HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 March 1981

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment,
Public Supply and Tender Act Amendment,
Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by nine 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 was presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 200 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: SECONDED TEACHERS

A petition signed by six residents of South Australia 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 Mr. Russack.

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. 572 to 584, 756, 874, 876, 879, 882, 883, 885, 886, 888, 891, 898, 904, 906, 909 to 911, 916, 921, 924, 928, 929, 932, 941, 945, 947, 948, 950, 951, 955, 957, 983, 992, 993, 999, 1002, 1005 to 1007, 1016, 1024, 1027, 1030, 1036, 1038, 1040, 1041, 1043 to 1053, 1055, 1056, 1058, 1060, 1061, 1071, 1076, 1087, 1090, 1091, 1097, 1100, 1102 to 1108, 1111, 1113 to 1115, 1118, 1123, 1124, 1132, 1141, 1142, 1148, 1149, 1151, 1152, 1154 to 1156, 1158, 1161, 1168, 1169, 1171 to 1173, 1176, 1180 to 1182, 1185 to 1187, 1189, 1190, 1193, 1195, 1196, 1199, 1200, 1207, 1213, 1214, 1219, 1224, 1225, 1231, 1235, 1242, and 1244.

STAFF APPOINTMENT

The SPEAKER: I am pleased to report to the House that Executive Council last Thursday appointed Mr. Gordon Wayne Thomson as a Parliamentary Officer on the staff of the House of Assembly. Previously, Mr. Thomson had been on secondment to the House of Assembly from the Public Service.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Superannuation Fund, Actuarial Investigation of—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977-1980—Regulations—Various Amendments.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

1. District Council of Riverton—By-law No. 23—Keeping of Dogs.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1980—Queen Elizabeth Hospital—Regulations, 1981.

QUESTION TIME

BUSINESS TAKE-OVERS

Mr. BANNON: Does the Premier's election statement, "The best thing Government can do for business is to get out of its way," inevitably imply a dependent South Australian economy in which the major investment, production and employment decisions are made by outsiders and, if not, what urgent measures will the Government take to stop the epidemic of take-overs of South Australian companies employing thousands of workers? I suggest that the Premier listen to the question rather than to the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr. BANNON: The John Martin take-over is simply the latest in a long series of raids on local companies. Although the Melbourne business man, Mr. Solomon Lew, has given assurances of continued operation, there has been press speculation about his ultimate future plans for John Martin's. Last year the Premier authorised the State Government Insurance Office to enter the market place and take over a parcel of shares that were being offered by the M.L.C. Writing in the *News* of 4 September 1980, the Finance Editor said:

> It is the ghost of the Bank of Adelaide which has haunted the Rundle Mall-based retailer, the largest shareholder in the bank. How much better for this State would it have been if Mr. Tonkin had kept his pre-election promise and saved the Bank of Adelaide in the first place.

My research indicates that since the 1979 State election outright control of substantial shareholdings have been acquired by interstate and overseas interests in more than 20 of 60 companies on the Stock Exchange of Adelaide 1979 industrial listing. That is over a third of all listed companies. From the Premier's reply last week, it is clear that the future of the South Australian Development Corporation, one of the State's potential defences against take-overs, is under a cloud.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition has asked one question, but has raised a great number of points in his asking of it. I certainly reiterate what I said before, namely, that the best thing that any Government can do to help private enterprise is to get out of its way. That is exactly what this Government is going to do. Before the Leader draws comparisons—and I think that he has used the recent take-over of John Martin's by Mr. Solomon Lee—

Honourable members: Lew.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Lew.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Obviously the Leader is not terribly interested, apparently. I just point out to him that Adelaide Steamship Company has done exactly the reverse with David Jones, another extremely large retail organisation. I would say that it is certainly as large as John Martin's.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader says that it does not employ as many people in this State: it does employ a great number of people and it will continue to employ a great number of people in South Australia. Apparently the Leader is disappointed at that, but John Martin's will continue in the way in which it has continued in the past. I understand that it has every hope of expansion and increasing its operations in South Australia. I cannot for the life of me see what the Leader is complaining about. He talks about a dependent South Australian economy, dependent on decisions and investment from outside. If he knows where the money can be found within South Australia to make us totally self-sufficient, unlike every other State in Australia, or the Australian economy itself, then I wish he would let me know; many other people would like to hear about it. Of course we are attracting investment in South Australia. The only proviso that we like to put on, and indeed which we regard as terribly important, is that people who come to take over joint ventures in South Australia maintain the operation of those ventures within South Australia. It is for that reason that we have adopted a policy of downstream operations occurring wherever possible on shore, that is, in South Australia, when it comes to the development of our resources. I am sure that the Leader would totally support such a statement, but I am equally sure that he would not suggest that South Australians should be expected to finance the enormously expensive developments that are going to take place in South Australia during the next decade. Whatever money we can raise from the private sector, we will, but I am totally and absolutely opposed to the policy which he espouses, and that is the barrow that he is now pushing, of Government ownership, of resource development, of every activity, which in fact time and time again has been proven to be better undertaken by the private sector and to the greater benefit to the people of South Australia.

Mr. Langley: What about John Martin's before—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am glad that the member for Unley raised that subject. The question of S.G.I.C's purchase of an investment parcel of 2½ per cent of John Martin's shares was raised by the Leader at one stage, I understand, yesterday, but he dropped it very suddenly and he certainly has not referred to it today as an attempt to save John Martin's. It is just as well he has not, because, if he really believes that the purchase by S.G.I.C. of a 2½ per cent investment parcel would save a company, then he knows very little about the open market place. We will do whatever we can to encourage investment in this State and we will do whatever we can to maintain and develop employment in this State, and that is the policy that we undertake.

Finally, let me say that, if the yardstick of success of the Leader of the Opposition is a measure of what happened in the last nine years in the 1970's, as opposed to the enormous developments which have been prefaced and predicted in the past few months, I know which system I would support every time. I will support the private enterprise system, the open liberal economic model, and do everything I can to promote that, because the results show quite clearly that collectivism cannot and will not in the long term produce the same effective and worthwhile results as the private enterprise system can produce.

REMAND CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Public Works inform the House why the Government rejected the proposal of the previous Government to site a remand centre at Regency Park, and what additional benefits are expected from his decision to build the centre at Hindmarsh? The Leader of the Opposition has been most critical, in this House and elsewhere, of the Government's recent announcement that the site for the construction of a new remand centre is to be at Hindmarsh, and that final feasibility studies will be commenced. Similar criticism has been made by the member for Spence, a former Minister.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The reason for the remand centre's being relocated from the proposed site at Regency Park was simple. Since coming into office, this Government has successfully negotiated with the Federal Government for a standard rail link from Adelaide to Crystal Brook as part of a national link-up—a great achievement for the Government. The proposed site for the remand centre was required for the standard rail link and the associated goods yards, and it is of far greater importance to the State that we make sure that the rail link and the associated goods yards should proceed as soon as possible and on the most suitable land available. The reason was an entirely logical one which had the full support of the Government, of private industry, and of anyone else in the community who thought about the location of a remand centre.

It also has the full support of the Department of Correctional Services, because its officers can see that the new proposed site on Port Road, Brompton, is a far better site than was the one at Regency Park, for a number of reasons. First, it is much closer to Adelaide, and much more convenient. A remand centre must be visited by a large number of lawyers, consultants and other people, including visitors to the remandees. Therefore, ready access is necessary, particularly by public transport, and it must be in close proximity to the city. The second important reason is that the land was ideal. It is in a commercial and industrial zone and in an area that badly needed to be redeveloped; furthermore, most of the site is owned by the Government. I take up the point of the member for Spence, who is reported in today's *News*, as follows:

> Mr. Roy Abbott, the Labor member for Spence, said today the site was too close to the business area of Port Adelaide and residents of Brompton.

The proposed site is much closer to Adelaide than it is to Port Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Port Road—that was the statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The answer can stand on its own, without help from either side of the Chamber.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am sure the *News* will stand

on its own, without help from either side of the House, because I have quoted from the *News* report, which states that it is too close to Port Adelaide. If it is too close to Port Road, I see nothing wrong with that. Closeness in terms of public transport access and ordinary private transport access is extremely important, and this is one of the reasons why the site was selected.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his typical reply that I heard on radio this morning (and he is becoming known as the "Too late and not enough Mr. Bannon" in the community, because he says, in response to everything that comes up these days, "Too late and not enough") forgot the record of his own Government when in office for 9½ years.

Mr. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I suggest the honourable member listens to the performance of the Labor Government in regard to the remand centre. In 1973 the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee made a scathing attack on the standard of conditions at the Adelaide Gaol and said that a new remand centre was of the highest priority. By 1979, the previous Labor Government still had not constructed a building or started work on construction. That is its record over six years. We have been in office for 18 months and in that time not only have we found a far better site for the remand centre but also we have announced that site, and we are at the detailed planning stage of that site and how it should be used for a remand centre. I can assure the House that in six years we will be far farther down the track to a remand centre than was the previous Labor Government.

I also indicate that the planning department, which is the ideal department to handle this matter in terms of giving expert advice to the Government on the location of the site for a remand centre and how it fits into the surrounding environment, has indicated that the site at Brompton is a far better site than that at Regency Park, for a number of reasons.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about the one—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The reasons are spelt out, and include the fact that the Brompton-Bowden area needs to be redeveloped. I would say to the member for Spence, in regard to his concern for his own district, that he must take into account, first, that a remand centre, built on a modern design, as indicated by the photographs I released last Friday, can have the appearance of an office building; it need not have the appearance of the Adelaide Gaol-type complex. Secondly, it can fit in, blend with and encourage commercial development in the area, because a great deal of commercial activity is generated from a remand centre.

I was interested to note that the Leader did not criticise the site; he was very careful not to do so, probably because the centre will be sited in the area of the member for Spence, and not in the Leader's area. The Leader simply said, "Too late and not enough." He did not think any money had been allocated. I indicate to the Leader that, in fact, the Government has worked out a loan works programme over the next five years, and the remand centre has the highest priority within that programme. The Government will ensure that its performance is far better than the performance of the previous Government in constructing the remand centre.

MINISTERIAL CARS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: My question is about cars and is directed to Minister number 10 from number 16—sorry, number 18.

The SPEAKER: To which Minister does the honourable member refer?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I refer to the Minister of Transport. Will the Minister unreservedly apologise to General Motors-Holden's and retract his statement about problems the Minister of Local Government had with his Holden Commodore, a statement which has cast a slur over the car's reliability? At the last election the Premier, in his policy speech, promised:

> A Liberal Government will move to smaller, more economical vehicles . . . and that will include the big white cars that Ministers drive around in, too.

Mr. Millhouse: That was pretty hollow, wasn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Last Thursday, in announcing that this policy had been reversed, the Minister said the Minister of Local Government had had difficulties with his Commodore, and one night was forced to push it across Victoria Square in his dinner suit, to the jeers of passers-by. I understand that there are plenty of jeers going on now about the numbers, too.

I have been informed by people in the car trade that they are most disturbed at the effect this statement may have had on Commodore sales (one can imagine that), because it impugns the reliability of this South Australian-made car. The Minister's statement is made worse by the fact that Mr. Hill was not even driving his Commodore on the night in question. I am reliably informed that he was travelling in a Ford LTD made across the border, and not in South Australia. I am told that the Minister of Transport is in further strife today with Mitsubishi about statements he made this morning that the Valiant was to be discontinued. According to my source, this is not true. Will the Minister now show his backing for South Australia by retracting his rather silly statement, and apologising to G.M.H.?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The easiest way that I can retract the statement, as the Deputy Leader calls it, is to repeat what I said last week, that the Hon. Mr. Hill had bought a Commodore for his own personal use because he was so impressed with it, and three other Ministers have also done so. If I was misinformed and the Hon. Mr. Hill was in an LTD, I am very happy to retract the statement. I made quite plain last week, in answering the question, that the Commodore is an excellent car. I hope that members realise that. I also made it plain on radio today.

RADIUM HILL MINERS

Mr. RANDALL: Is the Deputy Premier aware that at the weekend the Leader of the Opposition's press secretary made some statements that were critical of this Government's attitude to the health of miners of the former Radium Hill operation? Can he say whether the Government's attitude has been properly represented by these statements?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did hear the statements, on at least two newscasts, by a Mr. Rann, who I understand is employed as the Opposition Leader's research officer, in the care and control, for the time being, of the Leader of the Opposition, as he was formerly, I understand, of Premier Dunstan. I was surprised, quite frankly, that the Opposition used a researcher to make the running in some of these questions, including this question, which is obviously giving the Opposition a great deal of trouble at present. Mr. Rann, on the A.B.C. news on Sunday and Monday nights, said that the Government had abandoned the study into the health of former miners, and that this had been done deliberately because the Government wanted mining to

proceed at Roxby Downs without any public fuss. Mr. Rann called this scandalous.

Let us get the facts straight and encourage him to talk to his boss, the Leader of the Opposition, because he is obviously at odds with the public statements made recently by his Leader in relation to Roxby Downs mining. I first lay to rest the substance, if any, in Mr. Rann's statement. What he said is not true. The Government has not made any decision to abandon the study at Radium Hill. I understand that the Minister of Health is considering a proposal presently. I am surprised that the member for Elizabeth has not taken up this matter. The Radium Hill study was his pet project. I found it doubly strange that Mr. Rann took over the role previously assumed by the member for Elizabeth. The only conclusion is that the member for Elizabeth is still partially muzzled as a result of his lack of popularity at the last State election. I think that the same has happened to Mr. Hawke on the Federal scene, from what one gathers. But the fact is that Mr. Rann's statement is patently not true.

Members injerjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Leader is uncomfortable, so be it. The fact is that somebody in his employ is making pubic statements which are not true and which reflect upon the Government. I think it is incumbent on the Government to see that the public get the facts. Let me also quote, for the benefit of the Leader and Mr. Rann, what Mr. Rann's former boss, Mr. Dunstan, said to this House. On 27 July 1976, when he was questioned about Radium Hill, Mr. Dunstan said:

> I do not know what grave public concern there is. It was an extremely successful State project for which we gave Sir Thomas great credit. Where was the great difficulty about the danger of radio-activity in the mining and milling of uranium then: . .?

It is also patently obvious that Mr. Rann is in conflict, in his reference to Roxby Downs, with the attitude expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in a speech which will become quite a celebrated speech in the councils of his Party in relation to his attitude to the Roxby Downs development.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In answer to a question, yes, at the end of his speech. Mr. Rann has reflected on the Government's supposed abandonment of this study. The *Advertiser* report of what the Leader said is as follows:

> It was now possible that the mining of uranium could be placed in the "safe" category. There were machinery techniques and technologies which allowed it to be seen this way. But as a layman he was yet to be convinced. Some people who opposed uranium mining were alarmist and probably would never be convinced.

I suggest that he have a good hard look at his employee, Mr. Rann. The report continues:

> "But I do not think a major political Party has the right to be either alarmed or to react emotionally on an issue as important as this," Mr. Bannon said. "I believe we have got to examine it objectively within our Party councils and come out with a policy."

To all of which I say, "Hear, hear!" The article continues:

> "At the moment our policy does not impede the development of Roxby Downs."

The conflict between what Mr. Rann said on the Roxby Downs development and what the Leader said on Friday is obvious. Mr. Rann is plainly being alarmist; he is plainly in conflict with his Leader; and he is plainly in agreement with the sentiments of some elements within the Opposition, in particular the member for Elizabeth. It is my firm conviction—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It is my firm conviction that you ought to sit down before you make a bigger fool of yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, the Opposition does not like to be confronted with the facts on this uranium matter. It is obvious that it does not bother any longer to ask any questions about it in the House. The Leader said that I had to come back from overseas from my fact-finding tour to answer a barrage of questions in the House. I have had one such question from the other side of the House, and I think it was from the member for Mitcham on solar ponding.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a damn good question, too.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was, for a change, a good question. Members opposite do not ask me questions now, because they are not interested in the facts, and now that the misrepresentations come not only from the members of the Opposition but also from their staff, behind whom they are hiding, things are in a pretty parlous state. I wrote a letter to the Leader of the Opposition after I had read his comments and told him that he knows very well that as Leader of the Opposition he is entitled to a trip overseas. If he, as a layman, needs any convincing the best thing he can do is to avail himself of that trip and go overseas. I strongly suggest that he duplicate at least part of the trip I undertook, and part of which his former Leader undertook. If the Leader wants to know what is happening in the real world, the best thing he can do is to put a muzzle on Mr. Rann, and take up the opportunity of this trip, which is available to him, and find out what is happening in the real world.

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

Mr. ABBOTT: Does the Minister of Water Resources stand by his statement in the *Sunday Mail* that the distribution of the revised brochure on amoebic meningitis was delayed because the Government Printer is just flat out, rather than by the cost cutting that was indicated in leaked departmental documents? The documents reveal that a publicity campaign on amoebic meningitis was recommended last April by the expert committee, and it was suggested that the awareness campaign be conducted for the 1980-81 summer. This did not happen.

The Minister, in blaming the Government Printer, said that the delay was in the system, not in finances. The Government Printer was apparently just too busy. However, I have been reliably informed that the Government Printer could, at any time during the last year, have had the brochures available within a fortnight. Indeed, I would be interested to learn from the Minister how long it took for the Government Printer to prepare the Minister of Health's rather belated publicity campaign which was launched last week.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: First, the Opposition, once again, is trying to perpetuate an untruth in alleging that there was cost-cutting in relation to the water supply system, the monitoring, and so forth. That is completely untrue. That has been spelt out in this House on a number of occasions, yet the member for Spence still insists on perpetuating that untruth. Surely we have got through to the Leader of the Opposition by now that it is far better that he deal in fact and not in fantasy. There was no cost-cutting. The advertising material has been available all along, the only difference being that work was proceeding on an upgraded version of the publicity material. However, there was absolutely nothing wrong with the

existing publicity material, which was available to the member for Stuart and the member for Whyalla, if they had seen fit to find out whether it was around. It was freely available to anybody or to any organisation that wanted it. I cannot recall a request coming from either of the local members for that material. There was no shortage of that material, despite the point the honourable member is trying to make, that the material was not available and that therefore people were not informed.

The workload of the Government Printer is extremely heavy. As I have said before, brochures in relation to rainwater tanks will be out shortly. The reason why they are not available at this moment is that it is a matter of priorities. The rainwater tank brochures have been prepared and are awaiting printing by the Government Printer. There is only so much that the Government Printer can cover in a day or a week. However, the rainwater tank brochures will probably be available within the next two or three weeks, although the material has been prepared for some time.

The fact of the matter is that there has been no shortage of the very useful material which has been in use for a number of years and which clearly spells out the situation in relation to amoebic meningitis. The upgraded brochures are still in the process of being prepared, but that does not detract from the fact that the material that has been available all the time is perfectly accurate and gives all the necessary information required.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Education say what bus companies were used in 1980 to transport students from Reynella East High School to Dover High School for practical courses, and what was the total and daily cost of such transport? From which account were those costs paid? What companies are being used this year, and at what cost? For how long is it anticipated that this form of transport will need to be kept up?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the honourable member is seeking quite specific data, I shall be pleased to bring in a report for him within the next 24 hours.

MINISTERIAL CARS

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Premier say what advice the Government has received from security advisers on the potential impact on the personal safety of Ministers and drivers of cars with the new Ministerial number plates? How has the South Australian public responded to its elected Ministers being driven around in official cars bearing the new executive number plates? It appears that, by making Ministerial cars more conspicuous, the new number plates cannot increase the personal safety of Ministers and their drivers. There has been a report that the Deputy Premier has asked that his car be returned to the original system of number plates, and this reportedly follows an incident or incidents involving the car since last week, after certain persons worked out to whom the car belonged. Are other Ministers also seeking to scrap their new number plates?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The system of using number plates of this kind has been in operation in Canberra and in the Australian Capital Territory for quite a considerable time. It applies in Victoria also, and advice given in those two States is, as I have already informed the Leader of the Opposition, that the matter is one for increased security in some respects in that the cars can be more readily identified. I personally believe that the system of having the new number plates and the Piping Shrike, of which I hope we are all very proud, can become an accepted part of life in this State, as it has done in the Australian Capital Territory. I did note the comments in the press of the Leader of the Opposition, and I thought they did him little credit. One or two instances have been reported to me of difficulties with cars and drivers. I understand that there have been difficulties in the past which have not been reported but, because there is now a new system of number plates, the reports are coming in, and the matter is being investigated from that point of view at this stage.

AMDEL

Mr. RUSSACK: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware that, during the past week, the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Mr. Scott, has made further statements about the Thebarton plant of Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, and that in particular Mr. Scott has alleged that this Government attempted to cover up a Health Commission report on Amdel?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I am aware that Mr. Scott has continued his tirade in the Federal House against Amdel. He said, among other things:

> I point out that the South Australian Government endeavoured to cover up and bury this report.

He was referring to a report prepared by the Health Commission at the request of the Public Service Association, and, I understand, one of the other unions involved. He said:

> Fortunately, there were public servants who had enough conscience to make sure that the report got out.

That is patently untrue. The report was made available, as is the policy of the Health Commission, to the unions involved, as a matter of course. There was no way in which that report could be secret. It was made available to the Public Service Association, and another union was concerned, although I forget its name. Mr. Scott would have had no trouble at all in getting from the unions information in relation to that report. As such, it was available for scrutiny. Also, in answers given in this House on 5 August, the Minister of Health and I both discussed the findings of that report. There was no attempt to cover it up, and Mr. Scott's suggestion that it had been leaked by public servants, and commending them for it, is a reflection on their integrity. It was freely available.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: An attempt to con the media, too.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was an attempt to con the media, as the Premier points out. In his speech in the House of Representatives, Mr. Scott also said:

> This somewhat detailed outline of the Amdel operation has been necessary in order to show just how callous and uncaring the mining industry and Governments that support it can be.

Mr. Scott has branded this operation as callous and uncaring, but I would invite him to examine the operations of Amdel during the life of the Labor Government over 10 years in this State.

We all know that the new Amdel Act was introduced into this House by the Hon. Mr. Hudson. From memory, it gained the unanimous support of the House. Certainly, it was Labor Government legislation, and Amdel has operated under the aegis of that Act ever since. It is also appropriate to point out to Mr. Scott that this Government has authorised the Health Commission to buy sophisticated equipment to upgrade the level of monitoring at Amdel. All this seems to have escaped Mr. Scott and those others who are intent on closing down Amdel.

Even the Deputy Leader has got into the act and jumped on the Scott band waggon, but he forgets that, as Minister of Industry in the Labor Government, he was responsible for the industrial conditions that operated at Amdel. I do not recall that the Deputy Leader, when he was in the Labor Ministry, raised the question of Amdel in this House—and he was the local member. He has suddenly jumped on the Scott band waggon, and he has written to residents in the area, in the following terms:

> Dear Residents,
>
> You will be aware that the Opposition has been questioning the Government on the results of the latest radiation tests carried out at Amdel's Thebarton plant.
>
> I enclose a copy of a question which I asked the Minister of Health, Mrs. Adamson, in Parliament yesterday and the Minister's reply. It is apparent from the reply that the Government does not intend to take into account the protests made by the residents of Thebarton, the Thebarton council and the Opposition.
>
> You are assured that the Opposition will continue to pursue this matter in every possible way until a satisfactory conclusion is reached.

What satisfactory conclusion does the Deputy Leader want? We have explained to the House and to the honourable member that we have upgraded the safety monitoring, activities which did not occur to the Labor Party when it was in Government. We have explained that the tests have shown that the level of radiation at the boundaries of the Amdel site is equivalent to normal background radiation. We have explained that this new equipment enables us to keep an even closer check on Amdel operations, that the Amdel people are quite happy to co-operate in this way, and that they acted expeditiously on reports of the Health Commission. What is the only answer? The only answer is to get rid of Amdel.

I do not believe that I would be using the word inappropriately when I say that this is a scurrilous attack by the Deputy Leader on an organisation that enjoys an Australia-wide and, indeed, a world-wide reputation. If ever there was a johnny-come-lately into the issue, it is the Deputy Leader. If he is so concerned now about Amdel, why was he not concerned when things were not as tight as they are now, as a result of this Government's operations? If I can give a bit of friendly advice to the Deputy Leader, I will tell him that the sooner he divorces himself from the sentiments of Mr. Scott and takes a responsible attitude, as does the Government, in regard to this matter, the sooner his reputation in the community will rise. The only result that can come from the Deputy Leader's linking himself with Mr. Scott is the discredit that will fall on him dramatically.

BOTANIC HOTEL

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Environment say what is the Government's attitude in regard to, and what action is being taken to ensure, the preservation of the historic Botanic Hotel on North Terrace and the six two-storey chambers attached to the hotel, which are an important part of this State's heritage? An article in the *Australian* of Friday 27 February stated, in part:

> According to the agents, Matters and Company, "the chambers are ideally suited for conversion into prestige townhouses or doctors rooms or the like."
>
> The whole site is also regarded as an attractive redevelopment site although it would seem a shame to lose the existing picturesque architecture.
>
> Zoning for the site provides for use as an office, hotel, cinema, motel, consulting rooms, hospital, multiple dwellings or flats.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member about the Botanic Hotel. I know that a great deal of interest has been shown by the general public in this hotel, and I am very proud of what the department is doing in regard to buildings of significance to our heritage. I can assure the member for Norwood that we are aware of the significance of our older hotels particularly, and a study is being carried out at present in that regard.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE REPORT

Mr. BECKER: What action can the Minister of Education take to ensure that the annual report of the University of Adelaide is received much earlier than at present? On 23 February, some 14 months after the balance date, we received the university's annual report for the year ending 31 December 1979. I understand that the university is not accountable to any Government, although the Minister is responsible for the regulations. As the Public Accounts Committee is unable to investigate the university accounts, I draw the Minister's attention to the lateness of this report, and also to the fact that the salaries for the university have increased by $1 300 000 in the financial year under review. Caretaking and cleaning costs increased $40 000 to $1 200 000. Supplementary pensions increased by $456 000, from $90 234 to $546 540. That is a considerable increase, for which some explanation is required.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he asked to explain a question, which related to the late arrival of the report, but he is now giving details of the contents, and commenting as he goes. I ask him to come back to the explanation of his question.

Mr. BECKER: I have used the figures to illustrate that this report is some 14 months old. No doubt, some explanation is required. By requesting the Minister to look into the reasons behind the lateness of this report, I highlight the problem that any student of this type of report would have. That is the basis of my question.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member's question is relevant to an autonomous body which is federally funded. The University of Adelaide, like all other tertiary institutions in Australia, would be ultimately responsible to the Tertiary Education Commission in Canberra, which determines the level of funding for each State. I will certainly ask the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia to discuss this matter with the Chancellor of the University of Adelaide to see whether some degree of co-operation can be achieved. This matter is probably more appropriate to be taken up by the Federal Minister for Education, whose authority would have considerable difficulty, if the reports are coming through so late, in assessing the degree of support required by each statutory authority. I assume that accountability would need to be much more prompt than that in order to help the Tertiary Education Commission to determine levels of support which each of the different universities and colleges requires. I will refer the matter to the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority and to the Federal Minister.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I should address my question to the Premier rather than to the Minister of Environment, after the empty answer he just gave to the Minister of

Transport. What submission, if any, has the Government made to the Australian Heritage Commission to have the Torrens River placed on the National Estate Register? It will be obvious now why I mentioned both the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Transport in my preamble to the question.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. I have had a letter from a wellwisher at the University of Adelaide about this matter, and I desire to quote brief extracts, as follows:

> As you are no doubt aware, the present Government when in Opposition pressed the Labor Government to nominate the Torrens River, suitably defined, for inclusion in the National Estate Register. The then Government was dragging its feet because it wished to create no impediment to the proposed railway link up the river valley to the Tea Tree Gully Plaza.

So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that both the Liberal and the Labor Parties are in this.

Mr. Ashenden: Where do you stand?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am against it altogether on environmental grounds, if the honourable member wants to know.

An honourable member: And cost grounds?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And cost grounds, but primarily environmental. May I go on with the explanation?

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourble gentleman continues with his explanation and closes his ear to unnecesary and illegal interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At your direction and with your protection, Sir. The letter goes on to set out the then Government's objections, which were that certain developments of parts of the river may be necessary in the future and that including features such as backyards would debase the register. It then points out that the Liberal Opposition said that the listing would help to reinforce the provisions of the Government's conservation and enhancement regulations under the Metropolitan Development Plan, and also that there were few sections of river that had unsightly developments, but that it was surely the intention of the River Torrens Acquisition Act gradually to bring into the public estate land which lies within the boundaries of the Torrens and its environs. The letter also stated:

> The Opposition pressed home their argument that, by defining the River Torrens as the area bounded by a line 60 metres from the top of each bank, the Australian Heritage Commission would be reinforcing the environmental concerns of the South Australian Government as reflected in the legislation quoted above, as well as the River Torrens Protection Act, 1949, section 643 of the Local Government Act and the River Torrens (Prohibitions and Excavations) Act, 1927-72.

I vividly remember the way in which the then Opposition handled this matter but, unless my memory has betrayed me (and it sometimes does), there has been a deathly silence from the Government now that it is in Government and has its own little project for a north-eastern area transport scheme. It is for that reason that I put the question to the Premier, and I put it to him as head of the Government rather than to either of his two junior Ministers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, the Government is very conscious indeed of the need to restore the Torrens River valley to its natural and most enjoyable state.

