealed, when did they occur, at what localities and for what period of time?

6. What advice, if any, was given to the public in each instance where excesses were recorded and if none, why not?

7. How many Government and/or private employees are involved in water quality control testing, what are those departments or private firms, how often are quality control tests carried out and on what basis?

8. How often have excesses been responsible for an adverse affect upon—

(a) marine life; and

(b) the bathing public,

and when did they occur and what were the adverse affects?

9. What is the Government programme for upgrading and control of sewerage treatment and works in the next 10 years, what is the estimated cost in each instance?

10. What new sewerage treatment works are to be built in the next 10 years and at what locations?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Not relevant to this portfolio.

**MURRAY DISTRICT**

991. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Minister oppose the storage of uranium and nuclear waste or the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in the electorate of Murray and, if so, why and if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are not provided to hypothetical questions.

**PREGNANCY TESTS**

997. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Can South Australian women obtain Pregnancy Saliva Test Kits and, if so, from what outlets and when were they available for purchase?

2. What types of pregnancy tests are available to women in this State and what are the hospital/doctor charges in each instance?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are no known commercially available pregnancy saliva test kits.

2. There are three types of pregnancy tests available in South Australia.

(a) Routine laboratory pregnancy tests—

- For women attending metropolitan recognised (public) hospitals as outpatients:—
  - if uninsured for hospital benefits—free of charge

- if insured for hospital benefits—a \$10 occasion of service fee which is fully recoverable from their Health Benefit Fund.

- For women who are inpatients of metropolitan recognised (public):—

- if treated as a Hospital Patient—(whether insured or uninsured) included within the inclusive medical services provided by the hospital—no separate charge.

- if treated as a Private Patient—recommended fee \$6 which is recoverable from a Health Benefit Fund according to the table of benefit.

- For women in the private sector, when their test goes to:
  - a recognised hospital or I.M.V.S.—recommended fee \$6
  - a private specialist pathologist—recommended fee \$8.

(b) A special pregnancy test is available in one teaching hospital in metropolitan Adelaide. This test is for difficult diagnostic cases and for gynaecological disorders, the recommended fee being \$24.00 which is recoverable for the insured according to the table of benefit. Patients who are uninsured and who attend major metropolitan teaching hospitals are not charged for this test.

(c) Commercially available “do-it-yourself” pregnancy tests can be purchased across the counter in retail pharmacies, the approximate cost being \$9.00 which is not recoverable from Medical Benefit Funds.

All women who attend a doctor for pregnancy diagnosis will be charged a visit fee, unless they attend a metropolitan government hospital and are uninsured where no charge is made.

**FUEL PRICES**

1011. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are increased fuel prices having an effect on:

(a) the tourist trade and if so, to what extent over the past 12 months; and

(b) cellar door sales at small wineries in this State?

2. Has the Minister had any discussions with the Minister of Transport in both South Australia and federally with a view to reintroducing public transport to the Barossa Valley and/or running of train services in conjunction with wineries to promote sales of wines and the tourist potential of the Barossa, if so, what has been the response from them and if no discussions have taken place, why not?

**The Honourable JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) No fundamental changes in traditional tourist patterns in South Australia have occurred in the last twelve months as a response to increased fuel prices. To some extent, however, short-term readjustments have encompassed to move to smaller vehicles, increased destination based, rather than touring, holidays, a preference for shorter distance travel and, in those situations where inclusive holiday costs are reduced, some movement towards public transport alternatives to the private car.

(b) No specific information is available.

2. No. However, a working party of officers from the Department of Tourism, Department of Transport and Australian National Railways reported in November, 1980 that the introduction of a regular passenger rail service to the Barossa Valley was not an economically feasible proposition. Moreover, in view of the difficulties that would be associated with tourist mobility in the area itself, it would be of limited practical benefit to the tourist industry in the region.

The organisation and promotion of special tours to the Barossa Valley, incorporating rail travel, however, is considered to be a desirable initiative. Australian National has indicated that trains are available for hire to groups for special occasions and the Department of Tourism will be liaising with the Regional Tourist Association in this regard.”

**SUNGLASSES**

1015. **Mr. Hamilton** (on notice) asked the Minister for Health:

1. What investigations and/or recommendations have been made concerning the effect that various types of sunglasses may have upon a person's vision?

2. What is the best type of sunglasses that should be worn and why?



3. What are the categories of sunglasses considered injurious to a person's eyes and why in each instance?
4. What statements have been made by the Minister on this subject and if none, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Advice on the purchase and use of sunglasses is obtainable from registered eye specialists, optometrists, opticians and pharmacists throughout the community.

### PENSIONERS

1018. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many pensioners in South Australia are in a similar plight to their Victorian counterparts in that "many pensioners are reluctant to visit their doctor because they cannot afford drugs recently removed from the pharmaceutical benefits list" and what representations has the Minister made to her Federal colleagues to rectify this matter and, if none, why not?

2. Was Di-gesic, a pain relieving drug widely used by arthritis sufferers, among a list of five drugs that were withdrawn from the pharmaceutical benefits list?

3. Do pensioners now have to pay about \$5 a month to buy Di-gesic on an average prescription and, if not, what is the amount?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows: 1. Not known

2. and 3. These questions should be directed to the Federal Minister for Health.

### GOVERNMENT LAUNDRY AND LINEN DEPOT

1026 **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many employees are engaged at each Government laundry and linen depot?