Mr. Millhouse: You have had 18 months to do something.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed (and obviously the honourable member has been far too busy in court), the Government announced recently, as a sesquicentennial project, the upgrading and the expenditure of considerable sums of money on that project. It will, we trust, become a linear park for the enjoyment of all South Australians. I believe that it will be a project on which we can look back in 1986, when it is hoped that it will be completed, with a great deal of pride and pleasure.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what I asked you at all; I asked you about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question, and I ask him to desist from interjecting.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not particularly mind whether the honourable member for Mitcham likes my answer or not—it does not matter two hoots to me—but I am going to give him the answer whether he likes it or not: that is, that we are very conscious indeed and that, by making the decision we have made to recognise our 150th anniversary, I believe we have taken a significant step forward. That will be one major project undertaken to celebrate that year. I know that we will have the support of local government bodies and, indeed, of everyone in the community who cares for our natural heritage.

As to the question which the member for Mitcham used as his excuse to make the comments he did about the Torrens, about the former Government and about this Government, I would suggest that he should have a word with the Minister, because that is where the question should be directed. I know that consideration is being given to it. I am not able to tell the member for Mitcham what progress has been made. I realise that it is unlikely that he will be in the House very often before it rises again, so I suggest that the easiest thing for him to do is stroll across the Chamber and have a word with the Minister and find out.

LEGUME SUPER TREES

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Woods and Forests Department has conducted any investigation into the feasibility of exploiting legume super trees in South Australia for possible commercial wood or wood chip production and, if so, what are the results of those investigations? In an article published last year in *Newsweek* it was suggested that scientists overseas were developing super legume trees that dramatically increased the productivity of commercial forestry operations. It was stated that these trees grow up to 50 feet a year. They were described as:

> . . . the shock troops of war on deforestation. They grow quickly, provide shade for other plants, and produce 10 times more wood than trees in temperate zones. They can also withstand harsh rainstorms and devastating dry spells. They tend to be extremely hardy and are able to look after themselves in poor soil.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The member for Newland raised the subject with me on Thursday 20 November last year and, as I was about to leave the country at that time, I suggested that the Woods and Forest Department do some research into the subject. The first thing to note from the article referred to by the honourable member is that it states that these trees "produce 10 times more wood than trees in temperate zones". I think it is noteworthy that the timber that we grow in our own departmental forests, radiata pine, produces eight times as much wood as is produced by most trees in the temperate zone. There was considerable discussion, apparently, surrounding these species at the 1980 British Commonwealth Forestry Conference in Trinidad.

Those trees have been widely tried in the tropics and in warm temperate zones with monsoonal rainfalls of 30 inches to 180 inches, or, in our current terms, 762 millilitres to 4 572 millilitres.

They withstand natural dry seasons in this monsoonal belt but do not handle extreme or sustained drought, as claimed in the press article. Trees of this kind generally have poor form, and thus in the warm moist areas produce large quantities of light, thin-walled, large-celled wood suitable for some kinds of pulp but yield a very low proportion of utility wood for any structural purposes.

Leucaena is treated cautiously in African and Latin-American countries as it can spread as a weed in a non-usable form. They are largely thought of as fuel and pulp. Generally, the article must be treated as an exaggeration in that it generalises the "super" tree concept which is true of these species only in their ideal conditions. The Director of the Woods and Forest Department believes that in selected warm higher rainfall areas of South Australia (and they are few) some trials may be worth while but, generally speaking, "super" performance cannot be expected.

I respect the research done so far by the department, and I also respect the keenness of the member for Newland in raising this subject, because in this country, and certainly in this State, we ought to be exploring every possible avenue with respect to natural growth and the development of any forest timbers for our own industrial or other purposes. Although the Director's report does not deal with my colleague's request to investigate the subject further, I shall do so on his behalf and on behalf of the industry generally. I will also report progressively to the honourable member.

AVIS RENT A CAR

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: What representations will the Minister of Tourism make to the Avis Rent A Car company to withdraw its advertisement labelled "How to Survive a Business Trip to Adelaide"? On Monday March 2 in the *Australian Financial Review* appeared a full page advertisement labelled as I have described, and in part that advertisement stated:

> Las Vegas it ain't, but we do have a plan to help you survive.

It then went on to say that part of the company's plan to help businessmen to survive coming to Adelaide included what it called a survival kit, which contained, among other things, a Disprin pack to match the headaches they get here. The article finished up as follows:

> We are big enough to know it is the little things that go wrong that can make a business trip to Adelaide unbearable.

I think those comments all need some response from the Minister for Tourism, who must surely be responsible for encouraging the stays of businessmen in this State to be as profitable and as happy as possible. I was further concerned when I saw an article in the *Australian Financial Review* of Friday February 27 which announced that the advertisement to which I have referred was, in fact, part of a $1 500 000 campaign that started last Sunday. This $1 500 000 campaign, according to the article, has been aimed "specially strongly" (and that is their grammar) to the business community. The article also quotes Mr. David Arbuthnot, the Managing Director, as saying that the company's future strategy has been built up around recent market research.

A further comment indicates that Avis has done a problem detection study to analyse what the problems are, or what they are perceived by their clients to be. Inasmuch as this indicates that there is a public perception by businessmen, among others, that Adelaide is not a good place to visit, I believe it behoves the Minister to take urgent action to see what can be done to improve the image of the city and to have the advertisement withdrawn and replaced by something more flattering to our city.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have not seen the advertisement to which the honourable member refers. I am at a loss to understand why any company should choose to take what appears to be a disparaging line of reasoning in respect to any capital city. I will investigate the advertisement and provide the honourable member with a reply.

ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether anything is being done to counteract the apparent loss of power to commercial and retail services during peak demand times, particularly on occasions such as hot summer days when the heavy domestic use causes additional demand and some losses for some commercial and industrial purposes? Recently, I was led to believe that some supermarkets were forced to throw out and dispose of some meats and perishable items when their refrigerators could not function adequately due to sudden losses of power. It is apparent that this happened on days which also would have shown a larger than normal domestic use of electricity. It has been put to me that the Electricity Trust should do everything possible to ensure that a quantity of power is maintained.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member mentioned this to me verbally a few days ago, and I checked with the trust on the position in connection with the maintenance of voltage at periods of peak demand. I was assured that the sort of occurrence that the honourable member described would not have occurred as a result of a loss of power. A number of possible explanations come to mind; for example, on very hot days obviously there is an extra load on refrigerators, and it may well be that the refrigerators are designed in such a way that they operate at maximum efficiency under conditions which are not extreme. We have had quite extreme conditions this year. I am assured by the trust that, in general, there is no loss of voltage or of power as a result of the peak demands which come seasonally on to the grid. It is stated that isolated occurrences in certain localities could cause a drop in voltage and power—for example, if a pole is knocked down, that could interfere with the supply of electricity to a suburb or to an isolated area.

If the honourable member can supply me with precise details of the premises affected, I am quite prepared to ask the trust to investigate these isolated instances. I do not think the explanation he has given is the correct one; certainly, not as a matter of course in the operations in the supply of electricity and power in the metropolitan area, even in times of peak demand. I shall be happy to take up specific details and have them investigated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REMAND CENTRE

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: In reply to a question from his own side concerning the site of the remand centre, the Minister of Public Works suggested that my attitude to the site of the remand centre was coloured by the fact that it was no longer in my electorate but had been moved to the electorate of my colleague, the member for Spence. I was a member of Cabinet that made the decision to proceed with the remand centre on the site at Regency Park, bearing in mind the advantages of the site and its distance from residential areas. The site was not in the railway area but was immediately north of the State Transport Authority workshops and west of the land reserved for railways purposes, contrary to what the Minister said.

I, as local member, and the then Chief Secretary organised public meetings in the district, at which we explained the project and the situation at length, discussing it with local residents, and assuring them of the benefits of the scheme. None of that action has taken place in the current instance. I absolutely refute that in any way our attitude to the decision that has been made finally by this Government some 18 months later than it should have been—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BANNON: —in reverse of the previous ones was coloured by the location; on the contrary, that site was and remains a very appropriate site for a remand centre.

At 3.12 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amendment the Public Service Act, 1967-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a common law principle of many years standing that, where employees are not prepared to carry out duties as directed, the employer can refuse to pay them, that is, the "no work as directed, no pay" principle. Because it has been held that the Public Service Act and regulations comprise a complete code of conditions for Public Service officers that may override common law principles, Executive Council on 6 December 1979 approved of the inclusion of regulation 16A in the Public Service regulations that provide for the "no work as directed, no pay" provision.

It is now considered preferable and more appropriate for this provision to appear in the Public Service Act, rather than the regulations under the Act. I emphasise that this amendment to the Public Service Act replaces an existing Public Service Act regulation. It is my hope, of course, that public servants will continue to maintain a responsible attitude to their work and the service they provide to the taxpayers and that this provision need not be used. Of course, if essential services are being affected by industrial action, it is right and proper that those undertaking that action should not be paid their salary whilst that action continues. However, should industrial action be taken by public servants, the same provisions should apply to them as apply to all other workers.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 enacts new section 36a of the principal Act. New subsection (1) provides that, if an officer refuses or fails to carry out duties which he is lawfully required to perform, the board may direct that salary be not paid on the day or days on which he refuses or fails to carry out those duties, or persists in the refusal or failure. Subsection (2) makes clear that the direction may be given where the officer reports to work and is prepared to carry out certain duties, but not others. Subsection (3) provides that the direction is not subject to appeal or review and may be given notwithstanding the provisions of an industrial award or industrial agreement. Subsection (4) defines a "day" for the purposes of the new provision as including a part of a day, and defines "salary" as including prescribed allowances.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its object is to provide that the Hairdressers Registration Board may fix varying annual registration fees for registered hairdressers. The board has for some years prescribed a lower fee for hairdressers who are employees than that prescribed in respect of hairdressers who are principals. Last year the board proposed to increase the fees payable by principals and employees on 31 January 1981 from $12 to $17, and $5 to $7, respectively. However, a question arose as to whether the board had the power to prescribe differing fees under the Act as amended in 1978. The Government wishes to put the matter beyond doubt so that the board may adhere to its long-standing practice of giving a concession to employee hairdressers. The board has not as yet collected any annual fees this year, as it is awaiting this amendment to the Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that any fees fixed by regulation may vary according to prescribed factors. It is provided that the first regulation made after the commencement of the amending Act shall be retrospective to 31 January 1981, so that the board may proceed to collect this year's annual fees at the increased rate, in accordance with its original proposals.

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

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill be extended to 9 June 1981.

Motion carried.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That the report be noted.

The report just tabled is the result of very careful consideration by the Select Committee appointed on 25 November on the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill. Evidence was taken from a large number of witnesses, representing virtually all interests that might be affected by the Bill once it comes into force; thus the committee heard the views of the mining and pastoral industries; the Mintabie Progress Association, representing miners and residents of Mintabie; sections of the Public Service involved in the implementation of the Bill; and groups concerned with nature conservation and the advancement of Aboriginal people. By and large, these people saw the Bill as a very acceptable measure and expressed confidence that the Bill, when implemented, would work well.

Indeed, there was really only one area of contention before the Select Committee. This was with regard to the situation of the opal mining community at Mintabie. However, before I deal with the committee's approach to the situation at Mintabie, I should emphasise that the fact that the committee has recommended some changes in that regard should not detract from the high level of endorsement by witnesses in relation to other matters dealt with by the Bill. These relate to such matters as access for general as well as exploration and mining purposes to the lands, the constitution of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, roads, the vesting of the various parcels of land to be granted by the Bill, and the arrangements for the continued operation of Granite Downs until the last pastoral lease applicable to that property expires in 2008. These provisions, each extremely complicated in itself, were the outcome of the negotiating process that led to the Bill and have stood the test of scrutiny by the committee and the witnesses who appeared before it.

I now turn to Mintabie. The difficulty with the future of Mintabie under this Bill has arisen because, to use the words in the Select Committee report, "It is the only area on the lands to be granted by the Bill, where there is a pre-existing land use and established community." In these circumstances, there was bound to be extensive discussion of the provisions of the Bill with regard to Mintabie both by witnesses before the committee and within the committee itself. In fact there was, and because of the sensitivity of the issue the committee visited Mintabie, inspected the field and took evidence on site. As a result of this process, the committee has formulated a number of amendments to the Bill for which it seeks the support of honourable members. The most significant of these is with regard to tenure.

The original Bill contemplated that residents on the field would enter into arrangements for leases with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku as owners of the land on which the field is situated. This was not satisfactory to residents on the field even having regard to clause 28 of the Bill, which was intended to provide a measure of protection for present residents on the field holding annual licences from the Crown. The concern of the residents on the field was, again to use the words of the Select Committee, because of their need for "security of tenure which arises from the desire of existing residents to improve the standard of their accommodation on the field and the need for tenure to be adequately defined and of sufficient duration to justify the level of expenditure required and to enable the borrowing of any necessary finance".

In view of this situation, the Select Committee has resolved to recommend that, after the land vested in Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, the settlement areas at Mintabie, which is an area just over 2 square kilometres in area, should be deemed by virtue of the Bill to be leased to the Crown for a period of 21 years. The Crown would then license persons entering the Mintabie precious stones field by virtue of clause 75 of the Bill to reside on allotments in that area, by means of annual licences, along the lines of arrangements that currently apply. Such residents would, of course, be subject to the provisions of the Bill, including the requirements regarding behaviour in regard to clause 27.

Before going further, I should point out that this was the only part of the amendments proposed by the committee on which agreement could not be reached with the Pitjantjatjara Council. Its preference was for a term of 15 years for the lease to the Crown. However, the committee took the view that "In recognition of the necessary balance of interests, that is, reasonable residential security for the Mintabie community, and the desire of the Pitjantjatjara people to hold title immediately, the committee recommends a term of 21 years for the lease to the Government". I should add that the committee took this unanimous view very largely because of the insistence of one member of the committee, who, as honourable members know, has a deep and abiding concern for the future of the Mintabie community and its people.

The other amendments proposed for Mintabie are straightforward, agreed, and no less important. They deal with rights of access to and use of present and future bore water supplies and the airstrip. The Outback Areas Community Development Trust is to be able to continue the role it has played in the past with regard to the provision of amenities at Mintabie.

The remainder of the amendments proposed, by and large, deal with questions of detail or rectify anomalies. They seek to increase the number of other members of the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku executive board to 10, to eliminate an inconsistency between the number required for a quorum of the executive board and the number of signatories necessary to effect the proceedings of it and Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to eliminate an anomaly with regard to the application of the customs of the Pitjantjatjara peoples in relation to disputes, and to restore to the lands areas that were assumed to be part of them but which had been excised out contrary to the belief of the Government and the Pitjantjatjara when the Bill was being negotiated. Following assurances from the Pitjantjatjara Council, it was decided not to amend the Bill to exempt from the access provisions the families of Government officers required to live on the lands.

I referred earlier to the high hopes held by witnesses and, indeed, by the committee with regard to the operations of the Bill. I should emphasise in this context, as the committee has emphasised in its report, that a major reason for this positive attitude is undertakings given by the Pitjantjatjara Council as to how the Bill will, in fact, operate. In particular, I draw the attention of honourable members to paragraph 17 of the committee's report which states:

> The committee has given considerable weight to the assurances given on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara Council in relation to access by families of those officers whose duties require them to reside on the lands, and to the anticipated negotiation of renewable five-year leases, after the expiry of the 21-year lease to the Crown. The committee is conscious that any anomalies, or irregularities, which may develop over the years may be remedied by amendments to the Act.

It will be essential that all persons seeking to conduct dealings under the terms of this Bill will need to show goodwill and patience. However, in the light of the evidence given to it, the committee has every confidence that this will be forthcoming.

I commend the committee's report to the House. In so doing, I would like to place on record my appreciation for the work that has been done in this respect both by officers of the Government and by the representatives of the Pitjantjatjara Council, and also by the Pitjantjatjara Council, during the negotiations that led us to the preparation of this Bill. I believe that, during the negotiations, there has built up a far closer understanding, a far closer affinity and a mutual respect on the part of all parties to these negotiations and the agreement, and for that I am very grateful indeed. I believe that this legislation will be a significant milestone not only in Australia but throughout the rest of the world, and it could certainly stand as an example in relation to many other similar situations elsewhere. I thank honourable members who served on the Select Committee for their close attention and for the co-operation, help and guidance that they have given. It was very much a bipartisan effort.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Select Committee report, and I point out from the outset that the member for Mitchell and I, as the Opposition members on the Select Committee, were cognisant of the fact that this Bill resulted from an agreement that had been signed between the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Government on 2 October 1980. During the second reading debate, speakers on this side made perfectly clear that they supported the Bill, and, although we were not entirely happy with every aspect of the Bill, we believed that certain technicalities should be looked at and that clarification was needed in respect to other areas of the Bill. We had no intention of altering the basic principles of that agreement between the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Government.

It was highlighted in the evidence submitted by the Pitjantjatjara Council to the Select Committee that the agreement reached on the Bill was not lightly arrived at but was the result of an exhaustive process. The settlement resulted from almost one year of negotiations. By and large, the Pitjantjatjara Council abides by the agreement signed on 2 October 1980 and is satisfied with the provisions of the Bill thus agreed to.

One technicality that concerned the Opposition related to the inadequacies of the definition of the word "Pitjantjatjara". Comments have been made by members that the definition was not broad enough to encompass all of the traditional Aboriginal groups in the area indicated by the land. However, when questioned on this during the Select Committee, the Pitjantjatjara Council stated that it was satisfied, as a result of extensive inquiries in relation to these matters, that the description of "Pitjantjatjara people" included the Yunkuntjatjara and Ngaanjatjara tribes, together with the fact that they must be traditional owners of the land or a part of it. It includes those who are able to obtain provision under the legislation irrespective of where they might be living now. The Pitjantjatjara Council anticipates that there will be people at Oodnadatta, Coober Pedy, on nearby cattle stations and at Yalata who will comply with that definition.

The Select Committee was also assured by Mr. Toyne, who represented the Pitjantjatjara council, that the groups Partutu, Nakako and Matuntara, referred to by the member for Elizabeth, from Tindale's *Aboriginal Tribes of Australia*, are included and have access to this legislation. Mr. Toyne also pointed out that Tindale's work was extremely valuable and was the first of its kind in that area. The experience of anthropologists, following on from his work, is that they found it extraordinarily difficult to reproduce much of the information that he obtained. Matuntara, for instance, is synonomous with Yunkuntjatjara, and the key to their involvement with this legislation is that they are people with traditional affiliation with the land.

The committee was assured that, on the basis of current anthropological information, all dialect groups of the lands are included within the larger classifications of Pitjantjatjara, Yunkuntjatjara and Ngaanjatjara. Another matter of concern to the Opposition was the absence of the right of appeal concerning the exclusion by the court of summary jurisdiction of people from the Mintabie precious stones field, referred to in clause 27 of the Bill. The Select Committee discussed this matter with Mr. Bowering, Assistant Crown Solicitor, whose advice was that this was taken care of under section 163 of the Justices Act, which deals with appeals generally. Subsection (1) provides:

> Except as provided in subsection (1aa) of this section, there shall be an appeal to the Supreme Court from every conviction, order, and adjudication of a court of summary jurisdiction (including a conviction of a minor indictable offence, or an order dismissing a complaint of a simple offence), as hereinafter provided, in every case, unless some special act expressly declares that such conviction, order, or adjudication shall be final, or otherwise expressly prohibits any appeal against the same.

It is quite clear that there is the right of appeal under that Act but, not being a legal person, I am not sure whether it would have been better for a similar provision to be included in this Bill, because this legislation will become very important indeed in the future.

The Select Committee also looked at the matter of the failure to use the term Pitjantjatjara in instances where the term Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku had been used instead, and vice versa. Accordingly, the committee recommends amendments in those instances.

With regard to mining on the land and the limiting of Pitjantjatjaraku say prior to exploration, or any say by them in the exploitation of mining tenements, the Pitjantjatjara Council accepts the arbitration provisions as adequately protecting their interests and ensuring responsible control over mining on their lands. However, the council felt that the essential element in the effectiveness of this provision is the suitability of the judge appointed as arbitrator. Apparently, the council had made it clear to the Government throughout the negotiations that the appointee should be one with the broadest possible experience in dealing with Aboriginal people and issues. The Pitjantjatjara Council intends vigorously to urge the Minister of Mines and Energy to appoint someone with suitable experience and, subject to this, it believes the arbitration system will work well.

A further point that I want to touch on briefly concerns the absence from the Bill of any mechanism for determining who is Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and who is not. Upon questioning, the witness for the Pitjantjatjara Council on this matter believed that this is something we must leave in the hands of the Pitjantjatjara people themselves, because we do not know enough about the requirements in Aboriginal law of membership of the ceremonial groupings. It appeared to the witness, in reading the dispute provisions with respect to the tribal assessor, that clause 36(1) begs, at least to a certain extent, the question of who is Pitjantjatjara. It is only a Pitjantjatjara who can invoke the assessor's inquiry. The witness submitted in written evidence to the Select Committee that in this legislation it will be the Pitjantjatjara themselves who will decide who is a member of the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and who is not. Even in cases of dispute, the tribal assessor will base his decisions

on the customs and traditions of Anangu Pitjantjatjarku. The Select Committee is recommending an amendment to clause 36(4) be deleting the words "Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku" and inserting the words "the Pitjantjatjara people". This will allow the tribal assessor, in dealing with a dispute where any Pitjantjatjara is aggrieved by a decision or action of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, to give effect to the customs and traditions of the Pitjantjatjara people rather than of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. That is a commonsense amendment.

As the Premier has reported, the most difficult area to resolve was the Mintabie precious stones field and the granting of annual licences and incidental rights for Mintabie residents. If one had not read the *South Australian Newsletter,* issued by the Agent-General for South Australia in London and dated 16 October 1980, one would not have thought there was any problem in relation to this area. On the question of land rights being settled, that newsletter states:

> A solution has also been found to the problem of the Mintabie opal fields, which will be encircled by the Aboriginal lands. Opal miners will continue to have guaranteed tenure for opal mining but guidelines will be laid down on other activities at the field and police will be stationed at Marla, which is nearby on the Stuart Highway.

That newsletter, which is under the name of the Agent-General, W. M. Scriven, and the Official Secretary, M. S. Duff, was a very early report on the negotiations that had taken place at that time. But there was not, in fact, any real settlement at that time.

Clearly, this matter has been one of much conflict between the parties concerned, and it has been an issue on which the committee spent considerable time in trying to find a workable compromise. The Select Committee's report states:

> The committee has considered the position most carefully, and, in recognition of the necessary balance of interests, that is, reasonable residential security for the Mintabie community, and the desire of the Pitjantjatjara people to hold title immediately, recommends a term of 21 years for the lease to the Government.

It is not my intention to explain all the details of this matter, because I know that my colleague, the member for Mitchell, intends to express his point of view on the committee's recommendations. However, it is hoped that, as a result of the committee's recommendation, the Mintabie miners will enjoy security of tenure over their residences and businesses. The Pitjantjatjara do not wish to interfere with any person who wishes to mine, conduct business, or otherwise live at or visit Mintabie lawfully. The committee's recommendation will allow the Pitjantjatjara people to hold title immediately.

I felt that the work of the Select Committee was a little rushed. I do not deny the Premier the right to be a member of a Select Committee, busy as he might be, but in order to report to Parliament on the scheduled date, which is today, the committee had to meet at very short notice on occasions, and other committee members, busy as they are, had to fit in with the Premier's commitments. I think that the absence on the committee of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, the Minister responsible for this important legislation, was disgraceful and an insult to the Aboriginal community of South Australia.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in the debate, but I am rather sorry that the member for Spence's memory is so short. When this matter was before the House on a previous occasion and a Select Committee was being set up, the intention of the then Premier Dunstan was that he would be a member of that Select Committee. The only thing that prevented that from taking place was that he became ill in this House and was transferred to hospital, and he never resumed his seat in this House. I think the member for Spence has been slightly hypocritical in adopting the line he has adopted. He is aware that a Select Committee comprises five members, three from the Government and two from the Opposition.

However, there are more important matters in relation to Bill to be discussed. I think it is fair to say that the Bill as it now stands is a great improvement on the Bill introduced by the previous Government. It is a considerable improvement on the Bill as introduced by the Premier some time ago. No matter what legislation is passed by this House, the effects will not be known until it is put into operation. We can stand in this House and grandstand as much as we like, but the effects of this legislation are what counts. The important thing is how this legislation will affect the Pitjantjatjara people as a whole and the people of this State.

Throughout the sittings of the Select Committee I made no secret of the fact that I adopted a course of action to ensure that the rights of a minority group were protected, and I make no apologies for that. At the last State election I said (and people attempted to use it against me) that I would do my utmost to make sure that the traditional opal miners were protected. When the legislation was introduced, unfortunately it did not go anywhere near far enough. However, the 21-year miscellaneous lease which those people will now have does give them a reasonable measure of security. I think it is interesting to note the provisions of clause 25 (2) of the Bill, as follows:

> Subject to this section, persons of the following classes are entitled to enter and remain on the Mintabie precious stones field without permission under this Act—
>
> *(a)* persons who hold precious stones prospecting permits;

We all know that this Government took a conscious decision to declare the area a precious stones prospecting area, the third such area in South Australia, the others being Andamooka and Coober Pedy. That is something which the opal miners have desired for a long time. That declaration meant that any person who wanted to could go and mine there. However, there was a difficulty, because they had no guarantee that they would be able to continue occupation of their residences. We have known for a long time that it has been the policy of the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy not to encourage or permit people to live on mining tenements. It would have been an unfortunate course of action if that took place. However, now that the miners have been given the opportunity to lease their sites from the Government, the Crown, for 21 years, with a reasonable opportunity to renew their licences in the future, I sincerely hope the problem has been overcome.

We have been given certain assurances, and I think it is important that those assurances are read into *Hansard.* During the sittings of the Select Committee I asked a considerable number of questions of most witnesses. I do not know whether they were always happy with the line of questioning that I took, but I believe it is essential that members of the Select Committee seek as much information as possible from the people they call before it. Paragraph 10, on page 3 of the report, states:

> At page 60 of the transcript he [Mr. Toyne] remarked that, provided this condition was met, they can stay there until they are 85; there is no difficulty whatsoever.

I sincerely hope that, in the future, those people who wish perhaps to live the rest of their lives at Mintabie will be permitted to do so.

In relation to the other matter of contention, namely, public servants, I think it is an anomoly that, for instance,

a school teacher or any officer of the Public Service of South Australia who is appointed to an area does not have the automatic right to take the immediate members of his family with him. You can imagine what would happen if such a person is sent to an area that is included in the Bill and his family is not permitted to go with him. It is obvious there would not be too many public servants in the area. However, we have been given assurances by the legal representatives of the Pitjantjatjara people that there will be no problems in that regard. I sincerely hope that that will be the case.

During the time I have had the privilege of being the member of this House it has been made clear to me, and from my observations over a long time I have noticed, that many people have set out to make sure that I am painted as the worst villain on two legs who has ever been in the area. It has been a consistent campaign, which has been aided and abetted by certain friends of the Labor Party, that a deliberate attempt will be made to make sure that my name is dragged down as far as possible. That has not worried me particularly, because, in relation to this matter, I have always been straightforward and frank with the people. My desire from the outset has been to make sure that the traditional Aboriginal people are consulted and that their views are taken into consideration. My concern has been for their long-term welfare. It is still so, and it will be so in the future, because we are talking about a large area of South Australia which has considerable potential for pastoral activity. Also, obviously in the future there will be considerable mining activity within or adjacent to the area.

I believe that it is important that the views of the traditional people be taken into consideration, and that is why I was concerned to make sure that the membership of the corporate body which will be set up is large enough to give each of those communities an opportunity to have some representation, because I believe that it would be not only unfortunate but also undesirable if the membership of that corporate body was too small. I also believe it is essential to make sure that a considerable number of these people are involved in signing any documents in relation to the size of a quorum which has to be present before a committee meeting can be held.

For a long time we have been aware that the people in these areas have had a desire to have freehold title to their land. All of us desire to have the most secure title we can possibly have over any piece of land which we occupy or seek to occupy. I do not in any way condemn them for wanting to have the most secure title—it is human nature, but I think it should be clearly understood that, just because in the not-too-distant future a document is signed by His Excellency the Governor, that does not mean that all the problems facing the people in those areas will be overcome. We all know that that will not be the case. However, I sincerely hope that it will be a step which will give those people some dignity and will allow them to go about their own business in a manner which they desire.

However, I should point out that, if anyone thinks he can isolate himself in the area referred to in this Bill and completely shut himself off from the people of this State, he is not facing reality. I believe that in the future certain people will regularly want the opportunity to go through the area. I understand very clearly some of the reasons why the people involved want the right to have the final say whether members of the public can enter the lands. Also, having had the opportunity of travelling through the areas on a number of occasions (and I will do so again in future), I can understand why. There are a number of people in this State who also want the opportunity to visit the area, and they want to do so for a number of varied reasons.

I have had it brought to my attention that people have been refused permission, and I believe the grounds given for the refusal were not realistic. I think that those who have the responsibility for determining who can enter will have to be very careful when assessing who can or cannot enter. If an attempt is made to virtually put up a wall and prevent from entering nearly everyone who seeks entry to the area, I do not believe that the people of South Australia will tolerate that situation. No matter what course of action this Parliament takes, people must be fully aware that the next Parliament or subsequent Parliaments can amend or repeal any piece of legislation. I am not advocating that the next Parliament completely overturn this legislation, but I am endeavouring to be a realist in pointing out that unless people exercise privileges and authority sensibly, I believe attempts could be made to change the existing situation drastically.