2. What services and technical advice are provided by each group laundry, to which recognised hospitals and other persons and businesses?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Dudley Park: 346.6 employees; Port Pirie: 24 employees.

2. A linen service is supplied to the institutions listed on the attached schedules. In addition, the management personnel at Dudley Park provide technical advice to a large number of small recognised hospitals that run their own laundries in relation to the most suitable type of equipment, fabrics to be used and laundry processing.

Dudley Park

#### *Recognised Hospitals Serviced*

Royal Adelaide Hospital (including Nurses, Dental and Staff)

Royal Adelaide Hospital Department of Public Health

Royal Adelaide Hospital Infectious Diseases

Royal Adelaide Hospital Northfield Wards

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital

Modbury Hospital

Flinders Medical Centre

Adelaide Children's Hospital

Strathmont Centre (Estcourt House)

Queen Victoria Hospital Inc.

Lyell McEwin Hospital

The Onkaparinga District Hospital Inc.

Strathalbyn District Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc.

South Coast District Hospital Inc.

Southern District War Memorial Hospital Inc.

Gumeracha District Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc.

Mt. Pleasant District Hospital Inc.

Karoonda District Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc.

Mannum District Hospital Inc.

Murray Bridge Soldiers Memorial Hospital Inc.

Orroroo and District Hospital

Peterborough Soldiers Memorial Hospital

Kingston Hospital

St. Margaret's Hospital Inc.

#### *Other Institutions/Customers Serviced*

Birrlee Hospital

Osmond Terrace Clinic

Family Living Centre

Strathmont Centre

Hillcrest Hospital

Glenside Hospital

Enfield Hospital

Ru Rua Hospital

Willis House

Adelaide Womens Community Centre

Marden Hill Rehabilitation Hostel

St. Corantyn Psychiatric Day Hosp.

Youth Project Service

Gilles Plains Community College

E. & W.S. Dept.

Highways Dept.—Walkerville

Highways Dept.—Northfield

Public Buildings Dept.—S.A.C.

Public Buildings Dept.—Netley

Kent Town Pre-School

S.A. Museum

S.A. Frozen Food

Home for Incurables Inc.

I.M.V.S.—Murray Bridge

I.M.V.S.—

I.M.V.S.—Nuclear

Cathstan House

Kingswood Hostel

Brookes Rehab. Hostel

North Eastern Community Hospital Inc.

Henley and Grange Hospital

Gleneden School of Nursing

Eden Park Training Centre

Port Adelaide Casualty Hospital

Port Adelaide Clinic

Southern Domiciliary Care Services

Ingle Farm Community Health Centre

Parks Community Health Centre

Western Domiciliary Care Service

Parks Community Centre

Palm Lodge Hostel

Newton Lodge Hostel

Strathmont Centre—Northcote House

Strathmont Centre—Mareeba

Hospitals Department

Automatic Data Processing

Lotteries Commission of S.A.

Local Courts Dept.

Adult Probation Service

Attorney-General's Dept.

Libraries Dept.

Art Gallery Dept.

Dept. of Services and Supply

Crippled Children's Association of S.A. Inc.

Australian Red Cross Society

St. John Council for S.A. Inc.

Archway Rehabilitation Centre Inc.

Bardan Lodge Hostel

Kelvin Hall Hostel  
 Memorial Hospital  
 Burnside War Memorial Hospital Inc.  
 LeFevre & Port Adelaide Community Hospital Inc.  
 Northern Community Hospital  
 Helping Hand Centre Inc.  
 Blackwood & District Community Hospital Inc.  
 Elderly Citizens Homes of S.A. Inc.  
 Western Community Hospital Inc.  
 "Restvale"  
 Gladstone Hostel  
 Amaroo Hostel  
 Kintore Hostel  
 Minda Inc.  
 Southern Cross Homes  
 Glenelg District Community Hospital Inc.  
 Bellevue Nursing Home  
 Uniting Church Retirement Home Inc.  
 Corporation of the City of Brighton  
 St. Vincent's Night Shelter  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Magill  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—McNally  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Vaughan House  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Lochiel Park  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Stuart House  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Colton College  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Hay Community Unit  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Northern Regional  
 Admissions Unit  
 Dept. of Community Welfare—Southern Regional  
 Admissions Unit  
 St. John Ambulance Service—South Coast  
 St. John Ambulance Service—Murray Bridge  
 St. John Ambulance Service—Karoonda  
 St. John Ambulance Service—Strathalbyn  
 School Dental Services  
 School Dental Services—Therapy  
 School Dental Services—Primary School Dental

#### DIABETICS

1029. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister requested the Federal Government to include life saving injection syringes and needles in the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and, if so, when and what has been the Federal Government's response and, if not, why not?

2. How many diabetics were there in South Australia as at 31 December 1980?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister has asked the Commonwealth Minister of Health to include syringes for insulin dependent diabetics in the recently announced PAD (Personal Aids for the Disabled) Scheme. A reply has not yet been received.

2. Not known. Diabetes is not a notifiable disease.

#### MINISTER OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

1082. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. When does the Government intend to appoint a "Minister for the Northern Affairs" to Cabinet as stated by the Hon. C. M. Hill in *Hansard*, page 909 on 14 September 1978?

2. Where will this Minister be stationed and will he attend Cabinet meetings on a regular basis and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows: Not at all.

#### STATE FLAGS

1084. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Why were State flags not flown from the Treasury building and the State Administration Centre on Proclamation Day?

2. Were instructions issued that flags were to be flown on that day, and if so, to whom, and if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows: State flags were not flown from those Government buildings because this would have required special staff arrangements on a Sunday. State flags were flown along the median strip in King William Street by arrangement with the Adelaide City Council.

#### PARLIAMENTARIANS' BADGES

1085. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the Premier considered striking official badges for State Parliamentarians in both Houses and, if so, when will such badges be struck and at what cost and, if not, will the Premier consider implementing such a proposal, and if not, why not?

2. Is the Premier aware of any agreement in the Federal arena for such badges to be issued?

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

1. No. The expense of such a proposal is not warranted.

2. No.

#### POLLS AND SURVEYS

1088. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many opinion polls and surveys have been conducted by this Government and—

(a) how many of these have been completed;

(b) which companies or private individuals were commissioned;

(c) what was the cost in each instance; and

(d) what was the subject and purpose in each instance?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** None.

#### MARIJUANA

1089. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier aware of the statement of the Catholic Dean of the Northern Region of the Archdiocese of Adelaide, Priest Louis Travers, that "an organisation similar to the Mafia was manipulating, pressuring and terrifying a group of market gardeners to join the marijuana trade" and, if so, what action will the Government take and, if no action is to be taken, why not?

2. What is the value and amount of marijuana that has been discovered by the Police Department during 1980 in the—

(a) Virginia area;

(b) Two Wells area; and

(c) all other areas?

3. How many persons were prosecuted in South Australia in 1980 for—

- (a) growing marijuana;
- (b) distributing marijuana; and
- (c) selling marijuana?

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

1. Yes. The matter is being investigated by the Police Department.
2. Not relevant to this portfolio.

### POKER MACHINES

1092. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government intend to reverse its policy never to allow poker machines in South Australia and, if so, why and when?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There are no plans to change this policy.

### PREMIER'S OVERSEAS TRIPS

1094. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many trips overseas does the Premier intend to make this year and of these—

- (a) what are the dates;
- (b) for what purposes are they being made;
- (c) what is the proposed itinerary for each trip;
- (d) who will be accompanying the Premier; and
- (e) what is the anticipated cost of these trips?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Refer to the Ministerial Statement of 18 February 1981.

### TELEVISION RESTRICTIONS

1096. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: When does the Government intend to impose restrictions on the number of T.V. programmes depicting—

- (a) rape scenes;
- (b) murder scenes and scenes involving explicit severing of limbs and torsos;
- (c) drug taking; and
- (d) scenes such as seen on T.V. on 24 January 1981 showing persons being sliced in half by guillotine machines?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** This is not within the jurisdiction of a State Government.

### PRINCIPAL—AMALGAMATED COLLEGES OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1117. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the appointment of a principal for the Amalgamated Colleges of Advanced Education be announced?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** When the selection has been made.

### DENTAL HYGIENISTS

1119. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Department of Further Education sought a Crown Law opinion with respect to the legal liability of dental hygienists in training and if so, is the opinion to hand and what modifications to the present mode of operation are to be instituted and if not, when will it be available?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes. A group policy has been arranged by the college to provide professional risk

insurance for each student. All students are informed of their personal liability and are required to insure against claims for negligence.

### DEPARTMENT OF FURTHER EDUCATION TEACHERS

1120. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the number of class contact hours per week generally taught by Department of Further Education teachers in the liberal arts disciplines and are there any plans to change to a system based on weighted student hours per annum?

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

1. The 1979 survey revealed that the overall average class contact of liberal arts lecturers was 15.8 hours per week. This did not include time devoted to administration.
2. The Department of Further Education is investigating closely the measures of educational productivity such as weighted annual student hours per staff member. An information system which will provide indices for each discipline is currently being developed. However, this information system has not been completed at this stage.

### DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF FURTHER EDUCATION

1121. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What plans, if any, are in hand to upgrade the classification of the Director-General of Further Education and his deputies?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** None.

### RESEARCH OFFICERS

1122. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What are the maximum salaries of the Parliamentary research officers in the Library and Ministerial research officers, respectively, and, if such salaries are not the same, does the Government intend to support the equalisation of such salaries and, if not, why not and, if so, when?

2. Does the Government intend to support the need for additional research officers in the Library and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

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

1. Maximum base salaries are: Parliamentary Research Officer \$21 806; Ministerial Research Officer \$23 392.

The salaries of Parliamentary research officers were increased in 1977 at which time an application for parity with Ministerial research officers was not supported by the government, and was denied by the Public Service Board.

2. No request has been made by the Joint Library Committee for additional research staff in the Parliamentary Library.

### GRAIN PESTS

1126. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What tests have been carried out to determine the effectiveness of Dryacide against grain pest insects including those most resistant to insecticides by:

- (a) the Federal Government;
- (b) the South Australian Government; and,
- (c) the Western Australian Government;

2. What have these preliminary tests indicated and how long before this substance will be available on the commercial market?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The C.S.I.R.O., Western Australian, New South Wales and Queensland Departments of Agriculture are jointly testing "Dryacide" for its efficacy and safety as a pesticide for stored grain in conjunction with the manufacturers, Agnes Clough Ltd.

A series of integrated prescribed tests are being followed by these organisations related to its use in:

- farm stored feed grain.
- farm stored seed grain.
- disinfestation and protection of harvesting and other machinery.
- disinfestation and protection of grain bins, silos and other storage facilities.
- effects on germination and emergence.
- animal safety and feed acceptance.