During the consideration of this meaure a great deal of time was given to the problems at Mintabie. We have been told that no attempt would be made unduly to affect or interfere with the legitimate rights of those currently occupied with mining at Mintabie. I think it should be borne in mind that the Mintabie area has been established for a long time; I understand that people were mining there before the area at Indulkana was established, a fairly recent event. I understand that opal miners were operating at Mintabie well before that decision was made. There are people who have a historic claim to that area; of course they have not been in the area for as long as the Aboriginal communities have been. I fully accept that.

During the early stage of negotiations, a publicity campaign was organised, endeavouring to get people to come to the Government, to members of Parliament, demanding that the previous Bill be put through Parliament without amendment. Fortunately, people faced reality when the fact was brought to their attention that the previous Bill was not workable. The Crown Solicitor's report made completely obvious that the Bill was not properly drafted and that it was not possible to have it operate reasonably or effectively. It was also brought to the attention of this Government that members of the previous Labor Government were having second thoughts in relation to the full ramifications of this measure. One should bear in mind very closely the number of Parliamentary sitting days that that measure lay on the table of the House with no action taken to bring on the debate of the Select Committee's report. That was an interesting delay, the reason for which we have not had fully explained to us.

The Select Committee's report is one that I hope will be read by a large number of people. I hope that the Pitjantjatjara people accept the report in the spirit in which it was brought up. There has been a geniune attempt by many people to try to accommodate the aspirations, needs and wishes of all concerned. I suppose it is true to say that this legislation is an attempt to correct some of the injustices that many people believe have been perpetrated against the Aboriginal people ever since European settlement of South Australia. I think I commented at the time of the second reading debate that it would be unfortunate if we set out to right one set of injustices and created another, and I was referring to the people at Mintabie. I hope that we have gone far enough in solving the problems associated with that group of people.

I should make very clear that there will be significant problems if people are put off the Mintabie opal fields without very good reasons. It is no good people thinking

that the people at Mintabie and those associated with the mining interests are a group of people who have no rights. I believe that, if attempts are made to get rid of any miner who is carrying on responsibly, there will be very real problems that will be difficult to solve. I am not making threats or statements which are not fact. From my experience of having dealt with these people for nearly 11 years, I believe that what I am saying is a factual and responsible statement.

This piece of legislation has received much consideration; it has been the result of two Select Committees, which have been lengthy, as can be seen if one examines the evidence. A considerable amount of Parliamentary time has been put into this matter. I sincerely hope that the legislation operates in a way that will benefit all sections of the South Australian community. I sincerely hope that we do not find that we have overlooked matters to which we should have directed attention. Obviously, as time goes by we will probably find one or two anomalies that will have to be rectified by amendments. As one of the members of the committee who has been involved over a long time with this matter, I sincerely hope that the Bill operates in the way in which the Government intends it to operate. I hope that this legislation will benefit all sections of the South Australian community, because I do not believe that we should single out any group or make life unbearable to any section of the community.

Again, I emphasise that I have been very concerned about the effects that this legislation, as introduced, would have had on the people at Mintabie. I hope those problems are solved. I give notice that I intend regularly to monitor the situation there, and throughout the whole area. If it is found that there are difficulties, I intend to bring such matters to the attention of the Government. As time goes by, it may be necessary for the appropriate Minister to keep in close contact with the corporate body that will be set up to make sure that genuine benefits flow to the Aboriginal communities.

What we are doing is entrusting considerable powers to those people. I have said before and I will say again that I have had little trouble in the past from any sections in my area in dealing with Aboriginal communities. I have had some problems dealing with some of the people that have advised us. Also, it is interesting to observe some of the actions of these people. On various occasions, there have been deliberate attempts made to prevent me from talking to sections of the Aboriginal communities in those areas.

In relation to mining activity, I was concerned at the attempts that were made to unduly influence the Aboriginal communities at one centre in my district when people were setting out to obtain contracts to mine chrysophrase. I sincerely hope that the manner in which those negotiations took place will not be the way in which negotiations with other groups take place.

All that needs to be said is that the manner in which those negotiations were carried out was, in my view, unusual, and it appeared that an attempt was made to apply undue influence to the Aboriginal community. It is absolutely essential that, when the corporate body is negotiating with companies which may wish to enter into agreements to mine or to prospect in the lands, adequate consideration is given to the views of the local community.

I enjoyed sitting on the Select Committee, even though I had some fairly interesting discussions with my colleagues and others over a long time on this matter. It is fair to say that perhaps sufficient consideration was not given to one or two aspects of the Bill before its introduction to the House. I hope that the legislation meets the desires and the aspirations of those who have drawn it up and who have been responsible for its introduction and passage through this House. I shall look with interest at future developments, and I sincerely hope that the legislation will prove to be for the benefit of all sections of the South Australian community.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): As a member of the committee, I speak in support of the motion. It was unfortunate that, among some reasonably sensible and, on this occasion, rather more moderate remarks than we have often heard from him in the past, the member for Eyre resorted to one or two comments relating to the history of the previous Bill which was before the House. His remarks were entirely inaccurate, and served no useful purpose in the present debate. To suggest that in some way the previous Bill was delayed for reasons other than those which were out of the control of anyone is quite incorrect.

I have detailed the chronology more than once and, for the benefit of the honourable member, I repeat that the Bill was in this House in 1979. Early in that year, the then head of the Government, Don Dunstan, who had been responsible for the whole measure and who is clearly responsible for the fact that this Bill is here today, had to vacate the position he occupied. A change of leadership and all sorts of other factors out of the ordinary occurred in that year, and that is the only reason why the Bill was not passed in the form in which it was then before the House. I raise this matter only because the honourable member chose to resort to that sort of tactic in discussing the present report.

He also referred to the drafting of the previous Bill and suggested, quite gratuitously, that in some strange way he had had advice that led him to believe that the provisions of the other Bill would not have been workable. I suggest to the honourable member that the Bill now before the House is in exactly the same category. It has reached the stage where presumably it may or may not pass through both Houses, and then it gets a try. That is when we find out whether it works. That applies to all legislation, and all legislation is subject to challenge in areas outside of this Parliament. There was no major point in his putting that forward, either.

The member for Eyre tried to give the impression that he, as a committee member, was one of those more seriously concerned with the rights of a minority group and with seeing that they were protected. I think that this was a perhaps unintended slur on his own colleagues on the committee who were equally concerned to make sure that the rights of everyone were given proper consideration and that the best workable arrangement that we could arrive at would be that which has been presented to the House in the Bill.

As committee members, my colleague and I found difficulty, right from the beginning, in sitting in judgment on a Bill which was the result of circumstances I shall outline. I have in my hand a copy of the agreement which was signed between the Pitjantjatjara people and the Government of this State on 2 October 1980, and it states:

> This Bill is the Bill which has been agreed between the Government of the State of South Australia and the Pitjantjatjara Council Incorporated as being the Bill to be introduced into the Parliament of the State of South Australia for the purpose of granting land rights to the Pitjantjatjara people.

There are four Ministerial signatures affixed to that, headed by the signature of the Premier, and at the bottom is that of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. The common seal of the Pitjantjatjara Council appears, and it is signed by P. Thompson and Robert Stevens, who are office holders in the Pitjantjatjara Council Incorporated.

I found some difficulty in considering that any major alteration should be made to a Bill under the circumstances I have just outlined. Many Bills come before the House, but very few have that sort of prefix permanently attached, bearing the heavy weight of the signature of the Premier of the State and the body concerned, the Pitjantjatjara Council Incorporated, stating that those two groups have agreed that that is what should apply, and yet the Parliamentary process requires that, in its submission to a Select Committee, the Bill had to be subjected to further scrutiny, and that the committee concerned was to recommend to the House the results of those deliberations.

A natural query which would follow that would be why the committee did not just bring back the Bill in the original form. The Bill was the result of a special agreement reached after a long period of negotiation between the two parties concerned. The reason why the committee did not bring the Bill back in that form is probably best explained, among other reasons, by paragraph 16 in the report which has been given to the House and which states:

> Your committee's attention has been drawn to the fact that the settlement area at Mintabie and the proposed route for the Stuart Highway have been excised from the lands to be covered by the Bill.

What was the use of having in the Bill provisions relating to residential occupation in the Mintabie area when they have been excised? There was a reason that forced the committee to re-examine clauses such as clause 28.

In the examinations carried out by the committee, its members had submissions from the Miners Association at Mintabie, through its counsel, Mr. Frank Moran, and through direct representations, both in Adelaide and at Mintabie, to which the committee travelled. Representations were also made directly to the committee from the Pitjantjatjara Council Incorporated. If that had been the sole scene, I believe that the proceedings of the committee could have flowed somewhat more smoothly than they did. What in effect was happening on the council was in parallel with what I have outlined. Direct negotiations were proceeding between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara Council Incorporated, with the committee sitting alongside on the same matter. I have no quarrel with the fact that the Pitjantjatjara Council might have wished to continue to make submissions, and so on. Some difficulty appeared in the early stages because of that kind of procedure. Within a few meetings, that was remedied largely when regular reporting to the committee occurred from those representatives of the Government who were carrying on the discussion with the representatives of the Pitjanjatjara people, and so we were able to proceed.

Previous speakers, including the Premier, have indicated clearly to the House that the amendments brought forward are really in two categories. There are amendments of a procedural, drafting and tidying nature, which were inserted, with foreknowledge, by the committee before bringing its report into the House, agreement to those changes having already been reached by that parallel discussion process with the Pitjantjatjara Council. Many of these amendments are of a minor nature. One of the amendments, which increases the number of people on the executive by two, was referred to by the member for Eyre, and I suggest that the honourable member's explanation for his agreement to the increase from eight to 10, in addition to a Chairman, displayed more than a trace of that paternalism that is to be abhorred in these matters. The honourable member said that in his opinion the increase would provide for greater representation for various communities from within the area of the lands concerned.

The honourable member should not be excused for making such a statement because, as the member for the area, he is familiar with the fact that the consultation process that takes place on any of these matters concerning the Pitjantjatjara people goes to very great lengths to ensure that all people in the area of the lands concerned are given as much information as possible. They certainly expect and have the right, as far as I have been able to observe as an outsider while visiting the area, to put forward their viewpoint on any of these matters. To suggest that in some way a bunch of people on a Select Committee can say, "They really ought to have 10 members", and that this will be an improvement, for the reasons given by the member for Eyre, does not hold water. I agreed to the increase to 10 because we were given the foreknowledge that that increase was acceptable to the Pitjantjatjara people, and that is the only reason why I believed any change should be brought back to the House in the form of an amendment. I was perfectly happy to leave in the hands of the Pitjantjatjara people the fact that there would be eight members and a Chairman of the committee, and I have no doubt whatsoever that they could have handled the matter just as competently with the eight members as with the 10 now provided.

The amendments were in two categories. There were two areas which at that stage in our deliberations did not necessarily involve amendments but about which it was known and expected that there would be a difference of opinion with the Pitjantjatjara Council in relation to possible amendments made by the committee. The first has been referred to by at least one speaker, and that is the requirement for permission to enter the lands, as defined in the Bill, for families of Government officers, who automatically have access to the area by right of their employment or pursuant to Statute, as expressed in the Bill. I am glad to be able to say that the committee did not make amendments in that area. It may well be that I have had a longer period of assurance from the people comprising the Pitjantjatjara Council than have other members. Long ago, since my first early contacts with the Pitjantjatjara people and my observations of the way in which they operate, I had no doubt that they would operate in a reasonable, lawful and sensible way, so that this matter did not present the great problem to me that it might have presented to other members.

We then came to the Mintabie opal field portion of the Bill. The viewpoint put forward by the mining people, both in Adelaide and at Mintabie during our visit, was not unreasonable: it was sensible and had a certain amount of logic behind it. It was not all logical, but we, as people, are not always logical. The point of view was put forward in a good way, and I particularly recall evidence given at Mintabie by Mrs. Kimber and Mrs. Ailsa Soldo, for example, two women on the field, who were perhaps able to give different evidence from what one might expect from a man who is engaged full time in the process of mining for opal. I believe that their evidence, for that reason, had additional value, because it came from the wives of men living on the field who were concerned with every matter, including the battle to live daily in the area. I know that one or two members of the committee who had not been to such areas, including the member for Rocky River, were very frank in discussion on the committee as to how worth while the visit to Mintabie was, because they could see the conditions under which people live in such areas, pioneering, as it were, mining, and so on.

We also had to consider the fact that, by this time, intentions had been indicated to counsel for the

Pitjantjatjara people with respect to what might be proposed as a compromise position in regard to what should apply at Mintabie. The nitty gritty of the matter comes down to the fact that the miners were not prepared (and they are the right words) to have their leases held in the hands of the Pitjantjatjara people. It may be that their reasons are not sensible, substantial or logical, but that is the way they felt, and their point of view was put to us most strongly.

Equally as sensibly and logically the Pitjantjatjara people, through their counsel, related to us that, because they are and will be a properly constituted body that will act in accordance with the laws of the State, including this legislation, and because they will not act capriciously or unreasonably with respect to the issuing of leases, they have the right to expect to be able to issue licences as a result of the passage of this Bill. The committee was faced with that dilemma.

I believe that the suggestion we have now put forward in the form of an amendment may please neither side fully, but it is a sensible and workable approach for the following reasons. First, the miners at Mintabie will have no initial change in their situation. They have been subject to annual leases and renewals, and that will continue. Secondly, as was put to us by some people in that area in relation to obtaining finance and making long-term plans and so on, people will have a longer tenure than was originally proposed in the Bill. There is now the possibility of leases being granted for five years, so these people will be in a better position than before for 21 years. Those remarks are to be construed as looking at the situation from the miners' viewpoint.

Regarding the Pitjantjatjara Council, I believe it would be presumptuous of me to say that I can understand how the members of the council feel about this matter, because I do not have the cultural background and the long affinity with the lands concerned that they have as their birthright, but I also trust that they would believe me when I say that, in trying to understand how they might feel about the matter, it was my view that, to be presented with a proposition that goes beyond that which they were prepared to countenance for a shorter period, and only under the pressure of the negotiating that was going on, at least they are not required to be divested of that area of land, which comprises the residential field area at Mintabie. In a sense, they will be, with the passage of the legislation, owners who have granted a lease back to the Government for the purpose concerned. In trying to understand how they might feel about the matter, I believe I can say that that is some sort of improvement over the former proposition. As I pointed out, the land about which there was so much discussion was not in the Bill to which they agreed. It does not matter whether that was as a result of error, or departments not telling each other what they were doing, or some other reason—those were the circumstances. I ask people to take that into account in working out why the Select Committee came to the conclusions it reached in this matter.

Also, looking at the matter from the point of view of the Pitjantjatjara Council, I believe there is at least one lease at Granite Downs, whereby a transfer may not be effected until 2008. The 21 years proposed in the Bill is short of that period. In trying to understand how it might appear to the Pitjantjatjara people, I suggest that there is some advantage there.

Another advantage, which should not be given any more weight than necessary, is that rentals previously payable for leases to the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku have been covered in the relevant amending clause. Provision has been made for those rentals to be made available and payable to the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

It cannot be denied that there have been losses for the Pitjantjatjara people. In the old clause 28, some provisions recognised that the Pitjantjatjara are a responsible group who would act in a way with which no-one could find fault. Under that old clause 28, they were accordingly given certain powers and rights. If members examine that old clause, they will then see that no compensation provisions will apply in future should this Bill, as amended, become law. Under the old clause, in the case of a person required to leave the residential section of the field by the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, the compensation provisions would apply. The committee gave much consideration to this, but felt that the security of tenure offered, on the other side of the equation, meant that the compensation provision could no longer apply.

I refer also to the rushed way in which committee members have had to cope with fairly complex problems over the past couple of weeks. This is not necessarily a criticism, because I can understand the sorts of reasons that have caused this. The Premier has great demands on his time. As he was Chairman of the committee, times of meetings had to be tailored to suit him. Secondly, we undertook to report to the House today. I respect the fact that the Premier endeavoured to meet that deadline, but it was not easy for committee members always to be available at required times. At a critical meeting last night, one member on this side of the House had to leave, because of other commitments, in the middle of what might be called the deliberation stage. That is where we get stuck into one another and have knockdown dragout arguments about a reasonable compromise.

The member for Eyre said there had been considerable discussion within the committee, and that is a reasonable statement. I do not know whether the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku felt that it might have been possible for a later date to be arranged to report to the House, so that negotiations in relation to leasing on the field might not have been so rushed. Possibly committee members, assisted by submissions from Mintabie miners, officers assisting the committee, and the Pitjantjatjara people, might have arrived at more acceptable provisions for the term of the lease term, or some other solution. We did the best that we could, in the circumstances.

The difficulty in getting information from representatives in Adelaide back to the north-west area was fully understood by all committee members. That had no little bearing on some of the difficulties encountered at the last few meetings of the committee, at which propositions and counter-propositions were the order of the day. No real concensus could be arrived at in some cases, and we had to operate on what might be acceptable when further instructions were received, and so on. That did not make it easy for the committee to be certain that it was making the right decision. Nevertheless, in the circumstances we made a decision that was fair to the parties concerned. It may not be the best one. Taking into account the threats made 12 months ago about what may have happened, unless certain things occurred, I believe that the change in climate in that period has been to the benefit of all concerned and to the legislation, should it pass in the form now before us. For that reason, I support the motion.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): It is with some considerable pleasure that I see this Bill restored to the House and ready to make further progress. Despite the very worst predictions levelled against this Government's potential performance in the field of Aboriginal land rights when we assumed Government,

under the leadership of the Premier we have shown ourselves not only willing but eager to make progress, and to consult with the Aboriginal people. If there is any adverse comment about the way in which some of the final Select Committee meetings have appeared to be a little rushed, I suggest that there was no ulterior motive in that, but rather a recognition by the Premier and Government that not only the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, but also the Government itself, were very anxious to see this legislation proceed and become part of the South Australian Statute Book.

It is obvious to all of us that members of not one but two Select Committees have exhaustively researched and ultimately tried to resolve problems in the best possible manner. While it may at some stages have seemed to the Pitjantjatjara people themselves that Select Committee work was in fact a deferral of the passage of this legislation, it should be made clear that Select Committee consideration of a Bill of this nature is essential to comply with South Australia's legislative procedure.

As a member of the initial Select Committee I have no hesitation in saying that the considerable amount of evidence which was given to it added greatly to my own background information on the Pitjantjatjara people and certainly enriched my knowledge of their way of life. However, ultimately the legislation has been achieved only with the co-operation of a great many people and literally after hundreds of hours of deliberation, many of these hours between the present South Australian Cabinet itself and the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku Council not only in Adelaide but also in the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku territory. The present Government showed that it was willing to move as a Cabinet away from the capital city and was ready to negotiate and deliberate with the Pitjantjatjara people in their homeland. I am sure that people across the world will welcome the fact that such agreements can be arrived at and can be achieved by quiet rational negotiation, and I express the fervent hope that all South Australians will support the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and the Government in ensuring that the legislation works to the best advantage of all South Australians.

I am specially pleased that the Mintabie residents and the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku have on a number of occasions expressed the wish to continue living and working together harmoniously, and it is a matter worthy of note that the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku have quite determinedly sought to preserve their cultural heritage, while at the same time the Pitjantjatjara Council members have shown a willingness to recognise the broader issues facing the South Australian Government and have been willing to seek compromise.

Reference was made specifically to the Premier's presence as Chairman of the final Select Committee. I do not feel slighted in any way by having been excluded. I was a member of the previous Select Committee, which did much work towards bringing the legislation initially to the House. I think the Premier's presence on the final committee certainly accorded to that committee the status that it deserved, because the Pitjantjatjara councillors are in fact leaders in their own right and it was only fair and just that the South Australian Government should be represented at the top level. Indeed, leaders of the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Government have consistently been represented at high level negotiations over the years.

At the same time, I point out that, apart from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, many other Ministers were quite critically involved in negotiations, not the least of whom were the Premier, the Minister of Health, the Attorney-General, the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Environment, and the Minister of Mines and Energy. In addition to that, they committed the resources of their departments. Cabinet and the whole of the Government were quite ready to go along and negotiate at all stages, from Ministerial to officer level. Much of the very important work was done at officer level. We would not have managed to get the legislation so far without that tremendous degree of co-operation, which was extended and which will continue to be extended, I hope, into the Opposition ranks as well.

It has been a quite remarkable example of high-level co-operation and collaboration between the Government and the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. Having served on the previous Select Committee, in company with the member for Eyre, I applaud the fact that the Bill has now returned to the House in final form, and I hope that it has a swift passage through both Houses.

Comments have been made briefly about the member for Eyre. I stress that never at any stage have I found him to be at all paternal or patronising towards the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku peoples. Indeed, he has always treated them as a mature, well-organised group. He has always expressed great sympathy towards their cause. At the same time, as the member for the largest electorate in South Australia, he has tried equally to give fair representation to protect all members of his electorate, and it has not been an easy task.

Now that the Bill is almost ready to enter the Committee stage, it would be appropriate to bring to the attention of the House that not only have members of Government and Opposition been closely involved in bringing the legislation to this stage but also that people outside the Government, the people in the remote outback areas and other bodies in Adelaide, have also been called in and asked to co-operate in this achievement. Not the least of that recognition should go to the people who have for probably a century shared tenure in that remote Far North of the State with the Pitjantjatjara and other Aboriginal peoples. I am referring to the landholders, the United Farmers and Stockowners Association members, who have also come to know the land and to respect it. They have been called upon in some cases to sacrifice, in other cases simply to co-operate, but certainly they have entered into the spirit of this legislation and the negotiations to a high degree. We are particularly indebted to the MacLachlan family, who have been called upon more than any others to co-operate and to negotiate with the Pitjantjatjara people and with the State and Federal Governments.

Perhaps it would be appropriate, too, while mentioning the work of the present Premier, who assumed leadership of the Select Committee and has done much to steer the legislation to the present stage, to mention the work of the past Premier, who also introduced an initial Bill into the House which has been subject to some amendment at the hands of two Select Committees and under negotiation with the Pitjantjatjara people. We must also go back well beyond that to the days of Sir Thomas Playford, who was far-sighted enough to recognise that the Aboriginal people should be granted land rights and, indeed, first allocated the Far North-West Reserve and committed his Government of the day to certain courses of action which had taken 30 years to bring to the present state of fruition.

We have received the report of a Select Committee. After studying it, I recognise that there have continued to be some dilemmas facing that committee. Some problems were presented, even at the eleventh hour, problems which I hope have been largely resolved, but perhaps the closing words of the Select Committee in the last two or

three paragraphs bear out the hopes that are borne along by this legislation. They are optimistic words:

> The committee has given considerable weight to assurances given on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara Council . . .

There is a higher measure of trust in that statement. The report continues:

> Your committee was impressed by the level of optimism and enthusiasm expressed by witnesses with regard to the operation of the Bill when it is enacted into law. Clearly there is a high level of goodwill towards its implementation . . . Your committee believes that the goodwill shown in its hearings will, indeed, persist when the Bill comes into force with consequent benefit to the Pitjantjatjara, other interests affected by the Bill and the people of South Australia as a whole.

I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have not been included in any way in the negotiations which the Select Committee has had with the Pitjantjatjara people. I was not a member of the Select Committee and, therefore, have not been privy to all that has been going on. It is only since the report was tabled this afternoon that I have had any reaction to the report. There is only one matter that needs to be discussed, and that is the question of a lease of 15 or 21 years. Already there has been mention of this by other members.

I do not detract from the work done by the Select Committee and all the complimentary things that members have been saying about each other. Let that all remain said. However, there is, as I find during the last hour since the report was tabled, some disappointment and disquiet on the part of the representatives of the council that the period has been made 21 years and not 15 years. Until the report was tabled this afternoon they thought that in fact it was going to be a 15-year period. That was as a result of discussions, I think, as late as last night or this morning. They now find that without further consultation with them, and at the last moment so far as they are concerned, the period has been lengthened to 21 years. It is a great pity that any sour note should have crept into this apparent reconciliation of views.

As I say, I have not been a party to the negotiations, and I have not studied in detail the provisions of the Bill, either in its original form or as it has been amended because there has been no need for me to do so. However, as I understand it, the Mintabie question has been the last sticking point of agreement, and the idea which is embodied in the recommended amending clause 28 is to lease the residential area of two square kilometres to the Crown and then for the Crown to be able to deal with the miners and others who at present are living at Mintabie.

The council took the view that 15 years for the term of that lease was long enough, and I am told that it has been anticipated by the council (although who can tell what will happen in 15 years time) that in accord with the general scheme of the Bill, which allows for leases of up to five years to others than the Crown (as I understand it, leases to the Crown can be longer than that), but there would be a lease of five years thereafter granted either to individual miners or to whoever might be appropriate. However, now we find that at the last moment that has been ignored and the views of the council have been ignored, and the period has been made 21 years. It is perhaps a pity, Mr. Deputy Speaker that you are in the Chair, but it is perfectly obvious from the speech that the Premier made in tabling the report this afternoon that this has been done at your insistence, because this is what he said:

> I should add that the committee took this unanimous view very largely because of the insistence of one member of the committee, who, as honourable members know, has a deep and abiding concern for the future of the Mintabie community and its people.

It does not mention your name, but it sufficiently identifies you, as the member for Eyre, as the member who has insisted on this being done. If I may put it in another way, not in quite the polite language of the Premier, it looks to me as though you have held the gun at the Select Committee's head—gun, get the pun?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not in any way reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not reflecting on you in your capacity as Deputy Speaker. I cannot accept this situation and it is a matter which can be argued, if you like, but in my view 15 years was the appropriate term. In due course I propose to move an amendment to the clause, if I get an opportunity, to reduce the period from 21 years to 15 years. If I may say through you, Mr. Speaker, now that you have resumed the Chair again, to my friends the member for Mitchell and the member for Spence, who served on the Select Committee as representatives of their Party, what I should have thought they could do in the circumstances if they were unwilling to give way on this matter was to bring in a minority report on this point alone.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That is in hindsight though, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it has been done very frequently. Select Committees can bring, and have in this place brought, in minority reports. I can remember one in which I was engaged (of course, it was well before the member for Mitchell was a member of this House) on the fluoridation of the water supplies of this State. There was a minority report of two members and a majority report of three members. What the member for Spence and the member for Mitchell could have done was to bring in, even this morning, a minority report saying that they thought 15 years was the proper time. Then, of course (and this is the important thing), the members of their Party, both in this House and even more importantly in another House, would not be bound by the fact that we have a unanimous report here and their own members have agreed to a 21-year term.

It is a pity that happened, and no doubt there is some explanation which will be internal to the Labor Party as to why it did not happen. In my view that would have been the way out of the dilemma, if it was a dilemma for the member for Mitchell and the member for Spence, but they did not want to take it. Well, it is too late now, but I hope that their own Party (and I know that the Leader of the Opposition is going to speak in a few minutes on this) will not feel absolutely bound, because of what these two members have done, to stick to the 21-year period. I hope they will feel able to support me in this House in moving an amendment to reduce that time from 21 years to 15 years.

That is the only jarring note, as I understand it, in the whole thing, and I am very pleased indeed that apart from this matter the Bill has been brought to a stage where it is acceptable to everyone. I hope that despite this it will be passed through both Houses of Parliament this week, as I know the Government wants it to do. I think it would be a pity if in the rush to get it through we were to leave the one jarring note sounding in the Bill.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the report of the Select Committee and the legislation that is currently before this House. Before commenting on the report of the Select Committee, I want to make one or two

comments. First, in relation to the member for Mitcham's comments about the term of the lease being 21 years, could I suggest to him that, after the report was tabled, had he been present in the House during the period of the debate by members of the committee he would have been acquainted with the reasons why the committee unanimously supported a 21-year lease. Indeed, the member for Mitchell pointed up the fact that the 21-year term is equivalent to a miscellaneous lease. It falls part way between the expiration of the first term and the long-term lease in relation to Granite Downs, and therefore is, as a number of factors in relation to the Bill have been, a negotiated compromise.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

Mr. OLSEN: I said that a number of factors in this Bill have been the result of a negotiated compromise. In the view of the committee, this was a reasonable compromise in the circumstances. I point out to the House that it was the unanimous view of the committee. I take exception to the remarks of the member for Mitcham that a gun was pointed at the head of any member of the committee to come in with a unanimous report or to select a particular term for that lease. Even I, with a short Parliamentary experience, was aware that a minority vote could have been taken by a member or a group of members of the committee. I take exception to his preaching to me about what could or could not be done. It was not the case. I was fully aware that the opportunities were available. In the circumstances, and with the long deliberations of the committee, they were not warranted, because it was the unanimous view of the committee that 21 years was the appropriate term considering the views of both parties.

This Bill is about protecting the interests of minority groups within our community, and the Mintabie miners are a minority group within the community. I hope that the member for Mitcham has taken, in discussions with the Mintabie opal miners, an amount of time equal to that which he has had with members of the Pitjantjatjara Council, because both are minority groups within the community deserving of equal consideration in relation to aspects of the Bill.

Comments have been made in relation to the excision of the land; in fact, the excision of the 2·2 square kilometres referred to previously in the debate was done by the former Government several months before the Tonkin Government came to power.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In 1980.