(b) Nil

(c) As for 1 (a).

2. Available data indicates that "Dryacide" probably has farm use against a wide range of grain pests provided the grain moisture content is below 12 per cent. The granary weevil appears to be the most resistant species. This data is currently being considered nationally by the Technical Committee on Agricultural Chemicals and an application has been made to the National Health and Medical Research Council to consider a maximum residue limit. The product will probably not be available commercially for six months and longer if more data needs to be made available to cover the rigid safety aspects.

### WOOD CHIPS

1127. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Was the Minister and/or officers of his Department or any persons to his knowledge involved in attempts to break the contract for supplying wood chips to India?

2. Has the Minister interests, directly or indirectly, with the Japanese companies, including the Marubeni Corporation and if so, what are those connections and/or interests?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. No.

### DISABLED PERSONS

1128. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What provision was made in the last budget for housing accommodation for disabled persons and, if provision was made, where will that accommodation be erected and how many persons will be accommodated?

2. What moneys have been allocated for specific projects for the disabled and what are the amounts involved in each instance?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Housing Trust has four programmes under which it assists the disabled:

- especially designed dwellings are included in new estates;
- dwellings acquired on the private market are modified in the process of renovation to suit the needs of disabled persons;
- rental dwellings are modified to suit the requirements of applicants or tenants who become disabled in the course of their tenancies; and
- dwellings are modified as necessary and let to organisations which provide communal or group accommodation for disabled persons.

The Housing Trust is not currently constructing any developments exclusively for the disabled. In order to avoid concentrating housing for the disabled and in order to provide the disabled with opportunities to live independently in the general community, units designed specifically for the disabled are included, where appropriate, in new groups of family dwellings and pensioner cottage flats.

The current new housing programme, which includes dwellings to be completed during 1981-82, includes units for the disabled in estates in Adelaide City, Hackham West, Salisbury North, Bowden, South Plympton, Morphettville, Seaton, Campbelltown, Murray Bridge and Port Pirie. Depending on household sizes, these units will accommodate from 15 to 30 persons. These special units are included in the contracts for the larger estates of which they are a part; however, it is estimated that the total cost of the disabled dwellings in the locations listed will be approximately \$544 000. These estates, including the disabled units, will be constructed with funds from the State, funds provided under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement and semi-governmental borrowings.

It should be noted also that the Trust has modified all of its house designs to include wider doors to bathrooms and toilets to provide better access for disabled tenants and visitors.

2. No specific budget provision is made for the modification of dwellings in the process of renovation and \$20 000 is budgeted for the modification of tenanted dwellings. It should be noted, however, that acquired and tenanted dwellings are modified according to the needs of applicants and tenants as they become apparent, and it is therefore difficult to predict total costs in any given financial period.

### HOUSING TRUST UNITS

1129. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment—

1. What is the 1980-81 and 1981-82 programme by the Housing Trust for the erection of:

- (a) double units;
- (b) single units; and
- (c) pensioner units?

2. What is the expected cost of these programmes for 1980-81 and 1981-82, where will the units be located and what types will be erected in such programmes?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The current financial years Building Programme, representing a capital expenditure of \$37 064 000 000 is summarised in Schedule I.

2. The 1981-82 Building Programme is still being formulated.

### 1980-81 BUILDING PROGRAMME SUMMARY SHEET PROPOSED COMMENCEMENT

Region	S.U.	A.H.	C.F.	Total Dwellings
Adelaide.....	55	203	173	431
Central .....	263	4	63	330
Southern and				
Riverland .....	181	40	73	294
South Eastern .....	31	29	17	77
Northern .....	79	12	14	105
Eyre .....	78	4	26	108
Grand Totals .....	687	292	366	1 345

S.U. Single unit  
A.H. Attached housing  
C.F. Cottage flats

**HALLETT COVE**

1138. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Is Hallett Cove still regarded as being outside of the metropolitan area for the purposes of the total fire ban on wood barbecues and incinerators which applies from 1 November to 30 April and, if so, why?

2. Are plans in hand to have the Hallett Cove area so incorporated into the metropolitan area for this purpose and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, the area is outside the Inner Adelaide Fire Ban District if that is the district to which the honourable member refers when he states "metropolitan area". However, the Corporation of the City of Marion, which includes the Hallett Cove area, has not imposed additional restriction (See Section 41 CFS Act) outside of those associated with the normal Fire Danger Season. In other words it is quite legal, except on days of extreme fire danger, for wood barbecues and incinerators to be lit provided the precautions are met as stipulated in Section 39 (2) (d) of the CFS Act.

2. No, there are no plans to include the Hallett Cove area within the Inner Metropolitan Fire Ban District. The Country Fire Services Board Meteorological Fire Ban Districts Sub-Committee holds such a move to be inappropriate since the areas of Hallett Cove, O'Halloran Hill, Flagstaff Hill and to the South, contain considerable areas of grazing land which for many years have caused considerable grassland fire problems. For this reason Hallett Cove, along with the aforementioned areas, will remain in the Mount Lofty Fire Ban District until such time as population density and other factors warrant consideration of a change in boundaries.

**HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES**

1139. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many South Australian Housing Trust commercial properties are managed by private managing agents?

2. Is it proposed that all Trust commercial properties will be managed by private managing agents?

3. Who are the managing agents of the Trust properties at the present time?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The number of commercial properties owned by the South Australian Housing Trust that are managed by private managing agents total 34. (273 tenancies).

2. No.

3. Jones, Lang, Wootton and Colliers International, Property Consultants.

**HOUSING LOANS**

1140. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What action has the Government taken to implement its housing election policy to ensure an improvement in the availability of housing finance?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The reply is as follows:

1. The maximum State Bank housing loan has been increased from \$27 000 to \$33 000. Instead of the loan being divided into two mortgages, with the second at a higher interest rate, all the loan is now contained in a single mortgage at concessional interest rate. There are now three levels of concession, which are matched to the level of people's need. Substantial State funds have been allocated to the State Bank for housing, and new ways of

involving private capital in welfare housing are being explored.

2. The State Bank loans have been made available equally for new and established houses, with a single rather than two separate waiting lists. The loans are now available in two parts, the second part for additions or renovations. There is no longer any special housing finance attached to houses built by the Housing Trust as compared with any other houses.

3. In response to the Government's action in abolishing (or reducing) stamp duty for first-time home buyers, the building societies have agreed to waive administrative charges for first-time home buyers who are buying new houses. Some proposed improvements to the Building Societies Act have just been introduced into Parliament.

4. Financial institutions have been encouraged to look at new forms of lending, which will increase less well-off people's access to home-ownership. Low-start loans, in which some of interest due in the early years is deferred and capitalized as part of the loan, are believed in particular to have a useful role to play.

**RENTAL-PURCHASE HOUSES**

1146. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many rental purchase-homes were made available during 1980?

2. How many applications are outstanding for 1981?

3. What is the programme for 1981-82?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. As recorded in the South Australian Housing Trust's Annual Report for year ended 30 June 1979, the trust's rental purchase scheme ceased to operate in that year.

2. See 1.

3. See 1.

**CHILD ABUSE**

1159. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What was the incidence of child abuse during each month of 1980, and what were the various categories of abuses and the respective numbers, ages and sex involved?

2. What number of persons were prosecuted during 1980 for this offence, how many were released on bonds, and how many underwent psychiatric treatment and what were their ages?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Confirmed incidences of child abuse that were reported to child protection panels during each month of 1980 were:

January .....	21
February .....	24
March .....	28
April .....	25
May .....	31
June .....	24
July .....	34
August .....	33
September .....	19
October .....	22
November .....	22
December .....	27
Total No. of incidences	310

The nature of the abuse and the age and sex of children involved was:

Age	Physical			Sexual			Emotional			Total
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	
Under 1 .....	15	16	31	—	—	—	5	7	12	43
1 .....	9	7	16	—	1	1	1	2	3	20
2 .....	13	14	27	—	—	—	2	—	2	29
3 .....	11	5	16	—	2	2	—	3	3	21
4 .....	7	8	15	—	—	—	1	3	4	19
5 .....	13	6	19	—	2	2	1	2	3	24
6 .....	6	4	10	—	1	1	1	2	3	14
7 .....	6	5	11	—	2	2	2	1	3	16
8 .....	4	1	5	—	4	4	—	—	—	9
9 .....	5	5	10	—	3	3	3	1	4	17
10 .....	6	1	7	—	1	1	3	—	3	11
11 .....	5	2	7	—	2	2	1	2	3	12
12 .....	3	—	3	—	4	4	1	1	2	9
13 .....	2	4	6	—	7	7	1	1	2	15
14 .....	7	4	11	1	4	5	2	1	3	19
15-17 .....	4	13	17	—	14	14	—	1	1	32
Total .....	116	95	211	1	47	48	24	27	51	310

2. Eighteen persons were prosecuted in cases reported to Panels. Eight persons were imprisoned, four received a suspended sentence or bond, three underwent psychiatric treatment. Two were under 20 years of age. Some cases are still proceeding.

#### MEDICAL STUDENTS

1160. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What reduction has occurred during 1980 for training of medical students at each training hospital?

2. What reduction is planned during 1981-82 for training of medical students at each hospital?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. None.

2. 1981—University of Adelaide reduced by 15 medical students in first year to 105 places.

Flinders University reduced by three medical students in first year to 60 places.

These are pre-clinical years and do not affect allocation for training at hospitals.

1982—same arrangements as for 1981.

#### SUNDAY TRADING

1163. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the premier support the relaxation of the existing laws pertaining to Sunday hotel trading hours and, if so, what form of relaxation is envisaged and when will it occur and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Ministers' personal views are not appropriate for Questions on Notice.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PROGRAMME

1164. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the Parliamentary programme for this year?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The programme for the next session has not been settled.

#### “PROPOSITION 13”

1165. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is “Proposition 13” to be introduced in this State as advocated by the Premier on 9 August 1979 and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. How is it to be introduced and what rates and taxes will be reduced, and what are the expected savings to South Australians?

3. Is legislation to be introduced requiring that a two-thirds majority must be in favour of tax increases in this State before they are introduced and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

4. How many new jobs will be created as a result of “Proposition 13”, and in what manner?

5. Does the Government still maintain that State services will not be reduced and that there will be limited future tax increases?

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

1-4 The principles of “Proposition 13” have already been introduced in South Australia by this Government with markedly reduced State Government taxation, and a reduction in Government intervention in commercial enterprise.

5. Yes.

#### DOG FENCE

1167. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

1. What is the condition of the dog fence in South Australia?

2. What portion of the fence is maintained by the Government and pastoralists, respectively, and what were the respective costs in 1980?

3. Does the Government intend to give greater financial assistance to property owners in this area and if so, how and if not, why not?