Mr. OLSEN: It was prior to the Tonkin Government's coming to power. The Hon. J. R. Cornwall was the Minister responsible for the excision from the area of the 2·2 square kilometres. I refer to the comments made in relation to the pressure on the committee and the remarks by the member for Mitchell regarding the Premier's chairing of the committee. The fact that the Premier was Chairman of the committee underscores the importance the Government places on this measure and the fact that it is intent on seeing the measure on the Statute Book. I think the case was very well put by the Minister of Education in his analogy between leaders of Government and leaders of the Pitjantjatjara Council.

Additionally, this is a unique piece of legislation, and obviously a unique set of circumstances applied to the negotiations during the discussions and deliberations of the Select Committee. I am sure that members opposite would not deny that it was appropriate that there should be a unique set of circumstances pertaining to these negotiations and discussions with the Pitjantjatjara Council during the period in which the Select Committee was sitting.

The Bill is a significant piece of legislation that indicates the reaching of a meaningful compromise. From 2 October, when the Premier signed the Bill, that meaningful negotiation, the compromise that was reached, will establish as a hallmark in this country and, indeed, internationally the basis of looking after the interests of such groups. However, I would like to point out to the House several comments made in evidence to the committee which I think underscore the wide-ranging viewpoints within the committee on the subject and indicate the very difficult task of reaching a compromise in relation to legislation of this nature. I shall quote several comments from the evidence, not to give credit or to condemn but to point out the wide-ranging viewpoints expressed to the committee. One comment was this:

> It would be interesting to see the outcome of land rights claimed in the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

To the other viewpoint:

> Turning back the clock to the enviable days of uninterrupted occupation of the land.

And yet another view:

> One must always keep in mind that 110 000 square kilometres will pass to the Aborigines if this Bill is indicated, as opposed to the paltry 2·2 square kilometres to be left to miners after 30 years of occupation.

I stress that I quoted those extracts from the evidence not to give credit to or to condemn anyone, but to indicate the wide-ranging viewpoints within the community and the evidence to the committee. Therefore, the meaningful negotiated settlement of this difficult and, indeed, controversial issue is to the credit of the Government, and it indicates that compromise was necessary. The role of the Select Committee and the amendments proposed to the Bill I see as the fine tuning of the provisions of the original Bill. Credit must go to the Premier and his advisers for their obvious patience, their perseverance, their tolerance, and their determination to obtain an equitable result to such a potentially difficult question.

I couple with that those advisers and members of the Pitjantjatjara Council. I believe that the Government and the representatives of the Pitjantjatjara Council can look with satisfaction, in this first term of the Tonkin Government, at the establishment of such a breakthrough in relations and understanding, the hallmark of the calibre and intention of the Government. I am sure that is how this measure will be held, not only in South Australia but across the nation and internationally. For those who made the comment, on the election of the Tonkin Liberal Government, that the sky would fall in, the true credibility of this Government has come to the fore in its performance, and the placing of this Bill on the Statute Book, one would hope, with a minimum of delay during the course of this week.

On the one hand, the Bill provides the means to protect and preserve the culture of the Pitjantjatjara people. That protection is by way of the conference to which I have referred. It will also establish guidelines for exploration and mining, and I think I should indicate another quote from the evidence put before the Select Committee, as follows:

> It should be made clear that the Pitjantjatjara Council has indeed a regional policy and a long-term desire to take over the responsibility for all community services and to that end apply royalty moneys.

That is a commendable objective. The formula whereby the royalties will be split so that one-third will go to the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, one-third to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs for health, welfare, and the like, and one-third to the State is an achievement. I believe that that is an appropriate way of splitting royalties of this nature.

The Action for World Development, in its evidence to

the committee, made several important points, one of which was as follows:

> Because it is white society which dominates the human culture of this country and holds political and economic power, we feel that it is necessary for whites to make special efforts to learn this sensitivity and respect, and that there is now an onus on whites to show concern for, and commitment to, building just relationships with Aboriginal people. We believe that many Aboriginal people will show some response to such attempts to build better relationships and that racial hostility will then be recognised and to some extent dissolved.

It continued:

> We wish to strongly affirm our support for the ways in which this Bill has built understanding between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara, and the ways in which both parties came together to talk and listen to each other.

Further evidence was tendered to the committee by the Department of Mines and Energy in relation to the provisions of the Bill, and the department's support for the proper relationship that will be established between mineral explorers and traditional land owners. I believe that, given good will on both sides, the Bill can proceed and the provisions of the Bill can be enacted with reasonable aspirations for, and benefits flowing to, both parties.

It has been said that there were several difficult areas, one in relation to the Mintabie fields and the other in relation to the rights of entry of Government workers' families. Regarding the latter point, appropriate and well-founded evidence tendered to the committee was to the effect that, if a Government officer is required as part of his duties to be resident on the Pitjantjatjara lands, it seems to follow that he should have an automatic right to be joined by members of his family. Previous speakers have also said that staffing officers would be placed in an invidious position if they had to appoint a teacher, subject to the teacher's family being able to get a permit to accompany him or her to that area.

The Pitjantjatjara people objected to an amendment to the Bill to allow that automatic right, and I take the point that was raised by the member for Mitchell in relation to paternalism, when he said that this matter could be determined by the council. The committee agreed with the approach of the Pitjantjatjara Council and the representations made to the committee by the council's representatives on the basis of the undertaking that was given to the committee in this regard. As with all such pieces of legislation, a degree of goodwill and faith must be to the fore, and I believe that the Select Committee accepted the goodwill, faith and sincerity with which the representatives of the Pitjantjatjara Council put to the committee the need for the council to be involved in that area.

The second area of concern was in relation to the Mintabie precious stones field. I think it is fair to say that this was the subject of detailed discussions in the Select Committee. I appreciated the opportunity, as a member of the Select Committee, to visit Mintabie and Indulkana last Friday to see the areas about which we were talking. I commend what the member for Eyre has done in terms of supporting the rights of the minority group—the Mintabie miners. The committee, by unanimous decision, supported that view. I have already referred to the fact that the miners are a minority group, as are the Pitjantjatjara people. Certainly, their claim does not have the obvious deep seated emotional basis of the Pitjantjatjara people's claim, but the compromise of the 21 years gives reasonable security of tenure to those on the Mintabie field, some of whom have been there for up to 30 years, while at the same time not compromising unsatisfactorily the rights of the Pitjantjatjara Council to, at the earliest opportunity, assume control over that land.

I noted the comments made by the Pitjantjatjara people's counsel, Mr. Toyne, who made submissions to the committee, in relation to access of Government workers' families and Government officers, and the anticipated negotiable five-year lease after the expiry of the 21-year lease to the Crown. In relation to the Mintabie people, it could be expected that there would be renewable security of tenure, but that decision will be left to the Pitjantjatjara Council at the cessation of the 21-year term. In that respect, the interests of both parties have been served.

There was a bi-partisan approach by members of the Select Committee, who should be commended, because it was obvious from the deliberations that there was a real desire for the matter to be resolved and this measure to be implemented at the earliest opportunity. In the spirit of the undertakings given by Mr. Toyne, I am sure that agreements will be adhered to by the Pitjantjatjara Council in the future.

As I have said, with all such measures there must be a degree of goodwill and faith by all parties. I recognise the right of Parliament to ensure that this legislation will work in the best interests of all, and that any anomalies that may occur in the workings of the Bill in the future can be corrected. However, I have no doubt that we have laid the ground work for the positive implementation of a land rights Bill that can be a hallmark in this State and throughout Australia. This Government is the first to introduce a measure that has such wide-reaching justification and offers such justice to all groups in the community into a Parliament in this country. I commend the measure, and I support the committee report.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition, at the second reading stage, indicated its support for the agreement that had been reached between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara people, and has indicated its agreement in this debate in regard to the report of the Select Committee, on which two of our members were represented. First, I refer to the worst predictions, to which I think the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs referred when speaking about the Government's attitude to land rights. There has been quite a bit of congratulation on the Government side over this Bill. Indeed, there was a very high level of congratulation back in October when the agreement was signed, and it is a congratulation in which we join. I think it is as well to temper that congratulation, first, by pointing to the fact that, whatever agreement the present Government has reached, it is one based on agreements formulated and negotiated by a previous Government; and, secondly, that this agreement has taken considerable time to finalise, and it got off to a particularly bad start.

It is true that the worst predictions, as the Minister terms it, would have been realised if the Government had continued in the negotiating vein with which it began its term of office in the first six to nine months. They were marked by extraordinary negotiating ploys—plans being announced to allow mineral exploration on Aboriginal lands; a hastily unrepresentative committee was established and announced; there was the announcement by the Minister of Mines and Energy that mining exploration licences could be conditionally applied for, and so on. It all culminated in the extremely dramatic confrontation between the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Government on Victoria Park racecourse. It is worth pointing out that throughout that time the Opposition was very much to the forefront in organising, not just in this community,

widespread support for the Pitjantjatjara case. That went nationally, and even to the extent of bringing the matter to some international attention.

Many people have been involved in the issue. I refer to the sort of negotiating pressure and climate created early last year. I pay tribute to the role played by the media which, despite attempts by the Premier himself to interfere with the reportage of the issue in that famous letter sent to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, with copies to the Managing Director and the Chairman in order to put maximum pressure and intimidation on the reporters concerned, did not react but continued to report the issue fearlessly and openly.

It is just as well that happened, and just as well that, after the self-congratulation, particularly of the Minister and the member for Rocky River, we should recall it on this occasion. A climate of opinion was created, and that climate of opinion is a good one. After that initial false and terrible start, the Government got down to realistic negotiations. I certainly think that things improved when the Premier himself took a very active role in the proceedings. While, as the member for Spence has pointed out, his chairmanship of the Select Committee caused a number of problems with time tables, and so on, as far as the committee was concerned, nonetheless, the Premier was very much to the forefront of negotiations. I think it was appropriate and fortunate that he was. From that time, I suggest that there was a considerable change in the Government's approach.

The agreement announced in October was one that we welcomed as being reached between the two parties. We indicated at that stage that we, as an Opposition, would not stand in the way of any agreement that was freely and properly negotiated. I might add that the attitude of the current Government in this area is in stark contrast to that of conservative Governments in Queensland and Western Australia. Again, the Government deserves congratulation for the sensitivity it has displayed in this issue, in contrast to those other Governments.

However, it is still true that it has taken a while for the Bill to reach this stage. The Premier introduced it following the agreement signed on 23 October 1980. In his second reading explanation he said that the Bill overcame the serious problems, which he claimed were embodied in the previous legislation, with detailed provisions which were clear and precise. He went on to say that the measure resulted from extensive and intensive discussion, and, ultimately, agreement, and, because of its importance, not only to the Pitjantjatjara people, but also to the whole question of relationships with Aborigines in this State, he urged that it be considered without delay.

Parliament did not have another opportunity to consider it for a bit over a month. It was 25 November before debate was resumed; I am not sure why that delay occurred. In the second reading debate we indicated that we were prepared to facilitate this measure in any way that the Government wished. I think that has been demonstrated by the participation of our two members in the committee. Then, it appears that more snags arose.

I can understand that there must be some concern on the part of the Pitjantjatjara that, having signed an agreement which was announced with all the flurry that the media could muster, we went through a further protracted committee process in which fairly major issues arose—major not so much in their breadth, but in terms particularly of the Mintabie mining community. We can recall questioning the Minister of Mines and Energy closely about this aspect of the agreement some days before it was announced that the document would be signed. The Minister shrugged off those questions in the Estimates Committee. In fact, he treated the committee with some contempt, because he well knew at that time that agreement was very close and he gave the committee absolutely no indication or hint of that, despite detailed questioning.

But the issue of the Mintabie miners that we were raising quite legitimately, in the context of where they fitted in with this agreement, was simply shrugged off. We were informed that there was no problem with that group; everything had been organised as far as they were concerned; they had been adequately consulted; there had been a meeting with their representatives, and we were not to worry about it. That proved not to be so. The whole hitch, in relation to the Select Committee, was over that group. So, it is as well to remember that this House has, in a sense, been misled over the course of these negotiations. If this House has been misled, I suggest that at times the Pitjantjatjara Council has been misled, not in all cases deliberately, but, certainly, whether the Government intended it or not, there has been considerable confusion about just where they stood, and particularly in relation to the Mintabie issue in the past couple of months.

The member for Eyre has played a very prominent role in this whole matter, as he should, because his constituency covers the area in question. We on this side have suggested on a number of occasions, with some basis, that he should recall that his constituents include not just white settlers living in the area of his electorate but also the original people who live there. I congratulate him for taking part in this Select Committee proceeding in what appears to be, when one looks at the report, an extremely constructive manner. I would think my colleagues on the committee, from what they have said, believe that in most respects the member for Eyre's role was useful and one in which he genuinely attempted to compromise in some areas. As a result, a unanimous report has come from the committee.

I think he rather marred that by some of the remarks he made in the course of the debate. It appears that he just cannot come to terms with the fact that the Pitjantjatjara Council is a body fully capable of conducting its own affairs and negotiating adequately. His rather paternal attitude was shown in a passage of his speech when he lectured the council on behaving sensibly. He implied that in future the legislation could be changed, and showed a basic lack of understanding, I suggest, in references to a comparison between Mintabie and Indulkana, and how long these settlements were there. If one is talking in time scale that is just ridiculous, because the time scale we are looking at in these particular lands is, in Anglo-Saxon legal terms, time immemorial, dating back many thousands of years, certainly before the law contemplated the State of South Australia or defined by law the area of the Pitjantjatjara people. To talk about two settlements and their respective ages simply means misses the point. While I believe the member for Eyre has played a constructive role on the committee, I think he still demonstrates to this House that he needs to study and develop a little more sympathy and basic understanding for the Aboriginal constitutents of his area.

The main point at issue in the committee's report appears to be the question of the head lease to the Crown, whether it be for 15 years or 21 years. We are talking, in other words, about a period of six years. The Pitjantjatjara Council members have consulted amongst themselves, and their stand is that a 15-year lease is desirable and, in fact, what they want, and they have not backed away from that position. That is something they put strongly to the committee with their supporting arguments. If one looks at some of the extracts of evidence in the report, it can be

seen that reference is made to a 15-year lease. I think we on this side of the House are under no illusions that that is what the council wants.

We are going to support the report of the Select Committee. It could be asked whether that is consistent with the stand we have taken that we would support any agreement the Pitjantjatjara people came to with the Government, because, in this respect, they cannot agree. I believe it is consistent because when one reaches the stage of actually embodying an agreement in legislation, in this case following a Select Committee inquiry, we are in a situation where members of the committee, which is an all-Party committee, obviously have quite divergent views. The views of the member for Eyre are well known on the one hand, and the views, I suspect of the members for Spence and Mitchell, particularly the member for Mitchell, because of his active role both as a Minister and as a member of the previous Select Committee, are also well known. In some respects those views are poles apart, but they have come together in the form of this committee report.

It really is a question for the Opposition of what is possible and what is the best deal that the Pitjantjatjara Council can get out of this measure. There is only one area of disagreement and that involves the argument about a difference of six years in the duration of a lease. If in fact minority reports were to come from the committee, as was suggested by the member for Mitcham—let us say our members advocating 15 years—then the majority report from the committee could well have been different because the spirit of compromise that was necessary in the committee deliberations would not have been present. The assessment of those of our members on the committee, both of whom with considerable experience in this matter, was that, in order to have the Government, which after all has the numbers in this House, supporting a fixed term, very close to that which was asked for by the council, it was their duty, if you like, to take part in a concensus in a unanimous exercise.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think the Government would have got it over in the Upper House?

Mr. BANNON: The member for Mitcham interjects concerning the Upper House. The fact is that, if this was the only point of disagreement and if indeed the Hon. Mr. Milne could have been relied on to support the Opposition in relation to this and stick to the end (if that is what the member for Mitcham is assuring us of), we would still have the situation of deadlock where the Government would have to make some hard decisions about what it did with the measure as a whole. I suggest to the member for Mitcham that in that situation, where the Bill was not agreed, the Government may well have put a lot of other things back in the melting pot which might not have been to the benefit of the Pitjantjatjara Council.

That is an assessment that has to be made. I suggest that the member for Mitcham is not being quite honest with either this House or those that he is seeking to support in the stand that he is taking. The fact is that there is before the House a realistic measure which will be supported by the Government. For the member for Mitcham to come into the debate at this stage and say that he will move that it be 15 years because that is what the Pitjantjatjara Council wants is fair enough for him to make as a statement of his support for the council (and it is a statement I would certainly make, too), but to take that action will not help the Pitjantjatjara Council, or this agreement or the ultimate Bill in any way whatsoever. I suggest to the member for Mitcham, if he wants to constructively support the Bill in the interests of the Pitjantjatjara people, that he supports this measure as it comes from Committee because that is the best we are going to get. The area of disagreement is such that it will not make a fundamental difference to the Pitjantjatjara people's land rights, which are embodied in this Bill, over the total area. I think he would do well to consider the remarks made by the member for Mitchell in this respect particularly. No doubt he will go his own way because he would like to see a headline, but I hope those who are involved in the Pitjantjatjara Council understand the process in which we are involved.

Mr. Millhouse: You should have brought it on in the middle of the night when I wasn't here.

An honourable member: We don't have to wait until the middle night.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman will want to ensure that he remains here.

Mr. Millhouse: I take your point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANNON: It means a measure will pass this House which embodies in 99 per cent of its terms the agreed stand between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara Council. We believe that, as an Opposition, we have achieved the best possible solution in the interests of the Pitjanjatjara people and in the interests of the broad community of the State, and as such we support this measure.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I must thank members who have taken part in this debate constructively. I think the comments that have been made in the main have been extremely valuable. I do even welcome the contribution of the member for Mitcham because it has demonstrated quite clearly to the House, and I hope to the community of South Australia, just how easy it is to jump to conclusions without having any knowledge of the full background of the matters which have been considered by the Select Committee. Even in his foolishness today, I believe he has provided a valuable lesson to South Australia.

First, it is a little unfortunate, I believe, that the Leader of the Opposition saw fit to begin by emphasising the difficulties of the past and tending to ignore the achievements of the present, but at least he came down at the end of his speech with what I believe was a sensible assessment. I take some exception to his stating that there was widespread criticism of the method that this Government adopted for negotiation. I might point out to him that actually the widespread support which he claims that he and the members of his Party stimulated was not for the Pitjantjatjara people but was for the Labor Party's previous Bill. The term "previous Bill" came into almost all of those representations that were made in various ways. Be that as it may, certainly there was, I believe, a general community awareness of what the fundamental principle was and what we were seeking to achieve.

There was some talk about the press fearlessly going on reporting, but at that stage one of the things that happened was that both parties by agreement (members of the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Government) agreed that no further public statements would be made. I must say that the media, or some sections of the media, continued to report fearlessly, but it was rather more difficult to work out where the basis for their reporting came from.

I think it is unfortunate, too, that the Leader should have stated, or implied, that the Deputy Premier misled this House during the Estimates Committee. Can I just point out to him, and I am sure he will accept this when he knows what the facts are, that the evidence to the Estimates Committee was given on the Tuesday before the Bill was actually signed as an agreement between the Government and the Pitjantatjara Council. At that stage,

negotiations were still going forward as to detail, and he was not able to give to the Committee information which the Deputy Leader was requesting, because it was not then finalised. That is important to remember. I make my last criticism of the Leader in saying that I thought it was unfortunate that he included in his speech a further attempt to denigrate the member for Eyre by attempting to damn him with faint praise. That aspect of his speech really did not do him credit.

I shall now deal with the general fundamental problem that we have. The member for Mitcham suggested that we had an agreement to introduce the Bill and that just at the last moment the Pitjantjatjara Council learned to its surprise that there had been a change from the time for a head lease from 15 years to 21 years. In defence of the Select Committee and in defence of the Parliamentary process, I must point out that obviously once that decision was taken and minuted by the Select Committee there was no way that anyone could have been informed of exactly what the decisions of the Select Committee were until it had been reported to this House. So, it was not possible.

Mr. Millhouse: They knew everything else you were going to do, though, as you well know.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was not possible to let them know exactly what that time limit was. It was not a matter of discourtesy or of not wishing to report to them and consult with them; it was a matter of the procedures of this House. Equally, the agreement to introduce the Bill was one which said exactly that, namely, that we agreed to introduce the Bill. No Government, no matter how secure it may be in numbers in either House, could pre-empt the Parliamentary process and make a decision and say that something is exactly what Parliament will pass. I am sure the Leader would agree with me that the member for Mitcham, in suggesting that that perhaps should occur, is in fact negating his entire commitment to the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy.

The question of a 15-year or 21-year lease for the head lease is the only matter not agreed. I think it is important that we remember that very vital detail. The committee took into account not only the rights and privileges of the Pitjantjatjara Council but also the rights and privileges of the Mintabie people, and just as the Leader has outlined, everyone else in this House, other than, apparently, the member for Mitcham, accepts that the committee considered all aspects, all sides, and that is something that the member for Mitcham, by his own admission, has not been able to do. Frankly, I find his attitude in this matter disappointing, to say the least. He has not had an opportunity to consult with the Mintabie people, and I welcome his consultation with the Pitjantjatjara Council, but I point out to him that if he had taken the trouble or if he had had the time to consult with the Mintabie people he would have found that their initial request was for a continuance of the excision of the Mintabie area; they wanted a great deal more than they got.

Equally, the Pitjantjatjara people wanted immediate title, which of course they now have, and following several negotiations arrived at a level of 15 years for the head lease. The Pitjantjatjara Council has not got exactly what it wanted in that regard. It has agreed to everything else, so what we have now is a working compromise. The difficulty is that the compromise between the complete excision moving down to the suggestion that there might be a 50-year head lease and moving on, all these matters were considered in great depth and great detail by the committee. I must say that I resent the fact that one member can come into this Chamber, take very rapid advice from one side of the question (certainly a major party to this whole negotiation) and then presume to criticise the Select Committee for the decision it has made. It would have been much more impressive if the honourable member had attempted to acquaint himself with all sides of the question.

What we have here is a compromise in this one matter, and I very much hope that that spirit of compromise will be carried forward into the future relations between the two communities. I believe both groups are able to accept the compromise that has been put forward, because both groups are South Australians. It has always been the wish of the Government and, I believe, the wish and attitude of the Pitjantjatjara Council that the rights and privileges of small sections of the South Australian community should be properly balanced with the rights and privileges of the South Australian community as a whole. Here, we have looked not only at the Pitjantjatjara Council and its people but also at the Mintabie miners and the progress association. Also, we have looked at the U.F. & S. and the individual stockowners. We have looked at everyone who has any interest and concern with those lands, and we have balanced their undoubted rights and privileges against the undoubted rights and privileges of the entire South Australian community.

Not only through the negotiations which were held beforehand but also through the very assiduous attention that has been given to the Bill by the members of the Select Committee, we have come up with a measure which successfully achieves that balance. What will happen in the future? What will be the outcome in 20, 30, or 100 years time? I certainly do not pretend to know, and nobody else in this Chamber will know. However, I do know that, following all our negotiations and our concern and our care to achieve that balance, there is more chance of this legislation working effectively for the benefit of every individual no matter to which group he or she may belong, than anything else we could possibly put forward.

This is a landmark in South Australia's history. For the first time it will take up in legislative form the words used by Governor Hindmarsh in the proclamation that established this State in 1836, which I think a great number of people have at various proclamation ceremonies frequently found rather hollow:

> It is also at this time especially my duty to apprise the colonists of my resolution to take every lawful means for extending the same protection to the native population as to the rest of His Majesty's subjects and of my determination to punish with exemplary severity all acts of violence or injustice which may in any manner be practised or attempted against the natives, who are to be considered as much under the safeguard of the law as the colonists themselves, and equally entitled to the privileges of British subjects.

We have come a long way since that time in the development of understanding, in the development of mutual respect, in recognising that the Aboriginal people are capable of managing their own affairs, and that they have the right to do so.

I can only again commend this report and the amended Bill, which I trust will be passed through both Houses with great speed. I wish everyone in the Pitjantjatjara Council, in what will become the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, every success and every element of tolerance and patience that they can command, and I wish that every person in the community who is touched by this Bill will show those same qualities for the advancement of South Australia as a whole.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 2—After definition of "mining tenement" insert definition as follows:

"Mintabie resident" means a person who—

(a) is entitled to enter and remain on the Mintabie precious stones field under Division IV of Part III; and

(b) resides or proposes to reside on the field.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Opposition supports this amendment, which is felt to be necessary for the persons residing on the proposed precious stones fields. We believe that it is quite a sensible amendment, and one that is a machinery matter.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Constitution of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku as body corporate."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 3, line 10—Leave out "three" and insert "five".

The amendments in appendix C to clauses 5, 9 and 12 are interdependent. The reasons have been given in the report. It is a matter of removing an anomaly in the numbers in relation to the proceedings of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Opposition supports the amendment. It is clear that the present figure of three is inconsistent with other clauses of the Bill, particularly clause 10 (2), which specifies that five members of the Executive Board shall constitute a quorum. As was pointed out by the Premier, if it remained unchanged a minority of the Executive Board could claim that meetings took place at which certain resolutions were passed in accordance with the wishes of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku when in fact they had not.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Constitution of the Executive Board of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 4, line 38—Leave out "eight" and insert "ten".

I have previously given the reasons for this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Evidentiary provision."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 5, line 34—Leave out "four" and insert "five".

Mr. ABBOTT: The Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Mining operations on the land."

Mr. ABBOTT: The Pitjantjatjara Council felt that the essential element in the effectiveness of this provision was the suitability of the judge who was appointed as arbitrator, and it also felt that the appointee should be one with the broadest possible experience in dealing with Aboriginal people and issues. I am pleased to see that the Minister of Mines and Energy has come in, and I would like to ask either the Premier or the Minister whether an assurance can be given that an experienced person, as requested by the Pitjantjatjara Council, will be chosen for that position. If that assurance can be given, I believe, along with the Pitjantjatjara Council, that the arbitration provisions of the Bill will work very well.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am happy to give that assurance. The arbitrator will be chosen by the Minister of Mines and Energy, but only after consultation with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Mr. Keneally: There are such people available within the courts in South Australia at the moment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, I have every confidence that there is a wide spectrum of experienced people from whom to choose. Any such appointment will be made after consultation, and I think that is a most important element of the choice.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Right to continue in occupation of business or residential premises."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Pages 17 and 18—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:

28.(1) The defined area shall be deemed to have been leased by Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to the Crown for a term of twenty-one years commencing on the date of commencement of this Act.

(2) The Minister of Lands may, upon the application of a Mintabie resident, issue or renew an annual licence entitling him, subject to the terms and conditions of the licence, to occupy land within the defined area, but no such licence shall operate after the expiration of the period referred to in subsection (1).

(3) The annual rental payable under a licence issued under subsection (2) shall be twenty dollars or such other amount as may be determined by the Minister of Lands, and in determining any such annual rental he shall have regard to, and generally follow the rates of rental fixed by the Crown in respect of annual licences issued in comparable situations.

(4) Once in each year, the Minister of Lands shall pay to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku all amounts collected during the preceding period of twelve months by way of annual rental under licences issued in pursuance of this section.

(5) The Minister of Lands shall not issue a licence under this section to a person who is, by order of a court, prohibited from entering or remaining on the Mintabie precious stones field, and, if such an order is made against a licensee, the Minister shall revoke his licence.

(6) An annual licence issued under this section is not transferable nor may any of the rights conferred by the licence be assigned.

(7) The Minister of Lands shall, as soon as practicable after issuing a licence under this section, notify Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku of—

(a) the name of the licensee; and

(b) the land to which the licence relates.

(8) A Mintabie resident shall be entitled, without permission under this Act, to use and maintain the airfield adjacent to the defined area as an airfield, and to have such access to the lands as is reasonably necessary for the purpose.

(9) A Mintabie resident shall be entitled, without permission under this Act:

(a) to use and maintain the bore and water distribution system by which water is provided on the Mintabie precious stones field, and

(b) to drill a further bore or bores (either in addition to or in substitution for the present bore) on a site to be agreed with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku (which agreement shall not be unreasonably or capriciously withheld) and to install and maintain such pumps, pipes and other equipment as may be necessary to connect it to the water distribution system, and to have such access to the lands as is necessary for those purposes.

(10) In this section—

"the defined area" means section 1291 Out of Hundreds (Everard).

(11)) This section shall cease to operate in the event of the Mintabie precious stones field ceasing to be a precious stones field for the purposes of the Mining Act, 1971-1978.

This matter has been ventilated quite considerably during the course of the previous motion, and I do not intend to go into it at any further length now. It is a matter which I think is very much explained in the report; again, not only is it self-explanatory but also it has been canvassed very considerably in the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to move an amendment to the clause that the Premier has substituted for clause 28. I have taken up to the table a copy of the amendment. This has been done, as the whole of this matter has been transacted, quite hurriedly. I move:

Line 2, subsection (1)—Omit "21 years" and insert in lieu thereof the words "15 years".