4. What is the total length of the fence in South Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:**

1. Approximately 80 per cent excellent. Approximately 15 per cent aged but still serviceable. Approximately 5 per cent in difficult terrain requires relocating and rebuilding.

2. (a) Maintained by pastoralists, 64.7 per cent.
- (b) Maintained by Local Dog Fence Boards. (Small Cooperatives of Pastoralists), 30.8 per cent.
- (c) Maintained by Government (Mount Clarence residue as from 1/2/81), 4.5 per cent.

Maintenance costs vary greatly depending on age of materials, terrain, drought, flood, fire, estimated at from \$80-\$300 per kilometre.

3. Government subsidises dog fence rates on a dollar for dollar basis (Section 31, Dog Fence Act, 1946-1975). Government also provides salary and camp allowance, vehicle and vehicle expenses for the Inspector of Fences and driver, with this assistance taken into account, Government subsidy and assistance equals \$2 for each \$1 raised by rating pastoralist landholders.

Dog Fence Administration and Management is the subject of an Inter-departmental Review Committee, report expected April 1981.

4. 2208.6 kilometres.

### ADOPTIONS

1179. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Was a vacancy created shortly before Christmas by the retirement or resignation of a typist in the Department of Community Welfare who had the responsibility of preparing court documents in relation to adoption cases and, if so, when was this vacancy filled, why did this replacement take so long to be effected, how many adoption cases were held up and for how long were they delayed?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Three vacancies were created shortly before Christmas. Two officers transferred to other positions and one officer resigned. Two of the vacancies were filled immediately. The third vacancy was filled on 9 February 1981. Internal transfer arrangements were delayed due to the withdrawal of successful applicants. A minimal delay was caused in lodging applications for courts. The number of applications already lodged was in excess of court hearings available and consequently there were no delays in court hearings.

### PARLIAMENT HOUSE FACADE

1183. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier: In order to commemorate the 1986 sesqui-centenary, has the Government given consideration to modifying the eastern facade of Parliament House in accordance with the original 1913 plan?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No.

### SWAN SHEPHERD GROUP

1184. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the current situation with respect to the collapse of the Swan Shepherd group of companies and, is an investigation by the Corporate Affairs Commission still in progress?

2. How many companies are involved and is it correct that as much as 33 000 000 may have been invested in these companies by members of the public and, if so, has most of that 33 000 000 been lost?

3. On 28 October 1980, was the following resolution carried at a creditors' meeting, sent to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs:

"that this meeting directs the liquidators to request the Corporate Affairs Commission to take such action as may be necessary to prevent the principals of the Swan Shepherd group of companies leaving Australia"

and, on 30 October, did the Commissioner reply:

"While the Commission is aware of the concern of creditors of these and other companies in the 'Swan Shepherd group', you will appreciate that the Commission has no control over any proposed departure by officers of any company out of the jurisdiction prior to the institution of court proceedings",

and if this reply was given, why cannot some suitable action be taken in such matters by way of the Minister making representations to the Federal Government in order to prevent such persons leaving Australia?

4. What action does the Minister propose to take to see that the savings of small investors in the future are not put at risk by companies conducting their affairs in the manner that seems to have been the case with the Swan Shepherd group?

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

1. Yes, the investigation by the Corporate Affairs Commission is still in progress. I am informed that private examinations by the joint Liquidators of some of the officers and employees will be undertaken pursuant to the provisions of Section 249 of the Companies Act, 1962-1980.

2. The special investigation being conducted by the Corporate Affairs Commission relates to the affairs of 25 companies. Eight of these companies were placed in liquidation by the Supreme Court on 14 April 1980. Because of the state of the accounting records of the companies within the group and the large number of complex inter-company financial transactions entered into, it will still be some time before any informed conclusion can be reached as to the total moneys invested by the public and the total losses suffered.

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Where no proceedings have been issued the Federal Government would have no power to prevent persons leaving Australia. The Ministerial Council on Companies and Securities is considering the problem in relation to the National Companies and Securities Scheme.

4. Any proposed action will depend on the findings and recommendations of the Corporate Affairs Commission when it reports to the Minister at the completion of its special investigation, as it is required to do under Section 178 of the Companies Act, 1962-1980.

### LEGAL RESOURCES BOOK

1188. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it the intention of the Government to provide copies of the *Legal Resources Book*, produced by the Legal Services Commission, to members' electorate offices?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** When I have seen a copy of the *Legal Resources Book*, consideration will be given to the supply of copies to members' electorate offices.

### S.A.H.T.

1197. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What is the present delay in supplying S.A.H.T. rental accommodation to applicants for such places within the electorate of Salisbury (by category of accommodation)?



**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:**

Double Units—approximately 14 months  
 Single Units (brick) —approximately 14 months  
 Cottage Flats—  
 Single Person—approximately 4½ years  
 2 Person—approximately 3 years.

1198. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment—

1. What is the floor area of the office used by the S.A.H.T. at the Parafield Gardens Shopping Centre?

2. What would be the rental value of that office were it let for normal commercial purposes?

3. How many trust rental accounts and rental-purchase accounts are handled by that office?

4. How many hours per week is the office open for payment of such accounts?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 73 square metres.

2. \$53.80 per square metre per annum.

3. As part of the trust's service it will receive rent and similar payments at any office; 8 977 receipts were issued at the Parafield Gardens office during the 1979-80 financial year.