The amendment is not in the usual form because we do not have a printed Bill or a printed amendment, but I suggest that it is sufficiently clear for all honourable members to understand what I propose to do. There is no uncertainty about that. I believe that the period of 21 years, which has been inserted in the amending clause, should be reduced to 15 years. In other words, the term of the lease should be 15 years and not 21 years. I do not propose to go over all that was said during the debate on the report, but I very much regret that once again I have drawn the annoyance of members of both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party on this matter.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Only disappointment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier well knows (and I was careful not to go into this, because I did not want to inject a divisive note when I spoke before) that the Pitjantjatjara Council is not happy about this, and that is why I have said what I have said. I had to say it straight out because of the taunting I have had from the honourable gentleman and others. This is the only matter on which the representatives of the Pitjantjatjara are not happy, and surely to goodness they deserve at least one voice in this place without my being condemned for being that voice. That is all I have had this afternoon from honourable members. I was approached by the representatives only after the report was tabled and the Premier spoke to it. Admittedly, I knew this morning that there had been discussions on this matter, but the Pitjantjatjara did not know, nor did I know, the result until the report had been tabled. Is the Premier so absurdly arrogant as to say that those who are sitting behind me in the Speaker's gallery should not approach me, because that is what he is putting?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has been in this place long enough to know that he is not permitted to refer to people sitting in the gallery.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what the Premier is saying—that those people are not entitled to have their viewpoint and their protests on this matter raised in the House so that, I suppose, he can have the honour and glory for bringing in the Bill and we can say that there has been agreement on all points. What an absurdity! The fact is that the representatives of the Pitjantjatjara want the period to be 15 years and not 21 years, and it was arrant nonsense of the Leader of the Opposition to say, as he did when he spoke in the debate, that, if there had been a minority report (and that is a turn of phrase that is not quite accurate), if those on the Select Committee had voted against the recommendation and moved an amendment for 15 years, the Government could have got away with murder and changed the whole thing. What an absolute absurdity. That was the only reason that the Leader could give when he spoke for his members supporting the Government in making the term 21 years. No-one who listened to him speak would believe that that was other than a very hollow reason indeed.

I believe, to my disappointment, that the whole of the Labor Party will now support the term of 21 years. Well, I am not going to support it, and that is why I have moved this amendment. It is a shame that, right at the last moment, when there could have been agreement throughout, the Pitjantjatjara were not told, as they have been told about everything else in the course of negotiations, about this matter until the report was tabled publicly in the House. Before I spoke, I did not have an opportunity to discuss the matter with people other than the representatives. How could I, when the report did not come in to the House until half past three this afternoon, and it is only five to six now?

I have since been taken to task by dear old Frank Moran, who was acting for the Mintabie opal miners: he tells me that I am all wrong, that the clause is wrong, and that it should not be in the form in which it is. No doubt you too, Mr. Chairman, feel that way, but I do not, and I am not prepared, despite my friendship and affection for Mr. Moran, to accept what he has told me. I believe that the clause is in a proper and acceptable form, except that the period should be 15 years and not 21 years, and for that reason I move the amendment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Amongst the remarks to which we were just treated, I think the honourable member said it was a shame, and he went on to waffle something or other. I think it is a shame, too, that we have been subjected to this kind of behaviour from the honourable member. I have no quarrel with the fact that the people to whom he referred had every right to make an approach to anyone they liked on this matter, but there is no need for us to be subjected to this grandstanding type of performance that the honourable member has put on. He was not a member of the Select Committee and he does not know what went on, but he is quite prepared to get up and say, "Surely someone in this place is entitled to stand up for the Pitjantjatjara people." Let me put on record that I have been standing up for them for six years. Where was the honourable member then?

Mr. Randall: In court.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not know where he was, but one did not hear the voice until quite recently. I am perfectly willing to say that, at the time when I was supporting this matter publicly in the streets, it was not quite so popular an issue, and that may be the reason why the honourable member was not there. I do not believe that we should have had to resort to this kind of thing on a Bill which has gone through all the processes and which has been thrashed out over the years. Despite this, the honourable member has come out with this sort of nonsense. Enough words have been spoken on the matter, and it is time the damned thing got into legislation and became the law of the State. That is my view and the view of my colleague who was also on the Select Committee. It is wonderful to be able to sit outside and not have to take any responsibility, and then come into the House and conjecture as to how the two Opposition members should have behaved, considering that they did not have the numbers anyway. That is the name of the game. Of course, the honourable member could have done all sorts of wonders, but he has been in the House a long time, as he constantly reminds us, at times in Government. What in hell did he do about land rights when he was in the position to do something?

The point I make is that we have been operating in a Select Committee, and you, Sir, well know that from the position you occupied during the Select Committee. It would little profit the House for me, as a member of that committee, to trot in here and say who said what and who was going to stand on certain subjects, and it should be apparent to the honourable member that there was more than one draft relating to amendments generally, let along

this clause. In its deliberations, the committee has tried to do what is fair for all concerned, bearing in mind that the Bill must come before the House and then be subjected to the passage of the numbers game. That is what I have tried to do. I heard the honourable member mutter something about what would happen in another place. I do not believe that I need to say any more, and I ask that the honourable member's amendment not be supported.

Question—"That the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham to the amendment moved by the Premier be agreed to"—declared negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: There being only one member on the side of the Ayes, I therefore declare that the question passes in the negative.

Mr. Millhouse's amendment to the amendment negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from 6.5 to 7.30 p.m.*]

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin's amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 29 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Disputes."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 20, lines 20 and 21—Leave out "Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku" and insert "the Pitjantjatjara people".

This is very much a matter of common sense. "Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku" should be replaced by "the Pitjantjatjara people" and this does, I think, represent the involvement of individuals in decisions, as is envisaged.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Opposition supports the amendment as moved by the Premier. It is clear that the reference was intended to be to the Pitjantjatjara people, and, as the Premier said, it is common sense.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 37 to 41 passed.

Clause 42—"Non-application of Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 21—After line 12 insert subclause as follows:

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Outback Areas Community Development Trust may expend moneys for the benefit of residents of the Mintabie precious stones field.

Considerable concern has been expressed (and this is a matter which has not been canvassed fully in the report of the Select Committee) by the Mintabie Progress Association and other people at Mintabie that a great deal of what people have been able to achieve in terms of community facilities has been achieved with the help of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. It would, I think, not in any way be the intention either of the Pitjantjatjara Council or indeed of the Government or any other person that the Mintabie Progress Association and the residents of Mintabie should in any way be deprived of the benefits of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, as enjoyed by other sections out of hundreds in that area. For that reason it has been agreed that we should make it possible for the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to apply to the area of Mintabie for moneys to be expended in a subsidy form, or indeed in any way the trust considers appropriate, as has been done before. It seems to me to make a great deal of sense that, if the head lease is to be one of 21 years and the prospect of five-year renewable leases is a very real one after that time, obviously the Outback Areas Community Development Trust should be able to apply its help to Mintabie, just as much as to any other northern town.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support the amendment. One of the reasons which played a considerable part in my being happy about this amendment was the evidence we received at Mintabie and you, Mr. Chairman, were present at the time the evidence was given. Mrs. Kimber gave some fairly interesting evidence in relation to the amounts of money which had been raised at Mintabie for community effort and about how that money was raised. As we saw for ourselves during the visit, not a large number of people were involved, anyway, and the sums of money that were expended in relation to the airfield, the water supply in the provision of a larger and better pump, and the hope that the community had that the building in which we held our meeting might become a community building, and so on, I thought spoke volumes really for the self-help and the efforts that have been put forward in that area by the community. That was supported by evidence from Mrs. Soldo as well, the wife of a miner in the area. Clearly they regard this as being way outside the ken of people living in Adelaide. They felt themselves somewhat isolated, but indicated to us their gratitude that in the past they had received some assistance through the auspices of the funds available through this body to recognise the great efforts that had been put in on a community basis to maintain and construct the airfield and to provide an adequate water supply in the area, before the advent of the Mines Department.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 43—"Regulations."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On reflection, you would agree, Sir, that it is at least worthy of note in *Hansard* that some degree of misunderstanding of the provisions of the clause to which we are referring certainly existed at Mintabie and in other areas. At Mintabie we were able to allay some of the fears people had in relation to who would be providing the regulations and who would be originating them by explaining to them that the situation applying to regulations is that they are tabled in this place, and the Governor may make the regulations in consultation with the bodies prescribed within the relevant clause 43. I do not believe that had been properly perceived, certainly in the Mintabie area, and in adjacent areas generally. While we were riding in that vehicle, which you, Sir, will well recall managed to stay on the road ahead of the one you were piloting and thus was able to make sure you kept on the straight and narrow, the matter came up for discussion in the Ford in which I was travelling. Mr. Murray Evans, Manager of Granite Downs, raised this very matter which may be of interest to you; apparently you had not heard of it. When I was able to explain to him what was the effect of that type of clause he indicated that, because of the understanding he then had, fears he had had no longer existed.

Clause passed.

The first schedule.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

After paragraph *(f)* insert paragraph as follows:

(g) the land in respect of which partial surrender No. 4603197 and partial surrender No. 4603198 were registered in the Register of Crown Leases.

Amendment carried; first schedule passed.

Second schedule and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I wish to thank members for the care and consideration which, in almost every case, has been given to the passage of this legislation through the House today. It is a significant day; it is legislation which I believe will be most important, and indeed, historic legislation, not only in

South Australia but in the rest of the world. In saying that I do not want it to be thought in any way that the only reason this legislation was considered by this House was for that purpose. It is legislation which has been long overdue; it is legislation which I believe will lead to a new era of understanding between people of different racial origins in Australia. For that reason I believe it is a very significant day indeed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the man who began this whole proceeding, and who, in effect, caused the Bill to appear before us in the form it has done. I refer to the Hon. Don Dunstan who at a time when it was not fashionable and not politically wise to do so recognised that the Aboriginal people had aspirations and aims which ought to be recognised in Bills such as the one we had before us. I believe the former Premier is deserving of the commendation of the House as a whole.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Bill has arrived at this stage in a more acceptable form as far as I am concerned than at the time when it was originally presented. I say with a great deal of personal satisfaction that the discussions which have taken place over a long period have resulted in a measure which I hope represents a balanced point of view, as the Premier rightly has pointed out. It has been unfortunate that one particular member in this House has taken the opportunity to do some grandstanding, endeavouring to gain for himself a little bit of publicity.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clauses in the Bill as presented to the House at the third reading stage.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to do that. All I want to say is that I am pleased with the Bill as it has arrived at this stage of the proceedings. I sincerely hope it meets the aspirations of all people of this State, and that it is used to implement further development in those areas which have such great potential.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support what has been said by other members in this third reading debate, and it is a very great achievement, and I do not say other than that. I do regret, though, and, of course, the member for Eyre was having an oblique shot at me a moment ago—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was, Sir; there is no doubt about it.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Mitcham, as I asked the honourable member for Eyre, to speak to the third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I want to say is that, despite the strictures which have been heaped on me in this debate, I regret that the period for the lease referred to in clause 28 of the Bill is 21 years and not 15. I think it is a shame that there should have been any discord at all with the final product of the deliberations and the work that has gone into the Bill. So be it; I was alone in the House in voicing that view, and therefore, of course, it was swept away. Apart from that, I wholeheartedly support the Bill, as does my Party.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I support the remarks made by the previous speakers. It is rather a pity that the difference of opinion arose with respect to that one major section of the Bill, but it takes two sides to make an argument, and the recommendations that were handed down by the Select Committee were made in good faith. It would have done all members a lot of good to be at some of the hearings of the Select Committee, particularly the one which we attended at Mintabie. Had the member for Mitcham been present on that day, I am sure that he would have had a different outlook on the matter he raised, particularly in view of the fact that one of the miner's wives giving evidence to the committee broke into tears during the giving of her evidence.

We attempted to compromise in that area in the interests of both of those minority groups for whom we, as Parliamentarians, are responsible. I endorse the remarks made by the member for Mitchell. I said, too, during the second reading debate that Don Dunstan, the former Premier of this State, will go down in history as the man who pioneered Aboriginal land rights legislation in South Australia. I have pleasure in supporting the third reading.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I simply want to make the point that, while this is momentous legislation, it could not have taken place without very long discussions and a great deal of co-operation from the Pitjantjatjara Council, members of the Government, members of Cabinet, and indeed from a great number of people in the South Australian community. I do not believe that there is any one person or Party to whom credit totally falls in this matter. It is a matter of great credit for the entire South Australian community. I want to thank everyone who has contributed so much in that regard. I think that is all that needs to be said.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HISTORY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

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

URBAN LAND TRUST BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TEA TREE GULLY (GOLDEN GROVE) DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3264.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I desire to ask you for a ruling pertaining to this legislation as, in my view, the Bill is very similar to the legislation which was introduced some two or three months ago and which was passed with amendments in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: It is simply a reversal of it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I put it to you, Sir, that in the past—and I have not researched this—there has been a ruling (I am prepared to be guided by what you say in this matter) on whether it is possible to introduce legislation similar to that introduced previously. I know, Sir, that you will have examined this piece of legislation. It certainly appears to me to be similar legislation to that introduced previously. Is it in order to proceed with this Bill?

The SPEAKER: I have been asked to rule whether the Education Act Amendment Bill, 1981, is in effect the same question as the Education Act Amendment Bill,

1980. I have given this matter considerable consideration. Standing Order 202 states:

> No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

This Bill, and the earlier one, are obviously not the same, as can be ascertained by reading them. However, several of the clauses of the present Bill do have the effect of negating provisions agreed to at the third reading of the earlier Bill, which could impinge on the same question rule.

As it seems to me Standing Order 202 does not cover the latter situation, I have referred to Erskine May, which states on page 493:

> . . . There is now no rule against the amendment or repeal of an Act of the same session. Formerly, it was expressly disallowed, but was made permissible by the Act of 1850, and, since the repeal of that Act, by the interpretation Act, 1889 (s.10).

I therefore rule that this Bill may be proceeded with. In doing so, I refer to the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1978, section 49 (which is identical to the U.K. Interpretation Act, 1889, referred to above), which states:

> Any Act may be altered, amended, or repealed in the session of Parliament in which it was passed.

I further indicate that I shall be asking the Standing Orders Committee to look at a new Standing Order to put this matter beyond doubt, because, if the only effect of this Bill had been to repeal the earlier Act, the Bill would not have been admissible under Standing Order 202, which clearly conflicts with section 49 of the Acts Interpretation Act. The Legislative Council has overcome this problem by inserting an additional Standing Order to give effect to section 49, but such action has never been taken by this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Sir. The point of order arises out of the ruling which you have just given and with which, with due deference, I agree. In all the circumstances, because this is an unusual situation—we do not normally simply negate what has been passed before—I take it that it will be permissible for members to refer to the earlier debate, which would otherwise not be permissible. In particular, I want to refer to the eulogy of the Minister of Education by the member for Baudin when he wound up the debate, after he conned the present Minister into accepting the amendments.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member, before I address myself to the point of order that he has taken, not to use the opportunity of standing on a point of order to make comments against other honourable members in the House. I do not uphold the point of order that the honourable member raises. It is quite clearly against Standing Orders for a previous debate in the same session to be specifically referred to. It does not prevent discussion relative to the subject matter, but I am not wanting to invite the honourable member to attempt to transgress to determine whether I have read the previous statements and can find passages in his comments to the House which require me to draw his attention to the subject.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): The Opposition supports this measure at the second reading stage, although I will be moving some amendments in Committee. They will be available to the Government shortly. I apologise for the fact that the Government does not have them in its hands at present, but we have, by agreement, brought this matter up the Notice Paper for other reasons. I want to divide my remarks into three parts. The third part will specifically deal with my attitude to the Bill as it stands before us. I want to refer, first, to the rather peculiar attitude that the Government has adopted in the past fortnight to the introduction of this measure. Then, I want to say certain things about what happened following the passage of a similar, although, in deference to your ruling, Sir, not identical measure, through this House last year.

As members will know, as Opposition Whip I receive, about midday on Monday, a list from the Deputy Premier which sets out the business for the week. If that is agreed, as almost always happens, then that becomes the blue paper that we have on our desks at present. Yesterday fortnight, I received from the Deputy Premier a list which included the Education Act Amendment Bill listed for Thursday of that week. I thought that that was a little peculiar because, also, as Whip, I had with me a letter which had been provided by the Government Whip to the effect that the Minister of Education would require a pair for the whole of that week because he was at the Australian Education Council in Tasmania.

On the Wednesday I approached the member for Fisher in his official capacity and raised this matter with him. I asked how it would be possible to debate this matter when the Minister would not be with us. He said he understood that "Roger would be handling it", which Sir, in Parliamentary terms, meant that the Deputy Premier would be handling the matter. I was a little bemused by this, because this is a fairly delicate sort of matter and I would have thought that the Minister of Education would be able to exercise a little more subtlety than the Deputy Premier, for all his stirling qualities, is known to be able to exercise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be coming back to the clauses quickly, I hope.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, Sir. In any event, we did not proceed with the debate in that week. On Monday of last week, again this matter was listed for debate during the week. During the week, I received advice that it was fairly critical that the legislation be put through before the end of this week's sitting. I was made aware (and I believe this is pertinent to the measure we have before us) that the Medlin committee, as it is called, the advisory committee on Government grants to non-government schools, has a list of schools which are awaiting the passage of this measure before that committee determines whether those schools should be given a grant. Since they are well into the first term, and since had the Government been prepared to proclaim the original measure they would probably already have a decision, these schools are, naturally, a little disturbed about the trend in the management of this legislation.

I approached the Minister and pointed out to him that, unless I was able to have clearance from Caucus on Wednesday of last week, we would not desire that the debate proceed last week. The Minister was able to give me an advance copy of this Bill, Caucus was able to settle its opinion on the Bill, including drafting the amendments the Minister now has in front of him, and we assumed that the debate would proceed on the Thursday. Indeed, we were prepared (and we made this clear to the Government) to set aside our normal right as an Opposition to at least a 24-hour adjournment (in this case it turned out to be a weekend adjournment) before we proceeded with the debate.

For some peculiar reason, the Government has waited until tonight to bring this legislation forward; indeed, we would not be discussing it even at this stage of the evening had it not been that the Opposition desired to postpone consideration of another measure until later in the evening. I think it is probable that this Bill can pass

through all the normal Parliamentary procedures in the remainder of this week and therefore the Medlin Committee will be able to get on with its proper business, but the Government has run the risk, in leaving it so late in the session, of the measure's not passing into law before we get up some time on Thursday.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Are you going to talk for three days?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not think that is likely, but one is well aware of the peculiar outcome of a similar measure introduced into the Parliament before Christmas, and I would have thought that the Government would be anxious to get this out of the way as soon as possible in this portion of the session.

I turn now to the matter of the Government's peculiar reluctance to want to proceed with the measure which passed through both Houses earlier in this session. I heard soon after Christmas that the Government was not going to proclaim the Bill, and I issued a statement to the effect that it should either proclaim the measure or spell out in detail its reasons for not so doing. That was released to the *Advertiser,* which did not run the story. One of the reasons given was that it was waiting on a response from the Minister, so that his response to my statement could be run along with the statement I had made, and that paper was having all sorts of strife in getting any sort of response from the Minister or anyone associated with the Government.

That is an extraordinary procedure, because, if that was adhered to by every journalist or subeditor, it would mean that the only way in which the Opposition could get anything in the press would be when there was some sort of response from the Government. Perhaps the more senior journalists were on holidays at the time and the people at their desks felt that the matter was too hot to handle. They were not able to get a statement from the Minister, and my statement did not get a run.

What is extraordinary about this measure is that the Government appears not to have consulted outside of this Chamber in considering amendments which the Opposition introduced into the House at that time. A person associated with the non-government schools sector rang me, on the day following the passage of the earlier measure through both Houses, to ask what had happened. I explained that the Opposition had moved amendments in which it believed, that the Minister had accepted those amendments in good faith, and that of course subsequently the matter had gone to the Legislative Council, where it had passed all stages.

Since that time, apparently, there has been hell to pay. There have been people running hither and yon, and approaches have been made to the Minister and to the Premier. In one case, as I understand it, there was an approach to the Premier in the Minister's absence, while he was in Tasmania at the Australian Education Council.

The Opposition does not resile from the position it previously adopted. We believe that the amendments we moved at the time were good amendments and that they are still good amendments. However, we are aware that it is going to be more difficult this time to get the Minister to accept anything from us in here, and therefore we have seen fit to redraft some amendments. A couple of amendments which the Minister accepted have been incorporated in the Bill now before us, and there is also one matter on which we do not wish to proceed—that is, the matter of setting fees by regulation. Unless something happens in another place, I assume that, once this legislation is carried, the Government of the day will have no power to set any registration fees at all. If that is the decision of the Government, well and good. If it believes that this form of regulation, which has been requested by the non-government schools, for the benefit of the non-government sector—and that is quite appropriate—should be funded out of the public purse, we will not put on too much of a turn about that, although we felt originally that it was reasonable that the regulatory power should be there even if, in the initial few years of operation of the system, the Government of the day might have decided not to make use of it.

This leads to other matters on which amendments will be moved, and I will refer more closely to them in Committee. I think that the Minister still believes that the amendments which I moved on the previous occasion and which he accepted are good amendments. Initially, I believed that he had been heavied by the Deputy Premier in order to get the legislation through the House quickly, in the early hours of the morning—I think it was 12 o'clock or 1 o'clock.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not think it was quite as late as that. If it were, that would merely underline the point I was making.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We were so desperate to shut you up.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Let me remind the Deputy Premier that I had been going for only five minutes when he leaned over and said, "If you will sit down and shut up we might get this through." He intimated that they would be accepting all my amendments. His colleague nodded vigorously, and I decided I had better sit down and shut up whilst I was ahead. I recall that the member for Ascot Park got to his feet, and I died a thousand deaths, because I thought that if he went for half an hour we might lose the advantage we had gained. However, he got the message and sat down quickly, and in Committee I was able to move my amendments *en bloc.*

Mr. Keneally: The Deputy Premier knew you were right, because he used to be a school teacher.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course. I am not so convinced now that the Minister was heavied by his colleague. I think he believed that the amendments which had been carried were good amendments, and I believe that he has taken further advice and has been told that they are good amendments. Two representatives of the non-government sector came to see the Opposition about this matter. What I am about to say did not come from them, but I am given to understand that the Minister referred this matter to Dr. Keeves, and that Dr. Keeves submitted an opinion that the amendments were good amendments and should be adhered to.

I am also given to understand either that the Keeves Committee sought to make a report to the Minister and was warned off that course of action, or that alternatively it put something in writing when it was told to excise that matter from the report which is either in the hands of the Minister, as it was to have been given to him last Friday, or is shortly to be in his hands. I am given to understand that the approach to the Premier occurred when the Minister found himself in the same lift as a representative of the non-government sector. When the Minister was asked how the new Bill was coming along, he said, "It is not, because I have asked Dr. Keeves to give an opinion to me on this matter."

That individual immediately decided that the non-government sector should approach the Premier, as it was not getting anything out of the Minister, and put a strong case for a Bill which would repeal what at least that sector of the non-government schools (although not everyone involved in the non-government schools sector) saw as obnoxious provisions compared to what this Parliament

had done previously. All that had gone on, and the final upshot was that the Premier had to get very firm with the Minister and say that it was necessary to introduce a Bill to do what these people who had approached him wanted to have done.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You understand—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The town has been buzzing with these stories for a couple of weeks. I think it is a pity. If the Minister felt that the amendments were good amendments, if the gentleman who is Chairman of the Advisory Committee, which is currently bringing down a report to the Government which the Government says will be the most significant report on education in this State since the Karmel Committee reported in 1971, believed that the amendments were good amendments, it seems a great pity that the Minister was heavied by certain of his colleagues, particularly the Premier, on this matter.

I now refer to the general attitude that the Opposition has to this form of legislation so that I can make clear why we moved the amendments and why we will seek to move certain further amendments in Committee. We accept the concept of registration within the non-government sector to ensure that charlatans do not operate to the detriment of the youngsters who may have the misfortune to suffer from an unfortunate choice that their parents made on their behalf. It may well be that I was wrong originally when I introduced legislation, and the Minister may continue to be wrong in introducing legislation in that a more aggressive use of the compulsory attendance clauses in the Act may have been all that was necessary to fix up this problem. First, that involves possibly long litigation and, secondly, there has been a clear request from the non-government schools for some form of registration. I took the decision, I guess in late 1978 (because I legislated in 1979), and the Minister has gone along with me to the extent that there should be amendments to the Act to, hopefully, fix up this problem.

What we are not trying to do is have the State in any way control non-government schools. I do not believe that there is any argument in this Chamber on that matter. Certainly, there was no attempt by the Opposition when we introduced our amendments late last year to make that happen, nor do I believe that that was in the mind of the Minister when he accepted those amendments. There is no attempt on our part in regard to the amendments that we will move to make that happen. However, we seek that, if there is to be registration, the umpire or umpires must have no axe to grind within the non-government sector. This is classic John Stuart Mill, Adam Smith, Liberalism, if you like.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Who do you get on the Teachers Registration Board? Independent umpires?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is another matter, and perhaps things should happen in relation to the Teachers Registration Board, but we are not discussing that at present. If the Minister believes that his colleague should be legislating in that area, we would be happy to discuss that at an appropriate time. I simply make the point that, in the non-government sector, while it is important that people should be protected from rogues and charlatans, and while it is important that they should be protected against heavy-handed Government, it is also important that they be protected from schisms, splits and divisions that may happen from time to time within their own ranks. At present, a very good spirit exists not only within the non-government schools sector but also between that sector and the Government system, but that may not always be the case. The Minister or whoever may replace him some time in the future may not always be so fortunate as to have people of the calibre of Bob Lean, John McDonald or Diana Medlin as the recognised spokespersons for this sector. It is not impossible that there could be, from time to time in the future, splits and divisions between the various individual schools or systems that operate in the non-government sector. In that situation, it would be wrong for a particular faction to, in effect, have control of the registration apparatus in that system.

The advantage of having people who are directly appointed by the Minister, and not necessarily from the non-government system, is that those people have no axe to grind and they will be truly neutral umpires in these matters. There could well be a situation in which a highly experimental and perhaps somewhat eccentric (in the terms that the Minister or I would regard it) school is set up but which, in terms of educational standards, is sort of doing the job. However, people of a different type from those with whom the Minister or I deal at present may run the system and decide that this funny little school is a nuisance and, for reasons other than those that the Minister or I would consider desirable, may refuse registration for that school. That would be a pity.

I hope that the object of this legislation is not to discourage diversity in the non-government system. I do not believe that it is, but again I make the point that, where neutral people are holding the ring (to use the traditional clause) there are some safeguards for everyone in the non-government system, not only those who may represent the larger and more recognised portions of that sector. That is why it is important that we move as we did previously and why the amendment is before the Minister.

Previously, we were concerned about the concept of whether a school, when registered, is registered until doomsday or whether there is some machinery and flexibility available to the Minister to review that registration. The Minister will recall that he had not given himself that flexibility except in the situation where the original registration was conditional. Now that the Minister has had a second look, I do not believe that the measure before us is any significant improvement.

A situation could arise in which a school went completely to the pack and the non-government sector wanted to do something about it. What would the Minister do in that situation? Would he have to come back here and amend the legislation? Would it not be better, since we are legislating now, to do it properly and give the Minister that sort of flexibility? That is the classic argument that is always put up—if we pass legislation and leave it in such a way that we accept the concept that we may have to come back here fairly quickly, it makes a bit of a mockery of what we are trying to do. We try to do the job properly when a Bill comes in for the first time. I believe that the Minister is denying himself and his successors much needed flexibility in this area.

We support this Bill. We are a little amused about what has happened since that time. I am also a little alarmed by one statement that has been made, that is, that I assured the Minister of Education that my amendments had the support of the non-government sector. I did not ever do that. I do not see how I could possibly have done that, because I did not consult with the non-government sector following the drawing of my amendments, although I believe that, once I had moved them, there would be a good deal of consultation on the Government side. What I did was telephone a representative of the non-government sector before drawing any amendments and before there was any discussion with the P.L.P on this matter to ask him what his attitude was to the Bill that the Minister was then in the process of introducing, because I thought it was only fair to my colleagues that I make that known to them

while at the same time I may be recommending that we move in Committee to make some amendments.

I am glad that I have the nodding support of the Minister of Education in this matter, because it has been around town, I think through the Premier (the Premier, not the Minister, was quoted as saying this) that one of the elements in the Minister's being so prepared to accept my amendments last time round was that I told him that I had been in contact with certain people in the non-government sector and that they fully supported our amendments and, therefore, either because he is such a reasonable man or because he is so innocent, the Minister felt that it was not necessary for him to make a similar consultation with these people.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: At 3 o'clock in the morning.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We have various pieces of machinery that are open to us: the Government did not have to proceed with the measure at that time. It did not have to go into Committee. It could have reported progress on the first matter, the first clause on which it thought there may be some argument. Alternatively, it could have let the legislation go through this Chamber as amended and then left it until the following day to see what should happen in the Legislative Council. None of these things happened. I did not regret that happening at the time. I still do not, because I believe the Government did the right thing at that time, and I am a little saddened at the events that have occurred since then.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I endorse the comments of the member for Baudin and certainly feel that this Bill is yet one other piece of evidence that the present Minister of Education shows that he is unable to handle the very difficult task which is imposed on him. One of the areas that has come through on a number of occasions has been the fact that the Minister shows a decisive tendency not to consult with people in the field upon whom legislation will have some effect. The point was made loudly and clearly I am sure to many members of this House some time ago that, when the issue of the transfer of teachers to the country came up, many teachers did not object so much to the need to transfer teachers to the country as they did to the arbitrary way in which the matter was handled without any sufficient degree of consultation.

Again, we find in this Bill that the Minister in his second reading speech talks about the amendments moved by the Opposition being accepted by the Government, in good faith he says, and then he goes on to say, "Subsequently, representatives of non-government schools expressed concern with those amendments." It has become quite clear that there was not, from the Government's point of view, consultation with the non-government schools to ascertain their feeling about those amendments. I point out that that responsibility for that consultation rests with the Minister, who is the responsible officer in charge of education in this State. It is therefore upon him to make sure that that consultation should have taken place. The fact that that did not take place could perhaps in isolation have been accepted as a simple mistake. However, the fact that it is endorsed by other pieces of evidence of no consultation having taken place in other areas in education is a damning feature of his administration of that Ministry.