4. 6½ hours per week Mondays and Fridays 2.00 p.m. to 4.15 p.m. Saturdays 9.00 a.m. to 11.15 a.m. From 26 February 1981 the Parafield Gardens office will also be open on Thursday from 2.00 p.m. to 3.30 p.m. for tenancy interviews.

**RETIRED OFFICERS**

1212. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the control of the Minister of Community Welfare are contracting to any departments under that Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Nil.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

**FILM PRESERVATION**

1228. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is the Minister aware of the report in *The News* of 2 December 1980 concerning the preservation of film material in the National Film Archives and, if so, are any similar problems of deterioration faced by the S.A. Film Corporation and what action is being taken to preserve historic film material at the State level?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Nitrate film has not been used in film production for many years, having been replaced by acetate film. Therefore, all films produced by the S.A. Film Corporation are on a safer, more stable film base (i.e. acetate film) referred to in the Newspaper report regarding the National Film Archives. The S.A. Film Corporation has an arrangement with the National Library under which printing material from all S.A.F.C. productions, when no longer required, are sent to the National Film Archives for retention. Use of acetate film for these productions avoids the problem of deterioration referred to in respect of older nitrate film.

**MICROFILMING OF NEWSPAPERS**

1230. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

What criteria were applied to determine which newspapers would be excluded from the list in reply to question No. 685 of those which have been microfilmed or will be in the near future?

2. Why was *The Chronicle* (1858-1957) excluded from that list and are the paper copies currently held by the State Library rapidly deteriorating?

3. Why has *The News* not been microfilmed since 1962?

4. Is *The Advertiser* currently being microfilmed and, if so, for what dates, how many previous attempts have been made to microfilm *The Advertiser*, was this work carried out by the Library or by contract and, if by contract, to whom was it let and why was the resultant film deemed to be of poor quality?

5. Is the programme being entirely funded from bequests to the library and, if so, has the Government considered contributing to the programme as part of the State's sesqui-centennial celebrations?

6. Did News Limited fund earlier microfilming of *The News*, was assistance given to *The News* after its own back issues were destroyed by fire, and has any recent approach been made to News Limited to ask for assistance to the microfilming programme?

7. Have approaches of a similar nature been made to *The Advertiser* and, if not, why not?

8. How many newspapers or journals have been withdrawn from public use because of physical deterioration and what percentage would this constitute of the collection?

9. Have any major interstate papers such as *The Age*, *Sydney Morning Herald* or *The Australian* been purchased in microfilm form or are there any plans to do so?

10. How many microfilm cameras are operated by the Library and what types are they?

11. What readers and/or reader printers are available for public use and are any further purchases likely in the near future?

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

1. The criteria used to determine which newspapers should not be included in the list of newspapers supplied in answer to Parliamentary Question 685 were:

(a) Physical condition.

(b) Public demand for use.

(c) Existence of copies held elsewhere.

(d) Availability of a private subsidy for microfilming.

2. The paper copies of *The Chronicle* held in the State Library are deteriorating rapidly. Sixty-seven volumes of *The Chronicle* out of 297 have been withdrawn from public use.

*The Chronicle* was not included on the list of papers scheduled for early microfilming because at this stage, no private subsidy has been promised and because the task of preparation for filming of this substantial paper was beyond the capacity of the staff available at the time the schedule was prepared.

3. Microfilming of *The News* stopped in 1968. At that time the filming had covered the years 1923-1962. It is not now known what caused the discontinuation, but the emerging higher priority of other papers has prevented its resumption. The Library holds multiple copies of all editions of *The News* for the years after 1962, and this paper does not therefore carry the highest priority for filming.

4. The State Library has microfilmed *The Advertiser* from 1960 until mid-1980. Since mid-1980 the staff available for microfilming has been limited and priority

has been given to other papers. The Library does have multiple copies of *The Advertiser* on file for public use.

The State Library ordered from *The Advertiser* a copy of its film of the paper from 1858-1959. The filming was not done by or on behalf of the Library, and the copy for the Library was made by Kodak (Australasia) Pty. Ltd. for *The Advertiser* on the Library's behalf.

This copy film was not entirely satisfactory, and the order was not completed. Apparently the original preparation of the newspaper, and the filming itself, was not done in accordance with generally recognised archival filming standards. Nevertheless, the copy film has saved the Library's original newspaper files very considerable wear and tear from public use.

5. With respect to the S.A. country newspapers, the microfilming programme has been funded (salaries in particular) by donations from individuals and groups or organisations. Photographic materials and microfilming equipment have been funded by Revenue funds. State funds have been the sole source of funds for the microfilming of the *Register*, the *Advertiser*, and some other papers.

6. News Ltd. subsidised the microfilming of the *News* 1923-62 to the extent of two pence per exposure. After the News Ltd. fire in 1968, its officers made heavy use of the Library's files of the *News*. A recent approach has been made to News Ltd. for assistance in the microfilming programme. However, as News Ltd. requires the microfilm in a format different from that required and produced by the State Library, no conclusion was reached. News Ltd. has, however, commenced supplying to the Library an additional free copy of all editions, for microfilming purposes.

7. A similar approach has been made informally to the *Advertiser*, but a conclusion has not yet been reached.

8. Approximately 1 400 volumes of newspaper have been withdrawn because of physical deterioration out of 6 000 volumes of South Australian newspapers that have not yet been microfilmed. This is approximately 23 per cent.