The amendments moved by the Opposition last year were indeed sound amendments in the philosophical principles that they embody. They sought to protect the rights, I believe, of those who attend independent schools in a broader sense, and I will come to that in a moment. Also, I feel that they tried to protect the educational standards of the community as a whole and tried to maintain or insist upon some consistency between the non-government and the Government education systems.

The question of autonomy of private schools has, of course, taxed the public mind for a long time. To what degree should private schools have autonomy? Indeed, some of the amendments we have before us tackle that particular question. They pose a different philosophical approach from the one which we initially posed. A change in the membership of the board of the non-Government Schools Registration Board is part of that question. Changing the proportion from a minority to a major of the members coming from the non-government schools sector is in itself a recognition or a statement that the non-government school sector should have a major say in the way those schools are registered or in the way those schools are oversighted by the board.

Likewise, the question of the registration and whether the registration should be renewable is another statement of philosophical approach that private schools should not be under the constant overview of the education system as a whole. We have to look at those questions and decide for ourselves whether we should accept that proposition. Indeed, this House may accept the proposition that in general the majority opinion, so to speak, of the administration of non-government schools should be held by non-government schools and that the Government system should be merely an input into that decision-making process.

Before coming to further elaboration of that point, I feel that we should look at the hazards that might face us if non-government schools were allowed total independence of opinion, total independence of development, without any input from the Government system. Before embarking on that, I also say that it is not my contention that private schools in this State on the whole would fall into an area of total disregard for the Government education system. I do not believe that is the case. I believe that a great many of the private schools in this State have maintained exceptionally high standards of education and exceptionally good facilities for the students who attend them, and that is a positive asset to education at large. But that does not deny the fact that there are always those minority schools that may in fact undermine the very good work of the majority. It is to the minority of schools that we may in fact be trying to seek some sort of control. We can speculate that there may be some minor schools, some minor sect schools or some independent schools of no particular religious affiliation that may be set up in years to come, and we may wonder at the effect they will have on the children who attend them. We need not just take that as being an area of speculation, for we can look at the effect of schools of a similar nature in other communities.

It is certainly true that in the United States certain of the religious sects maintain schools that seem to run counter to the educational philosophies of education as a whole. One may say, "So what; does that matter; is that significant? Surely it is a democratic right for a school to teach any proposition it wants to teach, and it is for the parents to make the decision that they should have the right to send their children to that school." I do not know that we can take that right to its fullest extent, because we are not dealing with products, we are not dealing with inanimate bodies, but we are of course dealing with children, we are dealing with people, people who will be benefited or disadvantaged by the education which they receive. I for one feel that it is possible that, given the philosophies of certain groups in the world today, children could be seriously disadvantaged in the way in which they can cope

in society at large if they are subjected to an education system totally dominated by the views of a particular group.

One could wonder what would happen, for example, if the Moonies set up a school and children from a very young age were subjected totally to the philosophy and approach of that group. Would those children be able fairly to contribute, to cope with society on an equal basis with all other children with whom they would have to mix? I pose the question that perhaps they might not.

Likewise, is it reasonable to expect no control over a school system that might seek to school its children in ideas that are 200 years out of date? We know that in America there are examples of what are called the Pennsylvania Dutch community, or what are more correctly known as the River Brethren, the Amish or the Mennenite communities—

Mr. Keneally: Did Ronald Reagan go to those schools?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: No, they are purer people than he is. The Mennenites, the Amish and the River Brethren do in fact lead very good lives, but we have a very essential difference. They have a very large community settled in one area of Pennsylvania and are able to operate almost independently of the rest of the world around them, so the children brought up in their schools and schooled in ideas that are 200 years out of date as far as the rest of us may be concerned are not disadvantaged because they will leave those schools and enter a society which is itself 200 years out of date. That is fine, if they choose that. However, I ask what would happen if in fact a small section of that community decided to migrate, for example, to South Australia and to establish a school for their children based on the same educational principles used in Pennsylvania and then said "Well it works there; it should work here".

I suggest that in fact it may well not work, certainly in terms of the best interests of the children, because they would not be able to leave that school and become absorbed wholly in a community that accepted the same propositions as those on which they were brought up, because there is just not that community here. If it seems somewhat far-fetched to talk about minor migrations from that community, I suggest that there is evidence to contrary. In fact, there have been movements from the Pennsylvania, a Dutch community, to many parts of the world, and they do, in fact, seek to try to maintain their same standards wherever they go. Again, while not wishing to decry those standards and the way in which they maintain their allegiance to principle, I feel that the education system of the host country is behoven to see that the children who go through that system are not in any way disadvantaged.

I quite firmly believe a compromise could be reached whereby an education system could be developed that adhered first to the religious principles of the group and yet, on the other hand, made sure that when those children left school they were able to cope fairly with every other child in society. We must ask ourselves whether this Bill seeks to give that protection to children in all those types of circumstances? I repeat the point: I am not in any way endeavouring to suggest that students who graduate from all those private schools known so well in this community will be disadvantaged in the way they can cope compared with other children. In fact, there are many who would suggest that, by virtue of one reason or another, they would be at an advantage over others.

However, we must look in all legislation we pass for those remote circumstances which we may not see now as taking place but which may well reasonably take place in the future. Given the proliferation of the number of small independent schools that have set up during the past few years, this is something we must face as a real possibility—that there will come a day when an independent school will want to set up, whose educational values we hold abhorrent.

One can take that one step further. Where does it apply to those people who insist on educating their children within the home, not letting them out into the education system at large? It may be that the parents have been teachers, are registered as teachers, and indeed may therefore qualify to teach their own children. Yet they may be subjecting their children to certain other beliefs attached to their general education that we may feel disadvantage their children in society at large. How can protection be afforded in that situation?

Of course, the response to that will be that the members that are on the board will largely come from the major schools or the major avenues of non-government education, and I accept that. Nevertheless, I believe that by debating the question whether there should be a minority or a majority we are also posing the question of what degree of control should exist at large over non-government schools.

Another point I believe should be made concerns the queston of registration. In amendments moved last year we sought to embody the principle of on-going renewals of registration of private schools. I accept the proposition that has been put by many in the non-government schools sector that that unnecessarily puts at risk the continuity of private schools. It could well happen that private schools could face cancellation of their registration over very petty matters that may have very little to do with education at large. I accept that that is a danger that they do not want to face. I accept that they do not want to become the victims of pettifogging administration of rules that may in fact be non-educational in their essence.

That does not take away from the point that there should be some continuing oversight of the way in which private schools are serving the interests of their own students, and the interests of the community at large. While members of this place may choose to repeal that section of a Bill that allowed for regular renewals, I think it should certainly insist upon some dynamic oversight, some continuing oversight, of the way in which schools fulfil their educational function. To simply say that a school achieved registration now, this year, and to say that that registration should be self-sufficient for all time, is to take no account of the way in which educational approaches or attitudes may change in society. Given the fact that we all anticipate our society continuing for a very long time to come, we would naturally hope that the schools which achieve registration may continue to for a long time to come.

Will the conditions applied now to a registration be satisfactory 100 years from now, for example? The field of educational philosophy is one that has been subjected to many changes, even within the past 100 years; there have been many changes of approach as to what education is trying to do, and how it should do it. There should therefore be some mechanism or some means of ensuring that schools that do in fact achieve registration are asked to take account of changes in educational philosophy over the years. One might suggest that that is automatically done by the market system, that if a school does not take account of changes in educational philosophy it will simply not achieve an intake of students—parents will not send their children there, and it will simply wither away. One would hope that that would be the case, if the decision not to adhere to new educational changes was significant enough, but nevertheless, it is leaving things perhaps rather a lot to chance.

I would have hoped that somewhere in the legislation, if we do not want to have the principle of renewals at regular intervals, we could at least have the concept of suggestions or alterations of conditions that schools would be obliged to meet as time went by; that the registration board could come back to a school in 15 years and say, "This particular precept of education has changed; we note that your school still follows another precept; we desire that you change in that regard." Even if a school is not tied to an exact renewal of registration, the board should still have the power to put such propositions to all independent schools. Certainly, I believe this should be the case with Government schools, too. I am not in any way trying to suggest that one school system be disadvantaged or thought of differently from another. There are already mechanisms in the Government system which theoretically enable them to take place. I think that the attempt by the Opposition last year to make this position the same for private schools was to be commended, and I hope that the spirit of that attempt will at least appear in this legislation as it finally passes from this House tonight.

The point must be made that we are looking for the danger signs, for what might happen in the private school sphere. Much good work has gone on amongst the present schools. Therefore, these are the questions which we are obliged to raise and consider and which I believe the Minister is obliged to answer.

At the minor level, the question of whether there should be two out of five or four out of seven members from independent schools is perhaps not so significant, and perhaps it can be accepted without too much difficulty, but I remind the House of the question I posed which does at least demand consideration, even if not acceptance, all members of this House. Likewise, the question whether the inspectors of non-government schools should or should not be members of the Government system is a question that deserves consideration, even if not acceptance, by all members of this House. Again, I believe the Opposition is to be commended for raising that matter before with this amendment, trying to insist on Government inspectors. We have an amendment tonight that seeks to slightly alter that, and I suppose we will give that consideration in Committee and there will be comment at that point.

This has not been happy legislation in the way in which it has progressed. I believe it has been symptomatic of the way in which the Government has handled educational issues in this State and of the disquiet that exists in much of the community. The subtle interpretation that, subsequently, representatives of the non-government schools expressed concern (that was what the Minister said) belies the fact that there have been subsequent expressions of concern from many sections of the community—not just the private school sector, but from parents, teachers of Government schools, and certainly, if they could consider all the impacts, I would suggest the children at the schools themselves. I believe the discussion of this Bill in Committee will be quite significant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This whole matter is a botch.

Mr. Lewis: What?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A botch. I shall tell the member for Mallee why, if he has not yet understood it.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what that abbreviation really means, and I take offence at the use of the word and the connotation in the vernacular, as I have understood it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Take no notice, Sir. It is an absurd interjection.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. It is a commonly used colloquial term, the meaning of which might not be apparent to all members and which might be construed by different members in different ways.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell him what it means.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will come back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It means a mess—that is what it means. It is a perfectly proper word, and if the honourable member looks in the dictionary he will find it there. This matter is a mess from beginning to end, and the unhappy expression on the face of the Minister shows that he realises that. It is a very good lesson to this Government in two ways, first, in relation to pushing Bills through in the middle of the night, because this finished I think at ten past two in the morning on whatever the date was. It is a very good lesson to the Government not to push Bills through at that time when people are tired and do not know what they are doing. Secondly, it is a very good lesson to the Government not to be conned by the Opposition—and there is no doubt whatever that that is what happened here.

The Minister did not take proper advice before the Bill was brought in. The member for Baudin suggested amendments which, on the surface, looked all right and the Minister, without taking any further advice, accepted them, not realising their significance. Then, if my surmise is correct, the Independent Schools Board got on to him pretty quickly when it realised what had happened and the result—and I speak with deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker—is that here we have a reversal of what was done before Christmas. It is a reversal brought about simply—

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the honourable member, while indicating due deference to the Chair's ruling, would accept that the clauses of the current Bill are only in part associated with the measures previously before the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am quite willing to accept that, but the fact is that we are undoing in large part (I use that phrase in deference to you, Sir) what was enacted in the middle of the night when no-one knew what they were doing, in November or early December. I hope the Minister will not be caught like this again. He has not had a good day today, and this is the climax. He has had to come back to ask Parliament to undo what has been done. Unusually, I had been consulted and my colleague in another place was consulted about this Bill, not by the Government or even by the Labor Party, but by certain parties outside who are interested in it. I am quite happy to support the Bill as it stands. I have only one problem with it, and I think that is all right, but to carry the botch—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know the member for Baudin does not want all his good work undone at one fell swoop. The eulogy of the Minister which he made—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It was sincerely made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sincerely made! Now he finds the ground cut from under his feet. To carry the theme of a botch a bit further, one cannot even trust the Bill file. Bill No. 80, which is this Bill in the form we are now amending, is not right, and to be safe one has to get a print of the Act itself because the draftsman (I suppose through carelessness, but there may have been some good reason), misnumbered the subclauses. I suggest to the Clerk and others who may be advising the officers of the House that they be very careful in what they read. The only thing to trust is Act No. 108 of 1980, where the new sections 72 are properly numbered. Otherwise, mistakes will be made between here and another place.

I have a copy of Act No. 108 of 1980, and I have already promised it to the member for Baudin, but if others have a

greater need perhaps he will pass it on. They had better look at it to see that they are on the straight and narrow. This shows what an unfortunate incident it is. I am prepared to support the Bill as introduced, and I do not much fancy the amendments of the member for Baudin. Of course, I will not canvass them at this stage. He is trying to salvage something from the wreck of his dreams. I would not help him do that.

I raise one matter. I believe that the Independent Schools Board is quite happy with the Bill as introduced, and it is with the members of that board that I have discussed the matter. The representative of one other independent school got in touch with me to say that his governing body was quite happy with the Act as it had been passed, No. 108 of 1980, because he preferred the school to be inspected by an officer of the Education Department rather than by someone from the Independent Schools Board, in certain instances that I need not elaborate.

Mr. Lewis: So you'd let education go to the DOGS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is an absurdly stupid interjection.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know, but it is still absolutely absurd, and I hope *Hansard* got it for its absurdity. Is the member for Mallee suggesting that the Independent Schools Board will let education go to the dogs, or is he suggesting that the department will let education go to the dogs?

The Hon. H. Allison: DOGS, in capitals; it is a little too subtle. I appreciate that it is 10 to 9.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Normally I would accept the implied rebuke from the Minister, but not when it was given to me by the member for Mallee.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to dwell on the interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This school would prefer not to be subject to inspection by the Independent Schools Board. If one looks at new section 72p, which the Minister is amending, it looks to be all right, because subsection (1) states:

> For the purposes connected with the administration of this Part, the board may by instrument in writing, authorise an officer of the department—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's what he's amending.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No fear he is not, not as I have understood it. The only amendment he has is in clause 8 of the Bill, which states:

> Section 72p of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "that person" and substituting "a person so authorised".

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But 72o is in fact 72p because of the confusion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does that mean that the Bill is wrong? No fear. This is the problem of looking at our Bill file No. 80 and relying on that, rather than on the print of the Act No. 108, which I have.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I am looking at No. 122, which is the document we have before us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Bill No. 122?

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Yes, that is what we are asked to debate. It states:

> Section 72o of the Principal Act is amended by . . .

It refers to the inaccurately numbered—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does that mean that the Bill that the Minister gave me is wrong? He gave me a copy the other day.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I think so. Clause 7 should read:

> Section 72p of the principal Act . . .

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am relieved to find that the Bill I am looking at is identical in clauses 7 and 8 to the Bill on the file. The Minister would be advised to get some professional advice. I see that no draftsman is present, but one should be present, otherwise something will go wrong. As I understand it, section 72p (1) will read (and perhaps the Minister may like to check this, because we had better get it right this time—it is only 9 o'clock at night, not 2 o'clock in the morning):

> For purposes connected with the administration of this Part, the Board may, by instrument in writing, authorise an officer of the Education Department to carry out an inspection of any non-government school or premises proposed to be used for the purposes of a non-government school and that person so authorised may, at any reasonable time, enter and inspect the school or premises specified in his authority.

That will meet the point made by my friend, because it must still be an officer of the department who is so authorised. The reason for the amendment rather escapes me, because it simply changes "that person" to "a person so authorised". I do not know why the amendment has been moved, but that is the only amendment to section 72p, and it is made to clause 8 of the Bill.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's right, but I think the Minister's intention in clause 7 is to amend section 72p and not 72o.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The amendment to section 72o hangs together, because it will read:

> (1) The Minister may, at the request of the governing authority, or head teacher, of any registered non-government school, cause the school to be visited by an appropriate person or persons for the purpose of advising the governing authority or head teacher in relation to any matter connected with the administration of the school.

The independent schools wanted that amendment because "person or persons" has been substituted with "officer of the department". I have no doubt that that is the amendment required. There is obviously a measure of confusion, and the Minister still does not seem to know what he is doing, or the member for Baudin does not know what he is doing. One or the other does not know.

Mr. Lewis: Or the member for Mitcham does not know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pretty certain that I am right. I am never confident I am right, because I am wrong so often.

Mr. Lewis: You've had a bob each way on everything you've said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is a stupid member. The member for Mallee must be the stupidest member in the House.

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

Mr. Lewis: Remember, it takes a fool to find a fool.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will you, Sir, give me your protection from the member for Mallee?

The SPEAKER: I have done that: I have asked the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Could you do it a bit more quickly, Sir? I am content with the Bill as it stands apart from that one thing, and I think I am right on that, too. It is a lesson to the Government not to be conned again in the middle of the night.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Millhouse: Now we will see whether he knows what he is talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham

sought protection, and other members have a right to the same protection.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Mitcham drew attention to one matter of vital interest to the House—there appears to be an error in numeration. This is an irony of life, because the honourable member will probably recall that a few days ago, when I gave him an advance copy of the Bill on his request, I alerted him, as I alerted the member for Baudin and the Clerk of the House, to the fact that what we should be looking at is the final Act, as produced, for the correct numeration. In fact, there were four different numerical sequences in this legislation. Originally, what should have been new section 72h was numbered 71h and no-one, at 2.35 a.m. on that dark and dismal morning, spotted the fact that we had jumped from 72 to 71 and back again to 72. I understand that that was renumbered from 71ha to 72ha. In view of the fact that there are at least two sets of numbers currently on file, a third one, which is not on file, and a fourth one, which is correct, I had assumed, and I believe it may have been an assumption in error, that the latest series of numbers were all related to one Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: They should be related to the Act.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes. In fact, one series of amendments is related to the Act, and I believe that the member for Mitcham, when he pointed out that the penultimate amendment related to a different clause, might have been correct. Having alerted him to the fact that there was an error, I point out that it has been perpetuated in the reprint of the Bill. I ask permission to report progress.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has used a phrase that is used only in the Committee stage. I ask that the honourable Minister seek leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will complete the second reading stage. The member for Mitcham said that he had been canvassed by one independent school, which believed that at least a part of the amended Bill was satisfactory. I was alerted to that possibility, but the mass of independent schools are quite happy with the amendments as proposed this evening by the Government. As members will recall, we accepted the amendments in good faith in the early hours of the morning at 2.35 a.m., and I make no apology for doing that.

The one thing that I was completely unprepared for was the sudden onslaught from the independent schools sector that was not addressed to the Government. It appeared that there was a high degree of trust in regard to the present Government's intentions. We assured them that, having accepted the amendments, there was no intention of the part of the present Government to undertake any punative measures and, having given that reassurance, I was told, "We believe you, but what would happen if a different Government came into office and we could be attacked on all sides?" That is a reflection not on the Liberal Government but on a possible future Government that may misuse the legislation. That was made patently clear in the debates that ensued outside as a result of my accepting those amendments in good faith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It disturbs me, too, that conversations in lifts were referred to when the only conversation that I had was with a member of a certain committee who I assume would have taken anything I said in the strictest of confidence, because it referred to deliberations which were going on within the committee. I will not enlarge upon that, but I am disappointed that information should come from that committee in that manner.

An honourable member: Not after the way you mucked them around.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, it appears that more than one conversation has come out of that committee, and certainly not the conversation that I received from the Chairman, so probably a lot of things are being bandied around that should not be.

Mr. Keneally: The longer you go the worse you're getting.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Not at all; I am just interested to find out exactly what has been said. The more that comes from the Opposition the more I realise—

Mr. Millhouse: You've got a draftsman—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows full well that officers of the House are not to be mentioned either in debate or by way of interjection.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The real point at issue is that both the former Government and the present Government did undertake to introduce either regulations or legislation specifically to do one thing, and that was to control the possible proliferation of undesirable schools. One member of the Opposition referred to the Moonies as one of the examples. He also referred to the Amish folk, a reference with which I do not really agree, having visited the Oxford Pennsylvania district, where the Amish folk are pretty well integrated into the community, are highly respected, are of excellent moral character, are highly industrious, are good businessmen, and if anything the abuse is from the remainder of the community which commercialises them. Amish folk do not have vast commercial enterprises perpetuating their names and background, whereas the rest of the community does, and makes a handsome living off them. I would not worry too much about the moral, ethical, business and industrial standards of the Amish folk. It was not a very good example of the type of school that might be introduced into South Australia.

I am not saying very much about the other example. I probably share the honourable member's concerns about a number of pseudo religious groups which seem to me to be money-making organisations channelling vast amounts of money away from Australia into the United States. I know of at least one that does that, and I am highly suspicious and chary of any educational institution that it might introduce.

The question of what might happen over the next 100 years is a very tenuous one. The present Education Act has been rewritten within the last 10 years. It was some two or three decades prior to that before a serious rewriting occurred. I do not think we need to look 100 years down the track. As the honourable member implied, people do tend to vote in independent schools with their feet or at least with their pockets. If they are prepared to pay for their children to go to independent schools, one can assume that it has some quality which they are prepared to contribute towards. I am not really worried about the past record of independent schools in South Australia. The former Minister of Education has said what a fine Government and independent school system we have, and I agree with him.

An honourable member: What's this about future Governments destroying it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That was simply a complaint with which I was assailed almost the instant I had accepted the amendments, or at least the next day. I said, "Look, we do not intend to be punitive. These measures as accepted can quite easily be adapted to the present Government's policy without any great fierce consequence

to the independent school sector." The instant reply was, "What happens in the future? What if someone comes without your philosophy?" I do not know to whom they are referring, but the point was made very strongly. Instantly, or almost instantly, letters came in from the Catholic sector and from the independent schools non-sectarian sector asking that the spirit of the previous legislation be reintroduced. It is significant that they pointed out that the former Government had intended to introduce something in that spirit, and I will define the spirit in a moment. What was the spirit of the legislation? It was really intended to introduce a regulation or minor legislation simply to control that possible proliferation of non-government schools which would not be acceptable. All other States have legislation or regulation to do this—South Australia does not. We read in an Opposition publication under the heading "Edumucation", which in itself indicates that we should be returning to the three R's, that the former Government had in fact already got legislation ready to introduce.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That we had introduced it. All that had happened is that the regulations had not been brought in.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I was invited when I came to office as Minister to rethink—not to introduce regulations but to amend the Bill itself. That was a course of action that we had decided upon, so that was the amendment which was introduced. It was an agreed Bill. It is perfectly true that at 2.35 in the early hours of the morning there was no consultation when amendments were introduced, and I do understand that—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Were you taken by surprise?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No. I did understand that the member for Baudin has conferred with the independent school sector. Perhaps then, as now, he does not say what sort of reaction he got. I was listening to see what the reaction was to the amendments.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I will tell you later.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In any case, I accept the responsibility for having taken on the amendments in good faith. Likewise, I accept the responsibility for doing my utmost now to correct that situation by introducing legislation which is in the spirit of the original Bill—that is, we do not intend to punish in any way existing non-government schools. What we simply aim to do is make sure that we do not have that proliferation of undesirable schools coming upon the South Australian scene and being approved for State and Federal funding. That is the reassurance that we have given to the non-government school sector. They have, I think, over the past 100 years governed themselves very well. There has not been any criticism addressed to them of a major nature from anyone, as I recall, and perhaps it is significant, although members of the Opposition will not acknowledge it, that the independent school sector is currently consolidating itself its numbers, probably this year more than ever, across Australia, not only in South Australia. So, the spirit of the Bill is simply to make sure that there is some degree of control on new schools, certainly not to embark on punitive operations against existing schools already firmly ensconsed in the non-government sector. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

KANGARILLA TEMPERANCE HALL (DISCHARGE OF TRUSTS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjournment debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3273.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I am concerned only with clause 29, which will not allow a situation that is presently prevailing with some landlords, particularly those who own a number of flats or units, to continue. At the moment they may be setting a rent of, say, $60 a week. Provided that tenants pay that rent by a specific time on a specific day (say 6 o'clock on Fridays), they get a rebate of perhaps $6, which gives them an incentive to pay on time. We all know some of the problems, particularly in relation to bad tenants, which in many cases cause landlords a great deal of concern. I believe that there is little wrong with the provision remaining as it is rather than outlawing the practice, which is the intention of clause 29. The practice is a general one which also applies to accounts that one may have with a shop or a business. It is a recognised fact that, if accounts are paid on time, one is eligible for a percentage rebate; if an account is not paid on time, a person's account is debited by a certain amount. That applies also to some of the trades; it quite often happens in the building trade in relation to jobs done by bricklayers or plumbers, for example. The account goes out and, if it is paid within a certain period, a reduction of five per cent or 10 per cent might be applied. This certainly applies to many of the tradesmen in the building trades, who have accounts with wholesalers who provide a rebate or an allowance for paying accounts on time. If a buyer fails to do that, a penalty is imposed. As we know, this happens with a number of Government departments, and it certainly applies with council rates.

I wonder whether the Minister has had any second thoughts on this matter. It is the only clause about which I want to comment, because the present practice applies throughout the business world, and I can see little harm in the situation which now prevails. If one is a landlord with a great number of units or flats, it is imperative that he or she receives rent promptly. A landlord may have an agent or a caretaker there to collect the rents. If rents are not paid on time, this person would have to hold those rents, and the matter of security is involved. If one is considering, say, 30 or 40 flats or units, that amount of money could be considerable. If money is paid to a caretaker in dribs and drabs, he must hold that money and he is open to attack. Other than that criticism, I support the Bill.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I concur with remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, in another place, and with the remarks made by the member for Gilles in consideration

of these amendments before the House. It is with a great deal of sadness that one rises to debate the Bill. The electorate that I represent has in it many thousands of people who live in rental accommodation, and many of those people are living from week to week on money solely from Government social security payments in one form or another, or they are people, particularly students, who require assistance from their families in order that they can live a life with some dignity. However, we find that the Government is bringing in amendments which can be seen only to advantage the privileged in our community (landlords in this case), and it will disadvantage the underprivileged. As members on this side of the House have said so often, the gap between the rich and the poor under the present State Government and under the Federal Government is increasing week by week, month by month, from each policy initiative we are having brought before us.

We are told by the Government that this Bill was brought in as a result of a working party that considered amendments which were promised to landlords prior to the last general election in this State. The Government in its wisdom appointed a very political person to chair that committee, and the member for Gilles has referred to this. To find that this very political issue, an issue that has been debated over many years in the community, is being treated in such a partisan way by the Government is no surprise to those of us who speak in this House for low-income groups in the community, whose many basic rights are being taken away.

I refer in particular to the covenant implied in residential tenancy contracts that families with children shall not be discriminated against. We find that covenant now being removed, so it will be lawful for landlords to discriminate against families who have children on the basis that they have children. We hear so much from this Government about the dignity and sanctity of the family, the rights of children and the important role that they play in the substance of our community in strengthening the very fabric of our community, yet there could be no more effective way in which that fabric can be slashed and harmed than this legislation that we have before us this evening to allow landlords to throw out on to the streets women or families solely because they have children, solely because they have accepted some responsibility to procreate. This cannot be tolerated by the Opposition.

I believe that it is unpopular legislation that should be spurned by all upright citizens in this community. It is something the previous Government fought to achieve, and we should not see such rights taken away lightly. We understand, although we have no proof, that every legislative measure that comes before this House, although there have been very few of substance since this Government came to power, is subject to a family impact statement. We never see those family impact statements. We do not know who is the author of those statements. We do not know what weight is given to them by Ministers or their officers in the preparation of legislation. However, we are told that they are prepared. This is one case where I cannot see that a family impact statement would advise the Government to proceed with such a measure. I would be interested to know what is the justification in the interests of the family and the community, particularly those who are most at risk in the community. I refer particularly to supporting parents, particularly supporting mothers who have children to look after.

Often, at very short notice, they are thrown on to the streets. They have to seek rental accommodation to give shelter to their families. They have very little income, particularly in the early months of their separation, their isolation. They are often spurned by their own families and friends because of decisions that have been taken and circumstances surrounding them, yet here we have this further hardship thrust upon them. It is a most distasteful piece of legislation, and I cannot see any justification for it. If the Government really believes in rhetoric it talks about with reference to family impact statements, I would like to see the family impact statement that supports this move. We find that there are proposals to increase the amount of bond money that people have to pay from three weeks rent to the equivalent of four weeks rent. We know that that will harm those people who have the least amount of money, that group of people I was talking about a few moments ago, and also many other people, particularly young people, who come from the country and interstate and who may be orphaned or have undesirable family backgrounds and want to make their own way. Many of these people are supported by the Community Welfare Department. In fact, I understand that the Community Welfare Department spends a large amount of the money it has for emergency relief in paying bond money so that its clients can secure shelter. It is, in fact, a position where the Government will be paying money to private landlords so that this provision can be met and so that a basic right of people in the community can be provided; that is, suitable housing.

We find that the social circumstances that exist in our community today are working strongly against those who have to rely upon rental accommodation from the private sector. I have spoken in the House many times about the great problems which face the public housing authority in this State in meeting the demand for rental housing. The Housing Trust has some 20 000 people on its waiting list for rental housing at the moment. I understand that a single age pensioner has to wait five years from the date of application for rental housing to be provided with that housing. Many of those people die before they can be provided with public rental housing.

The report on youth housing handed down in this House some months ago indicates that some 9 000 young people in this State cannot find adequate shelter of an evening. We know of the great troubles that young people are having in our community at this time, mostly because of unemployment, crises in education and the great pressures that are placed upon young people. They often fall beside the wayside into lives of crime or are addicted to drugs or alcohol, or to some lifestyle of wastefulness. This is indeed a great burden and tragedy for the community, and a bleak outlook for the future of our society.

One of the fundamental aspects of this is adequate housing for those young people, particularly those young people at risk, and for their parents and those responsible for caring for them. We can trace many of the young people who fall by the wayside in our community to problems connected with housing. I understand that some 10 000 people each year in our community rely on women's shelters and men's homes for adequate shelter. Unfortunately, only two institutions in our community provide emergency housing for families. One of those institutions is in my district. Although it has been promised Government funding from time to time, it has never received it, and it relies on funding from its sponsoring church to continue providing accommodation for family units, which I am sure honourable members would see as much more desirable than having to split families that lack housing. This is all a scenario that has been foreshadowed by a Commonwealth Government which has for the past five years cut back, systematically and calculatingly, the amount of money available to the States for welfare housing.

Last Friday, the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Housing met. What happened. There was a further reduction of 30 per cent in funds to the States for welfare housing. I have not heard or read of a comment from the Minister of Housing for this Government in condemnation of the priorities of the Commonwealth Government, nor have I heard him condemn the previous cut-backs made by the Federal Government. Some five years ago, 4 per cent of the Federal Budget was available to be channelled into welfare housing. Now, one-half of 1 per cent of that Budget is directed into welfare housing.

The Victorian Minister of Housing, who seems to be much more prepared to come out and speak on behalf of those people in his State that he represents, has called the Federal offer of funds on this occasion "inadequate and immoral", and so it is. Every citizen who is concerned for the welfare and dignity of low-income groups in our community should come out as well and condemn the Commonwealth Government for its priorities on this occasion and on each of the previous occasions when it has so effectively slashed the money available to the States for welfare housing.

The offer made on this occasion might not be accepted by some States, and no doubt they will want it reviewed, if necessary, at the Premiers' Conference to be held shortly. Not only is there a 30 per cent cut in Federal funds, but it is a sum of money that is not indexed, because it has been an agreement over a number of years, and it will have to be spread further because it includes, for the first time, the Northern Territory. For rental housing in our State, this means that further pressures will be placed on the private rental housing market.

I have received a report done in this State by the Shelter organisation entitled, "Adelaide's Housing Crisis, 1981", and it is a survey of the private rental market from 1979 to 1981. Members will know that Shelter is a national and international organisation which speaks on behalf of homeless people and inadequately housed people in our community and communities throughout the Western World. The inquiry was conducted primarily because of the effects of the legislation before us. The study looked at various publications that are available through the real estate industry in this State, and made a thorough study of listings in the Adelaide *Advertiser* over recent years, comparing, over a considerable period, the increases in the availability of private rental housing and flats.

It listed a number of very disturbing trends in the housing market in South Australia, and I shall refer to some of them. First, the report refers to the recent dramatic increase in mortgage interest, which has meant some people moving out of private home ownership and others being discouraged from entering it. Secondly, the report of the working party on youth housing indicated chronic housing problems in Adelaide. Thirdly, the report referred to cuts in funds to the Housing Trust and the State Government by the Federal Government to one-tenth of their real value in 1975. The fourth point was that there are now more than 20 000 applicants on the trust's waiting list, an all-time record, 25 per cent higher than in 1978, with almost double the traditional level of pensioners and unemployed households having applied.

The survey refers to the State Government's Emergency Housing Office, which assists in the aid of some 4 500 households with urgent housing problems that have arisen. This is an indication of the increasing demand for emergency accommodation from the private sector. The report states that all indications are that the mining boom of the 1980's will force Governments to keep a tight rein on the money supply, and there will be considerable pressure to sustain current or even higher interest rates, all of which paints a gloomy picture for the housing industry in this country. Specific reference is made to the increasing numbers of aged people, the increasing rate of marriage break-ups, and the level of unemployment, and the conclusion is that it is difficult to see how there will be anything other than an increase in demand for Housing Trust and other alternative forms of housing assistance for low income earners in the future. Few members would disagree with that.

The conclusions of the survey are indeed quite alarming, because Shelter believes that market rents will have a dramatic effect on the economy of South Australia, especially in country areas, such as Port Augusta, Whyalla, and Mount Gambier, and in the Adelaide suburbs, particularly the outer suburbs of Elizabeth, the Parks area, and Christies Beach, and it is predicted that people in those areas will soon be forced to pay up to $30 a week more for housing.

Mr. Evans: Did they make any comment about rental values in this State as compared with other States?

Mr. CRAFTER: I am glad the member for Fisher has raised this point, because it is one of the most frightening aspects of this Government's approach to the problem of low-income housing. I would have thought that this Government, of all Governments, would be encouraging young people to own their own homes and would be providing assistance for that, and yet we have had before us recently legislation to virtually abolish the South Australian Land Commission. One of the great advantages that young people in this State have enjoyed in recent years has been the ability to buy land on which to build a house at a very reasonable price, as compared with that paid by their counterparts in other States, particularly in Melbourne and Sydney, where the cost of land is almost equivalent to the cost of a house.

Mr. Evans: What about rental?

Mr. CRAFTER: That is what I am saying. I would have thought that that would take off the pressure from the private rental market, but we are having increased pressure, so market demands will mean that rentals will increase. Shelter predicts that we will find that, as a result of this Government's so-called initiatives, rents will rise dramatically, and before long they will be comparable with those of other States. The cost advantages that have been built into the economy of this State will rapidly erode. The people who will be affected most will be those who can least afford to pay the higher rents, those who are most at risk in our community. With your permission, Mr. Acting Speaker, I wish to have inserted in *Hansard* a table showing the results of the surveys conducted by Shelter.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Is it purely statistical?

Mr. CRAFTER: Yes.

Leave granted.

SHELTER SURVEY
Advertiser, Saturdays, January 1979-1981

	Year	Frequency	Relative Percentage	Frequency Change	Average Rent	Increase Per cent
Houses	1979	454			56·29	
	1980	464	+2·2		59·48	5·6
	1981	276	−40·5		68·46	15·0
Flats	1979	1 035			37·74	
	1980	1 241	+16·6		38·42	1·8
	1981	581	−53·2		43·16	10·9

N.B. Does not include fee charging letting services.

Mr. CRAFTER: One of the frightening conclusions of the survey done by the Shelter organisation is the frequency of vacancies advertised in the *Advertiser*, which has dropped dramatically, some 53·2 per cent for flats and 40·5 per cent for houses in a very short period. We can see that fewer and fewer rental properties are available in our community, certainly those properties that are easily ascertainable through the daily newspapers, and more and more people are demanding such accommodation.

On top of that, there has been a substantial rise in the cost. As the member for Fisher no doubt will indicate if he speaks in this debate, there is a grave risk now that rents will increase dramatically and that the return for landlords, because of market forces, because of Government policy, no doubt will be much more attractive. This legislation will further enhance the investment of landlords in rental properties, and undoubtedly it is the intention of the Government to return to landlords the boom days they experienced in the 1960's and early 1970's, when conditions were so favourable to landlords, and brought about the need for the residential tenancies legislation of 1976 and the fair dealing that this brought into this State. It was a piece of legislation much envied by residents in other States.

Other provisions in the Bill of which the Opposition does not approve relate to the proposal to allow for eviction proceedings to commence within seven days of the failure of a tenant to pay rent. The current provision is that 14 days in arrears is required. This, once again, falls very heavily on people who are in difficulties, often economic difficulties, if an unexpected illness or death occurs in a family, or if one member of a family, under the threat of a warrant of commitment to send that person to gaol, must pay a fine. The rent money goes on that expense. That is the urgent, immediate need. What can be done in seven days, when most pay periods are 14 days, when social security payments are made in 14-day periods, and when it often takes more than a week to receive emergency funding from one source or another when an application goes to a committee or to the various levels of Government and the private agencies that assist families in need in our community? Yet, the Government proposes that eviction proceedings can be commenced within seven days of the failure to pay rent.

This is a very pernicious move, and I cannot see how it can assist the landlord. If a person has no money to pay the rent on that occasion, one would have thought that a degree of understanding, compassion and conciliation was required so that the matter could be worked out properly, without a landlord's immediately having the power to rush off for eviction proceedings. If people are going to flee their premises, as a small minority do, there is nothing the landlord can do to recover his money. Such people are skilful at doing that sort of thing, but they will not be harmed by this provision, which will affect the genuine tenant who just cannot pay the rent that week. To bring down a measure such as this shows little understanding for that group of people. As I suggested earlier in relation to the provisions relating to the increase in bond money, we will once again find the already overburdened private welfare agencies and Government departments having to find those funds to maintain adequate housing for those people in the community. The Opposition cannot support such an unfair and unjust attack on those people.

Mr. Evans: Where is the "seven days" notice in the Bill? Tell me the clause.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. CRAFTER: I refer to the proposals of the working party, which were no doubt approved by the Government and which are to attack this group of people in the community by legislative means. The Opposition does not approve that action. Hopefully, members opposite will not adopt that course of action in the latter stages of this debate. We can see that, slowly but surely, the lot of those people in the community who are underprivileged is being made much harder. Those members of Parliament who are attending to their duties in their districts see all too often the problems of people who lack adequate housing and who have to rely on the rental housing sector for adequate housing for them and their families. We see all too often that those people are unemployed, ill, or have had some misfortune in their family, and to make their lot much harder does no credit to this Government, particularly since the Government went to the people so loudly and strongly on the basis of the dignity and sanctity of families and the family unit as the basis of our community.

I would have thought it would be of greater value to landlords and the structure of our community if this Bill had contained provisions that would provide more understanding for the reality of the problems that face the community, but that is not so, and the clauses to which I have referred are very biased in favour of the privileged in our community and those people whose properties are rented to others. For those reasons, I join with my colleagues in opposing those provisions of the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. It is very easy for any member to become emotional and consider that all tenants are poor and all landlords are rich. That conclusion can suit the political philosophy of a member in regard to an argument, and there is no doubt that the member for Norwood set out to use that argument, knowing, I suppose, that in his own district, some people would want to believe that that is the case. Perhaps he thought he could make use of that argument at some time in the future. I can give an example of the reverse situation to show how the member for Norwood can be misled by

taking the line of argument that he has taken. I know of a young couple who found that the only place of employment for the husband was in Whyalla. Owning a house in the Hills they had no alternative but to let the house, on which there was a substantial mortgage. They rented a house at Whyalla. Two of the children suffered from a disease, and another of the children had a hole in the heart condition that could not be operated on.

After working in Whyalla for some time, the husband contracted a cancer, and he is now facing the second episode of that cancer. The family had to return to their property in the Hills. Fortunately, service organisations helped in getting them back, but they still have the mortgage over their heads, substantial medical expenses for the children, plus the condition of the husband and the wife unable to work because of the circumstances in which they live. That family rented accommodation in Whyalla, because the rent that they received from their property hardly met the mortgage repayments, let alone maintenance and all of the other costs. To say that those people should have taken the risk of allowing tenants into their house who would not pay the rent, whether it be for one week, two weeks, or six weeks, would be unfair. I make the point for the benefit of the member for Norwood that there is no provision in this Bill to say that the landlord can evict the tenant within seven days, as the honourable member attempted to imply. He wanted the House to believe that that provision was contained in the Bill, but it is not. That may have been a recommendation of the working party report, but this Government did not accept it. When a member tends to use those arguments to try to strengthen his case, we know that his argument has very little foundation, and that he is desperate to create an emotional situation.

The honourable member made the point that we in South Australia are now beginning to pick up some of the leeway of the vacancies that existed for residential accommodation. We all know that from 1975 until recent times there has been a massive surplus of rental accommodation in South Australia. We now know that that leeway has gradually been taken up, for one reason in particular—people stopped building flats and home units for rental and stopped converting existing properties into strata-titled houses or flats. A slow-down in the creation of rental units resulted. As the demand continues, the leeway must drop.

To argue that the person who owns a property should pick up the community responsibility of carrying on an unprofitable business is unfair. Each and every one of us knows of people who own property within our electorates and rent it out for many and varied reasons. They could have been transferred to another State in their job and may hope to return to this State later and live in the home they built, spending the rest of their lives in that area. They have no alternative but to let that property out for rental. While it is being rented out, they are paying rent somewhere else to another person who has rental accommodation available. Those people are not in the business of attempting to make money from rental accommodation. They are seeking to make ends meet by getting a balancing-out effect, by renting their home as against the one they may rent in another part of this State or in another State.

There are people that have built or bought properties for rental and some of them have large numbers of units available. In recent years, they have argued quite strongly that the rents they receive are not high enough for them to meet all the charges against property, plus service the money invested. Those people who believe that, if you have money, you should not be able to put it into any area in which you can get an interest rate at least somewhere near the inflation rate will argue, "Bad luck; you should not rent property to show a profit; you should rent property to carry the social responsibility."

Mr. Crafter: Who says that?

Mr. EVANS: I will give an example. If one owns property (and it wouldn't be a very expensive place for rental accommodation) that was worth $30 000, even at 10 per cent one is looking at $60 a week to service the capital, without all the maintenance costs and other problems.

Mr. Crafter: And the tax deductions.

Mr. EVANS: Tax deductions are not much use unless you are in the income area where you could make use of them. If that is the case, a person can do it in other areas. If the member for Norwood is setting out to take that type of person out of the rental housing supply area, what he is saying is that we do not want the private sector to own rental accommodation to help pick up some of the leeway, so we will put more people on the rental accommodation waiting list of the Housing Trust. That is exactly what the member for Norwood is saying.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. EVANS: We do not want to place people in a position where they cannot survive by supplying rental accommodation, so they pull out of the field, with the Government thus having an even greater problem on its plate.

The previous Government was unable to solve the problem of creating enough low-rental accommodation for those on the waiting list. As the Minister (the Hon. Mr. Hudson) said when I raised the question a few years ago, even though there may be a waiting list of 10 000, 15 000 or 20 000 applicants, if you could make the offer tomorrow to all of them that there was a living unit available, a vast number of them would not need the accommodation. I am only repeating the words that have been uttered in the past by a previous Minister, and the same position applies today. Because there are 20 000 on the waiting list it does not mean that if those units were available tomorrow they would all want them. I am not saying that we should not be concerned about the position. We have been talking about the same problem since the mid-1960's and even before. Perhaps the creation of the Housing Trust in the late 1930's was the reason for it.

We cannot solve that problem overnight. What we are doing in relation to the private sector will not make that position any worse, because the market forces are such that there is still an over-supply of rental accommodation. Even if we have a living unit worth $20 000, and that is very cheap, for the landlord to survive at 10 per cent interest (and 10 per cent can be obtained anywhere in any investment; it is a low interest rate), forgetting about rates and taxes and other charges such as maintenance costs, he would have to get $40 a week to get 10 per cent on his investment. How many people on a low income, the area about which the member for Norwood is talking, could afford even that sort of money? It is not possible, so there is no benefit in the suggestion that the private sector can afford to pick up that area.

The Government is considering this problem, and we will attack the problem in a correct way. It is making Housing Trust houses available to tenants at the moment, so those tenants can buy them and there is more money to build houses for those people who require them on a rental basis. I am sure the Minister will prove the point to the member for Norwood. Because his Government avoided as much as possible selling Housing Trust homes to those

people living in them, even when they wanted to buy them, his Government was denying—

Mr. Crafter: Rightly so, too.

Mr. EVANS: Rightly so, says the member for Norwood. His Government was denying people who wanted low-cost housing the opportunity to have it, because many of the people living in trust homes had jobs and businesses that meant they could well afford to pay the market price for rental accommodation, and they were not doing it. In fact, the previous Government encouraged them to bludge upon the system, while people who were deserving of low-cost rental accommodation were unable to get it, because the Labor Government believed in the exploitation of the system.

The member for Norwood spoke about the many young people who have difficulty in relation to rental accommodation. In that area I believe he was accurate. This applies particularly to many of the unmarrieds. Unfortunately, that is a fault to some degree of our total society, whether it be family, whether it be the community, whether it be Commonwealth Government, the State Government, Labor Party, Liberal Party or whatever. We developed an attitude in the 1960's when we said to young people, "It does not matter what attitude you take, when you get to 24 or 25, having spent whatever you have on things that do not count much in later life, we will give you something to start off with, a house, and the taxpayer will pay." We have now got to the point where the taxpayer is starting to say, "I cannot afford to pay." I am not talking about just the rich; I am talking about the persons working for wages, often a very mediocre wage or salary, and they find the tax they are paying prohibitive.

The reason in one area in particular is that we make money available through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for people to be able to buy their first home at about 5¾ per cent. Under previous Administrations, both Federal and State, there was no area for increasing that interest rate. It was a 30-year agreement and people who got capital at that rate early in their married life could end up, a few years later, both being doctors or lawyers or in a good profession, and they had had 25 years at an unincreased interest rate.

I give credit to the previous Minister of Housing in this State in that he was prepared to accept (even though he said it grudgingly, but deep down he knew it was correct) a change that nowadays people can afford to pay a higher interest rate progressively, at a slightly increased rate each year, until it is 1 per cent below the long-term bond rate. We all know that the money that comes out at that low interest rate at 5¾ per cent is borrowed by the Commonwealth at the rate of at least 9 per cent and up to 10½ per cent. The person who pays the difference is the taxpayer, and quite often the taxpayer is a young person working for wages.

Mr. Keneally: He's a worker.

Mr. EVANS: As the member for Stuart said it is the person who is working and who is getting a mediocre tradesman's wage, and he is just priced out of the low-interest area because of the income he gets. He must pay the tax and pay the higher interest at 10 per cent, 11 per cent or 12 per cent, while his counterpart, a doctor or lawyer down the street, is getting away with 5½ per cent. The Government has amended that provision. I support the policy of the Fraser Government of increasing the interest rates progressively for those who can afford it.

Mr. Keneally: What did you do—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart will have an opportunity to speak in due course.

Mr. EVANS: If we had been doing that in this State since the mid-1960's we would have eliminated a lot of our housing troubles. However, none of us had the intestinal fortitude to do it as political parties.

Mr. Abbott: But you were in Government then.

Mr. EVANS: I admit that, and I brought it to the Party's notice at the time. I do not deny that my Party was in Government from 1968 to 1970, and we had a chance to correct the matter, but it was not taken up. However, at least the present Federal Government brought the message home. The amount of extra interest we get in the States each year is quite significant. I do not know the exact figure but it is millions of dollars overall. That is another benefit that does not have to come from the Federal Government; it is already being repaid, so the States can use it. I think the member for Norwood knows that, but if he does not, the member for Gilles knows that and knows it is a method of tackling that problem.

The member for Norwood said that many of these young students are supported by their families so that they can still rent accommodation, but it is a difficulty for them. He made the point that some of these young people come from the country or other States for a particular course because enrolment within a tertiary institution to further their studies is not available to them in another State. I believe that was the point he was attempting to make. I think in that case an injustice exists, if they have to move into accommodation on their own, but when there are four, five or six of them, as often occurs, and they share modestly priced accommodation, they are able to get by, even though it may be a battle. However, most people who succeed in this world, particularly at this stage when they are studying, have some battles.

Mr. Keneally: Inherit wealth.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. The member for Stuart may have inherited some wealth; he seems to be smiling, so he must have a lot. I do not have a lot of sympathy in one area, and this is a personal view which I believe I have stated before in this House. Many young people in our society are living on the system to some degree after moving out of their home when in fact there is accommodation and their family will accept them, but because they want freedom and independence they move out and then find the going rough. I do not deny them that right. I believe that a person should have the right to move out, if they are prepared to pick up the responsibilities with it. However, some people find it too tough financially and expect their parents to contribute something to help them when there may be a room and a family spirit available to them. If they make the decision in those circumstances, they should take the problems that come with it. They should not be problems that are placed upon the rest of society. There may be a feeling of emotion that causes people to say that I have no time for young people, that I believe that they should stay at home even though there may be family problems. Very few people, whether single or living together, do not have problems at times, and it is sometimes better to compromise and to take other steps than to expect society, through community welfare or whatever help there may be through the Government sources, to pick up the tab for the sake of their having a bit of independence away from the family structure. I do not deny such people the right to make the decision to have independence, but they should not ask the taxpayer to help pay for that independence and freedom.

The Bill will not create a shortage of accommodation. It will slow down the rate of movement of some capital out of this State to buy accommodation in other States. It will not affect rents in this State in an inflationary way unless we force so many people out of the rental accommodation area that there will be no private rental accommodation available, or not as much available, thus forcing up rents. I

think we all know that the market forces will put up rents in those circumstances.

One point on which the member for Norwood was not prepared to comment was that we in this State have the lowest cost for private sector accommodation of any mainland capital in Australia. The price for rental accommodation will escalate, because inflationary trends will cause it to do so. If it does not, there will be no private sector accommodation available. If one cannot make a reasonable income from rental accommodation, one will put one's money into something else.

Mr. Crafter: Aren't you going to talk about the covenant on children?

Mr. EVANS: The Bill does not say that people will be thrown out of homes because they have children. The Bill gives landlords the opportunity to make a decision whether to accept children under certain circumstances in certain accommodation. The honourable member would know that, when this Bill was originally brought in, there was a lot of debate as to whether that clause would work satisfactorily or not. In the main, I shall leave that to the Minister to answer. We have said that a landlord must take children regardless, except if he obtains an exemption because his is a special type of building in which there is danger for children or it is not properly fenced. This has meant that, where there may be many elderly people who have problems with sleeping or just in leading a peaceful life, they can force a landlord to take action against a tenant with children who may disturb the quality of life of the rest of the tenants.

Mr. Crafter: That is what the sociologists call a social mix.

Mr. EVANS: I do not care what the sociologists call it, but if it ruins the lives of 12 people it is better for us, as a society, to attempt to find accommodation for the family with children where the rest of the area will not be disturbed. I believe that few landlords have objected to having children in their accommodation, so there has been no problem in that sense. To some landlords it became a problem, but, more especially to the rest of the tenants, and I think we must be conscious of that.

When we first debated this matter, we found that the Housing Trust considered whether or not a family had children and the number of children involved before it would provide accommodation. The Government agency, under the Government that brought in the original legislation, would not accept a family with, say, five children in a house with two or three bedrooms, even though the family was prepared to live in those conditions. The philosophy does not go far when we get into that area.

The supply of emergency housing is a problem in a society experiencing broken marriages or where there is a tendency to think it is easier not to attempt to resolve the difficulties and where compromise is difficult to achieve. In some cases the wife, with the children, is forced to leave through the brutal behaviour of the male. Sometimes it is the reverse, but in the vast majority of cases the person who looks after the children continues to live in the family home, and the partner who is walking away from those responsibilities leaves the premises. If the house has a high mortgage and if there are hire-purchase payments, the person who remains behind faces an impossible situation. If the house is rented at normal market rents, the situation is equally impossible unless some provision has been made for emergencies and money has been left behind to help the partner who remains in the house.

This Bill will not harm this area or make it any worse. However, it is a matter we need to look at, and the Government is doing that. We will gradually overcome the problem, but we will never reach the point where, with a flick of the fingers, we have available at any one time all the housing necessary for emergencies. The Government is conscious of its responsibilities, and I congratulate the Minister in another place who introduced this Bill. It gives an opportunity for the private sector to continue in the market place and to supply rental accommodation at reasonable prices, considering the economic situation, giving landlords a chance to survive in the market place. I emphasise again that, if that does not happen, there will not be rental accommodation available and we will face a worse problem. I support the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I have listened intently to the member for Fisher, who has been very consistent in his attitude to this legislation. Perhaps he is consistent in relation to his area, because I do not know that there are many houses in his district that are rented. The Minister would not have the same problems in her district as other members face in the inner city area. Many people in the Unley area are renting accommodation, and it happens on occasions that people are shut out or thrown out, but it has not happened very often. People in this area live from day to day or from week to week. I know from the people who visit my office that one-third of the population in my area changes from time to time.

Under the provisions of the previous tenancies legislation, I have had no problems in my area, but that position will change when this legislation goes through both Houses, as people could be thrown out after 14 days. It could be seven days, and that would be shocking. I know how this Government works: something is done in the Upper House and it is changed here. If this legislation goes through, it will not go down too well with me. The Liberal candidate who stood against me at the last election is Chairman of the committee that has made recommendations in relation to the Bill. I will be telling the people of Unley, when we have Mr. Major standing as the Labor Party candidate, just what is the position. We have had no trouble in my district since the legislation has been in operation, and there has been great co-operation with the Police Force in the area.

I am sure this Government wants to put people out on the street. In my district recently, a person wanted to put someone out on the street, but found that the tenant had 120 days in which to get out of the house because of the time he had been in it. The landlord did not make the application, because he knew the law. I will make sure that people are not thrown out of their homes in my district.

I wonder why the Government has brought in this Bill. I have landlords and tenants in my area, and I have not heard one complaint about the present situation, but that position will change, and it will not be long before we will hear plenty of complaints. I agree that landlords have invested a certain amount of money, but in my area I do not think anyone could rent a flat for less than $35 a week. I do not know what rents would apply in the Minister's area, but that would be very cheap, in my estimation. An unemployed person receiving $150 a week to support his family of two or three children has no hope. We have had communes in my area where people have pooled their money to make sure they can pay the rent. We hear of damage being done to the premises. I know of two homes where it has been said that damage has been done, but when I have inspected the premises I have found that that has not been so. However, these people have had to pay out of their bond money.

I am very perturbed about this, and I intend to look after my constituents as much as I can. People in my district, whether they are tenants or owners, can always

approach me, and they know that. To think that the Government is making these changes is disgraceful.

I did not have much opportunity to prepare my speech, because this matter was listed for debate tomorrow. I remember that when the Labor Party was in Government and the Liberal Party was in Opposition, members opposite always said, "But you said it was not to be dealt with today—it was on tomorrow." I hope the Minister realises that this has happened. I will play politics strongly—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Just for a change?

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister must hold the record with that remark—it is the greatest of all time. The Minister says that she does not play politics: she takes everything very quietly. She says, "I thank the honourable member for his question." It does not matter from which side of the House the question comes. I am glad the Minister moved in. We can stand the strain: I have been on both sides of the House. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have digressed, but I must admit that I was upset that the member for Fisher made certain remarks. There would not be many flats in his district. I do not go to the country very often, but there are few areas in the country in which many flats are situated. However, in Unley, Hindmarsh and Henley Beach there are many flats, and I hope that some consideration will be given to people who rent those flats. Many people cannot afford to pay the sum required for bond money, which could be $200 or $300. I hope the Government considers this matter.

I also know that people can buy houses from $26 000 to $30 000, but not many people can afford to buy a house, so they have to rent flats, and they cannot afford the bond money required. There have been many transactions in regard to rental accommodation in my district over the years. I can tell the Minister that, if the Government attempts to move a person from my district under the provisions of this Bill, I will fight hard. I will go further—I will tell the people in my district that Mr. Nicholls, who is the Liberal candidate in Unley—

Mr. Randall: A good candidate, too.

Mr. LANGLEY: He was: he lost last time. The member for Henley Beach always comes in. Reference was made the other night to the member for Hindmarsh. Wonderful! You cannot help winning. If you win by a point, you win the premiership. The member for Henley Beach may be in a bit of trouble at the next election. Only one can win. I will retire from the House undefeated, unlike the honourable member. Only the other day, he went into the district of one of the members on this side.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will return to the Bill. I know I was out of order in answering an interjection. I assure the House that I will oppose this Bill and that I will look at what happens in my district in the future. I will tell the people in my district about Mr. Nicholls and, when they are run out into the streets, which the Government is trying to do, I will say, "Mr. Nicholls was the chairman of the committee that did the job." Members opposite have done a job on me in my district, but they have missed every time. The Liberal candidate will not win in my district. This Bill does not do justice to the people who cannot afford to pay bond money. I have not known of an occasion in my district on which a landlord or a tenant has not been treated properly. To put people out on the streets after 14 days because they have not paid rent is wrong, and, if I see one person run out of my district, I will help him, because that is my job.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I thank speakers from both sides who contributed to this debate, albeit with varying degrees of accuracy in the allegations that they made. I reiterate, particularly for the benefit of the member for Unley, that the Bill seeks to overcome the practical difficulties that have been experienced in the day-to-day operations of this Act since it was introduced. I draw to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the member for Unley, despite his protestations that he has had no complaints from landlords or tenants in his district, that his Party, when in Government, recognised that there were inequities in the application of this Act and established a working party with a view to reviewing the operation of the Act and, presumably, to introducing amending legislation. That should be recognised as a fact.

I now refer to the points made by the various speakers. The member for Gilles began his speech by alleging that the Tenants Association was not consulted about this Bill.

Mr. Slater: You should have listened more carefully.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member said that the Landlords Association and the Real Estate Institute were invited to comment (I think they were the words he used), but the Tenants Association was not. For the record, I make clear that the Tenants Association was invited to examine the report of the working party and to comment on the working party.

Mr. Slater: After it was finished.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The invitation was extended to the Tenants Association on 26 June 1980, and the association replied on 21 July 1980 with several comments that were taken into account by the Minister. It is true that Mr. Robert Nicholls chaired the working party. I would regard any comments in regard to Mr. Nicholls as quite irrelevant to the Bill. The working party also comprised two other public servants, Mr. Peter Young, the Deputy Director-General of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, and Ms. M. Doyle, legal officer from the Attorney-General's department. It is unworthy of members opposite to cast aspersions on the integrity of anyone on that committee.