9. It is planned to purchase microfilm copies of the capital city major daily newspapers.

10. Two 35 mm planetary microfilming cameras are operated by the Library. They are a Kodagraph and a Deagraph. A third camera (a Kodak MRG I) is on order and should arrive shortly.

11. There are five microfilm readers available for public use with newspapers, and a further three will become available shortly. Purchases of additional readers depends on priorities. There are no reader-printers available for public use with newspapers. Staff operated printers are available for making prints from microfilm at the request of the public.

#### FOOTBALL PARK FLOODLIGHTING

1232. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has any firm decision been taken by the Government with regard to floodlighting of Football Park?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Negotiations are proceeding.

#### STATE LIBRARY

1234. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What back-copies are maintained by the State Library of local suburban newspapers such as the Messenger Press publications?

2. Does the Government have any intention to microfilm these publications and, if so, has any consideration been given to operating such a programme as a joint venture with local government bodies and the Messenger Press?

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

1. Back-copies of all South Australian newspapers, including local suburban newspapers, are maintained in the State Library, and where possible, duplicate copies are set aside for microfilming purposes.

2. Consideration will be given to having these papers microfilmed as a joint venture as the higher priority filming of other papers is completed.

#### DOG CONTROL ACT

1238. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it a fact that officers of the Local Government Office were used to contact municipal and district councils, urging them to write to Members of Parliament asking them to vote for all amendments to the Dog Control Act and, if so—

(a) who authorised this to be done; and

(b) what were the officers names?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** No.

#### DOG CONTROL ACT

1239. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: How many municipal and district councils have been granted exemptions under section 7 (4) of the Dog Control Act relating to employing dog control wardens in other duties additional to dog control, which were they, and when were the exemptions granted?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows: The following Municipal and District Councils have been granted consent for their Dog Control Wardens to be engaged on other duties:

Council	Date of Letter of Approval
C.C. Adelaide	27/9/79
D.C. Barossa	29/11/79
D.C. Beachport	15/8/79
C.C. Brighton	15/8/79
D.C. Bute	17/8/79
C.C. Campbelltown	21/1/80
D.C. Carrieton	7/9/79
D.C. Central Yorke Peninsula	15/8/79
D.C. Clare	15/8/79
D.C. Clinton	15/8/79
D.C. Coonalpyn Downs	15/8/79
C.C. Elizabeth	15/8/79
D.C. Eudunda	15/8/79
C.T. Gawler	15/9/79
D.C. Gladstone	15/8/79
D.C. Kadina	16/8/79
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn	15/8/79
D.C. Kapunda	21/1/80
D.C. Karoonda	15/8/79
D.C. Kingscote	15/8/79
D.C. Lacepede	15/8/79
D.C. Lameroo	15/8/79
D.C. Laura	24/8/79
D.C. Lucindale	15/8/79
D.C. Mannum	24/8/79
C.C. Marion	15/8/79
D.C. Meadows	15/8/79
D.C. Meningie	15/8/79

Council	Date of Letter of Approval	Council	Date of Letter of Approval
D.C. Millicent .....	15/8/79	D.C. Tanunda .....	15/8/79
C.C. Mitcham .....	3/10/80	D.C. Tatiara .....	15/8/79
D.C. Mount Barker .....	19/10/79	C.C. Tea Tree Gully .....	15/8/79
C.C. Mount Gambier .....	15/8/79	D.C. Victor Harbor .....	15/8/79
D.C. Mount Gambier .....	15/8/79	C.T. Walkerville .....	15/8/79
D.C. Mt. Pleasant .....	14/11/79	D.C. Warooka .....	5/9/79
D.C. Munno Para .....	15/8/79	C.C. West Torrens .....	15/8/79
D.C. Murat Bay .....	15/8/79	C.C. Whyalla .....	29/6/79
D.C. Murray Bridge .....	15/8/79	D.C. Yankalilla .....	12/9/79
C.T. Naracoorte .....	19/10/79		
D.C. Naracoorte .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Onkaparinga .....	14/8/80		
D.C. Orroroo .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Owen .....	15/8/79		
C.C. Payneham .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Peake .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Penola .....	15/8/79		
C.T. Peterborough .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Peterborough .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Pinnaroo .....	15/8/79		
C.C. Port Augusta .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Port Broughton .....	24/8/79		
D.C. Port Elliot & Goolwa .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Mt. Remarkable .....	22/7/80		
C.C. Port Lincoln .....	15/8/79		
C.C. Port Pirie .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Port Wakefield .....	29/8/79		
C.C. Prospect .....	24/8/79		
D.C. Redhill .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Ridley .....	20/11/79		
D.C. Robe .....	14/9/79		
D.C. Robertstown .....	3/10/79		
C.T. St. Peters .....	14/9/79		
D.C. Snowtown .....	15/8/79		
D.C. Strathalbyn .....	15/8/79		

#### DOG CONTROL ACT

1240. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many municipal or district councils did not pay to the Central Dog Committee the one-third of dog registration fees collected or received by those councils, pursuant to section 12 (2) of the Dog Control Act, in 1979 and 1980, respectively?

2. Which were the councils concerned and what were their reasons for non-payment?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Auditor General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1980 tabled in this House shows that four councils had made no payment to the Central Dog Committee.

Those councils were the Corporation of the City of Whyalla, the District Councils of Dudley, Murat Bay and Port MacDonnell. These councils, with the exception of the District Council of Port MacDonnell have now paid.

The District Council of Port MacDonnell is refusing to contribute on the grounds that it will derive no benefit from the activities of the Committee.