The member for Glenelg dealt at some length with clause 29 of the Bill which seeks to amend section 59 of the Act, which provides:

> Where a residential tenancy agreement provides that, upon breach by the tenant of the agreement to pay rent or any other term of the residential tenancy agreement or breach of this Act or any other Act, the tenant is liable to pay—
>
> *(a)* all or part of the rent remaining payable under the agreement;
>
> *(b)* rent of an increased amount;
>
> *(c)* any amount by way of a penalty; or
>
> *(d)* any amount by way of liquidated damages. . .

The member for Glenelg made the analogy between discounts for rent and discount for any other goods or services for which payment is made on time, the discounting being in effect, an incentive for payment on time. It should be pointed out that, whilst it is recognised that the practice of discounting can lead to incentives for payment, it can also lead to penalties for failure to pay. That is what the present clause 30 is seeking to overcome. For example, a landlord may be willing to let the premises for $60 a week, but he might set the rent in the lease at $65 a week and include a term that the tenant is entitled to a rebate of $5 per week if the rent is paid on time. While this scheme is characterised as a rent rebate scheme, in fact it amounts to a penalty scheme. This is because if the rent is paid late by the tenant it will be at a rate greater than that for which the landlord is willing to let the premises. By

preventing the rent rebate scheme and the rent penalty scheme, the Act recognises that it is not the landlord's function to penalise tenants for breaches of the agreement—that function is to rest solely with the tribunal in cases of breaches of contractural terms and with the Magistrates Court in cases of statutory breaches. I should point out to the member for Glenelg that none of the groups which were asked to comment on the recommendations, including the Real Estate Institute and the Landlord's Association, had any objection to that clause.

The member for Norwood is guilty of misrepresentation in the way that he presented his view of this Bill. He indicated that the House should be sad to be debating the Bill. I challenge him to state why. There is no reason whatsoever for the House to be sad in debating this amending Bill, which recognises the rights of both landlords and tenants and provides a far more practical and equitable means of effecting the relationship between landlord and tenant. The member for Norwood seemed to be determined to have it that this Bill is devised to advantage landlords and disadvantage tenants. I categorically reject those assertions. There was no substance whatever in this Bill or in the second reading explanation to substantiate the member for Norwood's allegations.

He also alleged that the Bill would make it lawful for landlords to discriminate against families with children. He said that it would allow landlords (and I think I can quote his words correctly) "to throw women on to the streets because they have children". That is a gross misrepresentation and it should be laid to rest simply by reading the relevant clause. I should point out that the major provisions of section 58, as introduced by the previous Government, remain. It is still illegal to refuse to grant a tenancy just because children will live on a premises, and it is still illegal to advertise or state one's intention of so refusing to grant a tenancy.

The member for Norwood obviously has not read the effect that this amendment will have on the principal Act, nor has he recognised that subsection (3) of the principal Act has acted as an unreasonable restriction on negotiations between prospective tenants and landlords. A landlord should have the right to ask who is to live in his premises, including how many people and what children there will be. It is not necessarily discriminatory for him to ask such qustions, and yet subsection (3) of the principal Act makes it an offence.

One thing that the Government finds thoroughly distasteful about the principal Act is that subsection (4) of section 58 involves a reverse onus of proof on prosecuted landlords. That is contrary to the normal rules of justice and evidence in our legal system, and it is something which this Government rejects absolutely and which it proposes to delete from the Act. To suggest that this amendment woud allow landlords to throw women on to the streets just because they have children is arrant nonsense and should be regarded as such.

The member for Norwood also referred to increased bond money from three to four weeks rent, as provided under clause 18 of the Bill. I point out to the member for Norwood that the increase brings the level in line with interstate levels. For example, in New South Wales, where the Labor Party's counterparts are in office, the maximum bond is four weeks rent for unfurnished premises and six weeks rent for furnished premises. No such distinction is made in South Australia. I point out that average rents in New South Wales are infinitely higher than they are in South Australia, and therefore that provision in New South Wales is considerably more onorous than it could possibly be regarded in this State. I stress that a level of four weeks rent is considered appropriate to provide protection for the landlord's substantial investment.

As was highlighted by the member for Fisher (and I remind the member for Norwood), South Australia has the lowest rental rates of any mainland capital, and there is no evidence that this amending Bill will have any adverse effect whatsoever on those low rental rates. On the contrary, I think it will be demonstrated that more and more landlords will be encouraged to enter the field as a result of the removal of the punitive provisions of the principal Act, and that could only create a more highly competitive market and a far better situation in which tenants have the opportunity to choose between a variety of premises at a reasonable rental.

I also point out to the member for Norwood, in response to his allegations about the alleged failure of Liberal Governments to concentrate on the welfare housing market, that since this Government came to office the Housing Trust is concentrating more on urgently needed rental accommodation. The figure for the commencements for sale for 1978-79 (and some of those premises were rented) was 976. For 1980-81, the number is 410, and the honourable member will see how, when we are looking at commencements for rental, the proportion of these figures is reversed. In addition to the 500 houses a year being acquired for rental, 573 houses were being commenced for rental in 1979-80, and in 1980-81, 1 085 are being commenced for rental. That brings a total of 1 495 units for rental accommodation being commenced in the current financial year. That stacks up very well against the record of the previous Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The members for Unley and Norwood spent some time in criticising an eviction clause, but I stress that there is no eviction clause in the Bill. The member for Fisher demonstrated a good understanding of the diverse range of people who are involved as both tenants and landlords in the accommodation area. The member for Gilles and the member for Unley seem to believe there is an archetypal landlord who is a blood sucker intent on squeezing the last drop from his poor wretched tenants.

Mr. Slater: I didn't say that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, but that was the picture painted by the honourable member's colleagues, that the tenant is a poor, wretched, impoverished creature who, in all circumstances, has to be helped and assisted and who is a model of virtue requiring the care and attention of the Government. That is the general picture presented by the Opposition in debating this Bill. I should point out that, as a private member, I have had landlords who are low-income earners and who have tried to supplement their income by making part of their excess housing accommodation available for rental. I am referring particularly to widows. I have had them come to me absolutely distraught because of the punitive provisions of this Act and the effect it is having on their investment. These people are not high-income earners looking for a huge profit; they are low-income earners, in the main pensioners, who are trying to supplement their pension and, at the same time, increase the low-rental housing stock by making available parts of their houses.

These are the people who are simply not able to endure the oppressive provisions of the principal Act since it was introduced.

The member for Fisher made some very sensible, basic economic statements, and he dealt particularly with the need for equity in the way a Government, through legislation such as this, treats both landlords and tenants,

and I commend his speech to the House. The member for Unley certainly has experience at representing an area in which there is a higher than usual proportion of rental accommodation. However, I was most interested to note his assertion that there has been no trouble, as he put it, in his district since this Act was introduced. I must say that it stretches credulity to believe that an area in which there are so many landlords and tenants has not thrown up one complaint since this Act was introduced. I venture to say that, because his own Party recognised while in Government that there were inadequacies in this Act, it set up the working party.

Mr. Langley: You are quoting out of context.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley had his opportunity to speak. It is now for the Minister to sum up.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am not saying for one moment that I disbelieve the member for Unley. Not for a moment would I pick on the member for Unley; it would be too cruel, and I would not dream of doing it. I simply point out that I accept at face value the assertion he has made that he has had not one complaint. I can only wonder where his constituents have directed their complaints. Perhaps they have gone to a member of the Liberal Party in the Upper House.

Mr. Langley: In other words—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can only sympathise with the member for Unley, but not for one moment do I disbelieve him.

I conclude by reiterating the three basic premises on which this amending Bill is built: first, there is a need to maintain an adequate supply of rental accommodation in South Australia. It is a Government responsibility to ensure that this accommodation is available to people of all incomes and in all situations. Secondly, the Bill recognises that unnecessary restrictions have been placed on landlords of residential premises and that these restrictions should be avoided or modified in the interests of the total community. Thirdly, every effort has been made by the Government and by the Minister in preparing this Bill to ensure that a proper balance is struck and that the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants are recognised in a just and proper fashion.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Security bond."

Mr. SLATER: The Opposition strongly opposes this amendment to the principal Act. We believe that the increase from three weeks to four weeks rent for the landlord's security bond places an additional burden on many people in the community. I believe that this amendment will seriously disadvantage many prospective tenants on low incomes, and particularly those on fixed incomes. I refer, of course, to those people who may be unemployed, to single-parent families on welfare benefits, and to people on extremely low incomes. I made the point in my second reading speech that the South Australian Council of Social Service Incorporated believes, also, that this could be the case.

The Minister argues that the maximum requirement of four weeks rent in advance is in operation interstate. I do not think that is a particularly sound argument. The point was also made that, generally speaking, rents are considerably higher in other States of Australia. A survey just conducted indicates that the average weekly rental for flats in the metropolitan area of Adelaide is about $43. If the average is $43 a week and a four-week security bond is required, people on benefits and low incomes have to find $200 before they are able to gain occupancy of a flat.

It has come to my attention that there will be further problems regarding welfare housing in South Australia because, at the Housing Ministers Conference last Friday, even though there has been no announcement about this in South Australia by the State Minister of Housing, Mr. Hill, there was a further cut of 30 per cent in welfare housing funds by the Commonwealth. That announcement was not received very well by other State Housing Ministers, particularly the Liberal Housing Minister in Victoria, who said that it was both inadequate and immoral. I believe we will face further difficulties in providing welfare housing for those in the community who need it. The provisions of this clause will place additional burdens on desperate people. There are 20 000 names on the waiting list of the Housing Trust, and statistics from the Emergency Housing Office indicate that applications for help have doubled in the past 18 months.

The member for Fisher seemed to think that members on this side believe that there are all bad landlords and all good tenants. I do not believe that that is the case, nor I think do my colleagues. There are bad landlords, and no doubt there are bad tenants. The legislation of the previous Labor Government was basically to balance the situation, and I think it has been effective.

Mr. Keneally: Despite the opposition of the present Government.

Mr. SLATER: Despite the opposition that the present Government put up. Members opposite fought tooth and nail, and the Bill went to a conference. It is important that the balance be maintained. One of the important clauses of the Bill which will severely disadvantage those on low incomes is this clause. As members of Parliament, we see the problems more than do many others in the community, when people come to our offices for assistance with applications to the Housing Trust, some of them in difficult and desperate situations. The number of people we see depends somewhat on the type of district we represent.

Mr. Evans: And how active we are.

Mr. SLATER: And it depends also on how active is the member concerned. We all get inquiries from people in difficult situations, and it is my experience that most of them are on some form of fixed income. They are recipients of either social welfare or community welfare benefits. If the clause remains in the legislation, the Emergency Housing Office and the Department for Community Welfare will be required to help more people who cannot afford to pay a four-weeks security bond. The department will be asked to pay the bond to help people establish themselves in accommodation.

The clause is a poor one. The provision of four weeks rent is fair from the landlord's point of view, but it is a tremendous amount of money for the person on a low income, and many cannot find it. I ask the Minister to consider the matter carefully. I believe that the views of the South Australian Council for Social Service and the South Australian Tenants Association should be considered seriously. The Tenants Association has demonstrated its sincerity in providing a submission which was requested of it, I understand, after the working party had submitted its report. It was given an opportunity to make some input into the interdepartmental working party. The Opposition opposes the clause.

Mr. KENEALLY: I oppose the clause. I have some sympathy for the Minister in her stand on this clause, because I am sure that she would not recognise a poor person if she were dragged screaming out of her electorate and confronted with one. In her contribution to the second reading debate, she mentioned the poor people in the

electorate of Coles and referred to widows who came to her office distraught because the flats and accommodation that they had to supplement their incomes were putting them in an invidious position.

I would like to inform the Minister that it would be well for her educational benefit to know that in the overwhelming number of Labor electorates widows come to see their members because they do not have a roof over their heads, not because they are concerned for their investment; they do not have an investment. Those are the people about whom we on this side are concerned and about whom we were concerned when we were in Government. The Liberal Party has been consistent on this issue. It opposed it when in Opposition, and now it is in Government it will change the legislation.

People who come into my office at Port Augusta are required to pay bond money. If that was increased by an extra week's rent, they would find themselves in difficult circumstances. The people who are the electors of the Minister would have absolutely no difficulty in finding that extra week's money. It could be six, seven or eight weeks, and the overwhelming majority of her electors would be able to pay it without any concern. That would apply to the electors of all of her colleagues.

The people we represent are not so fortunate. They are on the bottom end of the economic scale, and they would find it difficult. They are the ones of whom the Minister has no comprehension at all. She is given charge of this Bill because she is the one Minister above all who has shown absolutely no compassion. She could be described quite equally with the woman who masquerades as the Prime Minister of England. We know what they say about her interest in those people.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Stuart that he will not impute improper motives to the Minister.

Mr. KENEALLY: If comparing the Minister with the Prime Minister of England is imputing—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in this clause about the Prime Minister of England or anyone else.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Stuart that he will relate his remarks to clause 18.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, on what statement of mine did you rule initially that I am not allowed to impute improper motives to the Minister?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member was imputing that the honourable Minister, for some reason, was not concerned about the welfare of certain people.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Sir—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: Am I to understand that I am not allowed to say in debate that a Minister of the Crown is not concerned about the welfare of the constituents I represent?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is entitled to make comments in relation to the clause before the Committee. He would be well aware that he is not allowed to impute improper motives. He is quite in order to continue to debate clause 18, as long as he refers to that clause.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, Sir. The people in my district, those on the bottom end of the scale who will have to pay this additional money, are not the people that that Minister is concerned about, and a record of tonight's debate will show that clearly. I am concerned about those people in my district, in Port Augusta in particular, who, because of many circumstances, are welfare people with limited incomes who find themselves in difficulties. I wish that your collegues, Sir, in the Government were as concerned as I am. The Minister would not recognise a poor person if she was confronted with one.

That is the problem that she and her colleagues face when they debate Bills like this. They make their judgment purely and simply on the basis of their knowledge of people's capacity to pay, but the capacity of people to pay in the District of Coles compared to the capacity of people to pay in Labor districts, which are Housing Trust and welfare housing areas, is completely different, so I ask the Minister not to continue in an arrogant fashion by disregarding everying we say. We speak from experience. We are the members who daily deal with the dispossessed people of the community, with whom the Minister and her colleagues are very infrequently faced.

If I become emotional about this subject, it is for a good reason. I ask the Minister to compare a widow who is concerned about her investments and a widow (perhaps from my district) who is concerned about keeping a roof over her head or trying to find the wherewithal to maintain not a reasonable living standard but some sort of living standard. That is where members on this side part company with the Government and why we have a completely different attitude towards legislation such as this. I ask the Minister to heed the requests of the member for Gilles and me and to recognise that this added burden will fall more heavily on those least able to pay. I am not concerned about those who can afford to pay. Legislation should not be based on those who are best able to cope: it should also consider those least able to cope, and those are the people that the Opposition is representing tonight.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I point out to the member for Stuart and the member for Gilles that this Bill is not a piece of welfare legislation but a Bill to regulate a commercial activity, and that is what it does. Private landlords should not be expected to bear the social and economic burdens of society. That is precisely why we have a Housing Trust and an emergency housing accommodation facility. We are talking about an Act to regulate a commercial activity, and that is a reality that honourable members opposite should recognise. That is why the legislation was introduced in the first place—to regulate commerical activity. The Government does not propose to allow any modification or alteration to this clause, and I will tell honourable members why.

First, the increase is not mandatory: the landlord and the tenant will still be able to negotiate a lower bond figure if they choose. The rental market in South Australia is still not sufficiently strong for landlords of premises, to which lower income earners are attracted, to hold out for the full bond if it cannot be paid. That point should be borne in mind. I reiterate that a level of four weeks rent is necessary to afford the landlord greater security for the protection of his premises. The member for Stuart may insult me if he wishes: that is his prerogative in Parliament. But let him not insult my electors, who represent a very broad cross-section of the community, including the dispossessed and the supporting mothers, whom I see quite regularly and about whose problems I am deeply concerned. That concern has been demonstrated. I am equally concerned about the widow who is trying to protect her inheritance as about the widow who has no inheritance whatsoever.

Concern for those people should not be confused with concern for equity with the rights of both landlord and tenant, and the member for Stuart should realise that, if there is one way to drive out landlords completely from investing in rental accommodation, it is to make the conditions under which landlords are obliged to rent their

accommodation so unsatisfactory that they will simply decide that it is not worth the trouble, and shut up shop. The result will be that the stock of rental accommodation, both low rental and high rental, is reduced, and that is not in anyone's interest.

It may interest the House to know that the tribunal's records over the past few weeks demonstrate that the tribunal makes about 450 orders for payment of security bonds per week. Most of these are with the consent of both parties, but in about 15 per cent of the cases (65 to 70 per week) the payment of the bond to the landlord is not sufficient to cover the landlord's losses. Those losses include both arrears of rent and damage to premises. Usually, both of these factors appear together. It is these factors that the previous Government completely failed to take into account, and the Government intends to redress that situation. This clause will remain as it is.

Mr. SLATER: I point out to the Minister that the extent of housing problems among young people in this State was documented in a report by the Working Party on Youth Housing, under the Department of Industrial Affairs, in July last year. This report indicated that one of the greatest barriers to young people between the ages of 16 and 18 years securing housing was an inability to finance security bonds. That aspect of society was recognised in the report, and it showed that some 6 500 young people were in difficulties in regard to finding accommodation, because of an inability to finance security bonds. If bonds are increased to a maximum of four weeks rent as opposed to three weeks rent, this problem will be accentuated.

The Government on the one hand says that it wants to assist youth, and forms a working party to investigate the problems of homeless youth, yet it then introduces into Parliament a Bill of this nature that will make it even more difficult for people in that category to obtain accommodation. The problem has been recognised. The working party has reported that people of that age group have difficulty in obtaining accommodation because they cannot finance security bonds, so I ask the Minister how she can justify her argument that the clause will remain the same, when the report showed that problems existed in that section of the community.

Mr. CRAFTER: While the Minister has been very keen to wipe aside the role of the Opposition in this debate in the same way as some landlords are keen to wield their enormous power over powerless people and their families, I believe that this is a very tawdry and disgraceful provision. As the member for Stuart said, we are concerned not about those who can afford the increased amount but those who cannot. The clause does not increase the bond money to four weeks: with the increase in rent which has occurred over the years, as has been shown in the shelter surveys to which I referred earlier, the increase is of the order of five or six week's rent. It seems that the increase in bond money required is out of proportion altogether with what is a fair amount. I refer to the $12 a week increase in house rents over the last two years, which was the finding of the shelter enquiry; that amounts to some $48 for a four-week rental period. If average rent is $43 a week, that is in excess of an extra week's rent for families. On my calculations, it is raising bond money in real terms from three weeks to five weeks, or even more according to the predictions of the shelter group and of others in the community, including those in the real estate industry.

If we apply the formula that is provided for in this section, they increase with increases in rents, so there is this built-in factor which in fact increases the amount of bond money that is paid not to the landlord but to the central fund, and that is the safeguard for the landlord. Certainly there are circumstances where damage to rental premises occurs which is far in excess of that amount, but I point out to the Minister that the prudent landlord covers his premises by insurance, and no doubt the tenant pays for that because it is passed on, and further, there are civil remedies for recovery of damages.

Mr. Evans: You can't get blood out of a stone.

Mr. Keneally: They're trying to with the bond money.

Mr. CRAFTER: This is right. The member for Fisher wants to use this piece of legislation to get blood out of a stone, and he wants to do it at a most vulnerable time, when a family is seeking accommodation at a time when they most need it, when they will pay the greatest price to secure accommodation. I think what is being attempted to be achieved in this way is incorrect. The Minister has not told the House the real reason for these amendments. I do not believe that they can be justified in real money terms. I believe that other safeguards are available for the landlord. I think the words that the Minister used were to the effect that this piece of legislation has nothing to do with the rights of people, of individuals, of tenants.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I did not say that.

Mr. CRAFTER: The Minister said that this was not a piece of welfare legislation. All of those principles embrace welfare legislation; that is what we have welfare legislation for. We are debating that in another place, and soon it will be debated in this House—those very rights that people would hope to enjoy in the community. This is a piece of legislation about fair dealing between providers of services in the community and consumers of those services. It very much regulates the quality of life that both parties will enjoy, and it very much involves provision of a central service within the community, a basic right of people to have adequate housing. To say, as the Minister did, that this is purely a piece of commercial legislation is nonsense. It was never intended to be as such. It is a very important piece of legislation. I believe it has been an innovative piece of legislation which has served the community very well and which will continue to do so. I cannot see the point of this increase when I believe the provisions already exist in the legislation, and the problems to which the Minister and other members opposite referred can be met by other means.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Stuart made the point that within his area there are quite a significant number of people in a low-income group. Of course, he does not accept the fact that he has a very large percentage of Housing Trust homes to help those people, which is a provision that is not available to people in my electorate and which has been denied to people in my area, except people in one section in Aberfoyle Park, by all forms of Government. To help the low-income people in my area we have to battle it out by other means. Therefore, the member for Stuart is privileged as far as his low-income groups are concerned, compared to people in some other areas. His argument was unfair to people in those electorates. In my own electorate many people would be thrilled to have accommodation available from the Housing Trust for people who may be struggling to survive but who do not wish to go to another area. However, Housing Trust accommodation has not been made available by the Government of any philosophy, even though there have been requests for that sort of accommodation. I think that argument is unjust, and the member for Stuart should realise that there are low-income groups in all areas which deserve consideration. It may be the case that in the electorate of Stuart there is not a very high percentage of private enterprise accommodation, so the member for Stuart may have been talking with tongue in cheek.

Another point made about young people was that the report had said that 6 500 were seeking accommodation. One of the things that disappointed me about the report was that there was no clear indication of how many of those persons had available to them, if they wanted it, accommodation in their family's home where at least there may have been a reasonable environment.

Mr. Slater: It was your Government's report.

Mr. EVANS: I know. I am not blaming anyone in the present Government or from past Governments. I am simply saying that that is one of the things I would like to know. I believe that is an example of how we are quite often misled when we look at figures and numbers—there may have been an alternative, and I believe many would have had one. We do not want to say that the total number was disadvantaged because they had no alternative. Regarding four week's rent, that is a maximum. When the market place is over-supplied with rental accommodation, the landlords cannot all make it apply, because there are just not enough tenants, so they must barter. We all know that there is now an over-supply of rental accommodation.

Mr. Keneally: You are absolutely out of touch with some of the electorates in this State.

Mr. EVANS: I am not talking about any particular electorate. In some districts there is an over-supply, and in others there is a shortage. There is a shortage in my area. One cannot rent a property in the Hills, but there are plenty of places in the metropolitan area where one can rent flats. The honourable member used the figure of $43 as being the average rental. I asked whether he was talking about furnished or unfurnished flats, and he said, "flats". I believe that if he looks at the report he will see that it was not just flats; it was also home units, and there is a difference, the units are in a higher price group. We need to be quite genuine when we use figures.

Mr. Keneally: What is the average price in your electorate?

Mr. EVANS: I do not know, but some people in my electorate are paying as much as $200, and some as little as $10. I know that $200 would be paid for some of the bigger homes rented by companies for State executives, but that is not the category we are concerned about. The Minister said that, in 65 to 70 cases a week, the deposit held is not high enough to pay for the damage done to premises. We know what happens in circumstances like that—the landlords have to attempt to raise more money from rentals from responsible tenants for them to operate viably. There can be no alternative if they are to stay in the market place. No member opposite would let out his home at a loss, and if somebody damaged the home and did not have the ability to pay for that damage, the next time such member let out his home he would seek to get a higher rental to recoup his losses. If a person kept on losing on each tenancy, that person would not be able to stay in the market place.

Also, I believe that where a person is unable to raise the four weeks bond, if that person has the ability to pay and makes those figures available to the landlord, and if the landlord can see that that person has the ability to pay the normal rental he is asking, and the people are struggling to raise the initial bond, the landlord would obviously see the benefit of giving them a lower bond rate. However, if the bond could not be raised, and the prospective tenant could not show that he had the ability to pay, the landlord would not let the property. Nor would any member opposite let it, if he was relying on that property to produce an income to survive. It is just logical that it is not going to have any serious effect at all. I say to members opposite that four weeks rent is not an unreasonable amount to be held in the case of damage to a property or of tenants walking out and not paying rent. If the landlord so chooses and believes that the tenant has a good record, he can let him in without any bond at all. The amendment is not saying that they shall be charged four weeks rental as a deposit: the opportunity is still there to negotiate.

While there is an over-supply in some areas, some members say there is not an over-supply in others. In those circumstances, there will be some difficulty regardless of the amount of the bond, because where there is an under-supply the tendency will be to raise the rent, but if we frighten the operator out of the market place the supply will be lessened and market forces will be increased even more against the tenant, not in favour of the tenant, so we need to encourage landlords to stay, and we should give them a reasonable chance of getting something for their investment so that they will stay in the market place and so that rents are kept at a reasonable level for tenants. If not, the Government will have a bigger responsibility.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am concerned at what I have heard from the member for Fisher and the Minister. I do not think that they represent too many workers in their electorates. I suggest that what the member for Fisher has just said would not be unreasonable in his electorate, because from what he has said it seems that people in his area could be, for example, general managers, and they could probably afford to pay four weeks bond money, but I would like the member for Fisher and the member for Coles—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member should refer to "the Minister", not "the member for Coles".

Mr. PLUNKETT: My apologies, Mr. Chairman. I would like both the Minister and the member for Fisher to have a look at some of the accommodation in the Peake District. I heard the member for Fisher suggest that possibly my colleagues would have more constituents in Housing Trust accommodation than he has. There is plenty of private accommodation in the Peake area. I notice that the member for Fisher is carrying on now. I suggest that the only persons that the Minister and the member for Fisher are representing in this House tonight are the landlords.

I do not think that the argument the honourable member has put concerning bond money has any great strength. One of my colleagues pointed out earlier that all these landlords would have their properties fully insured. If there is any damage and the landlord is unable to get payment for it, there is no way that he would not be making a claim against his insurance company.

I suggest that the member for Fisher, who spoke about the housing situation in his area, has nowhere near the problem with housing that we have in the city area. He said that a lot of young people could return to their homes and live with their parents. If he looked around my district, he would find that many young people have been forced to leave their homes in country towns throughout South Australia and come to the city seeking employment, so I do not think his point was valid.

I do not think that the Minister represents any of the poorer class people. I think that all she is doing is thrashing the poor people further and further. Many people come into my office asking for assistance for bond money at the old rate, and I have to send them to a welfare department to get that money. I can see one of the back-benchers on the Government side smiling. That is natural, because he would not know the situation where workers are not able to fork out four weeks rent. They are lucky to pay their rent, in a lot of cases. Rents have already been increased, and now landlords will be asking for four weeks rent in advance. I suggest that some members on the other side should think a little before they vote for this measure.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will deal briefly in turn with the arguments of each of the members who have spoken on this clause. The member for Gilles appears to overlook the fact that there is a high incidence of tenants abandoning or damaging premises. Taking the average of 65 to 70 tenants a week, on an annual basis about 3 500 landlords each year experience a situation where tenants either damage premises or abandon them while in arrears of rent.

That is a very large number of landlords who are left without sufficient bond money to cover the costs of repairing damage or failure to pay rent. I think members will agree that 3 500 people in that situation is a large number. This clause is in the Bill simply because the extra amount of the bond will not cover all losses, but it will provide additional protection for landlords.

Members opposite allege that the Government is interested only in landlords and not in tenants, but that is not so. It is interested in the rights of both groups, and it is trying to ensure that the rights of both groups are protected and that the stock of rental accommodation in South Australia is sufficient to meet the need. We will not achieve that aim if we have oppressive legislation that drives landlords out of the accommodation market.

The member for Norwood spoke of the needs of low-income families who could not raise four weeks bond money. In cases of genuine financial difficulty, people can go to the Housing Trust or the Emergency Housing Office. All members know that, and they know that those people will be taken care of.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If we are talking about satisfaction, I think it would be acknowledged that those two agencies do a very good job.

Mr. Keneally: They do a very good job.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to hear the member for Stuart acknowledge that. The member for Gilles referred to the problem of homeless youth and the report on youth housing. Some of the young people in that situation would not have a hope of raising even three weeks bond money, and therefore it is false to design the Bill around their problems. Those young people need to be dealt with as a completely separate category, and the Government is looking at ways and means of helping them. Many need supervised accommodation and the kind of care that they could not be expected to get through private rental accommodation. It is a false and irrelevant argument to try to introduce their problems into the relationship of this Bill and the paying of bond money.

The member for Peake, interestingly enough, claimed that I would not know anything about his electorate. I lived in his electorate for 21 years until my marriage, and I know quite a bit about the area he represents.

Mr. Slater: How long ago was that?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That was 22 years ago, when I was 21. The honourable member alleges that the Government is not representing the poorer class. I think that that cannot be substantiated. In introducing the Bill, the Government has attempted to amend inequities. There is much in this Bill of considerable advantage to what the honourable member may describe as the poorer class, but whom I would prefer to describe as tenants who have difficulty in paying high rents.

He referred to insurance and said that landlords could insure their premises against damage. That is true, but the premiums for that insurance get higher and higher the more frequently premises are damaged, and then we have a vicious circle which makes it impossible not only to provide accommodation, but to get a return of investment. It is not just the cost of the premiums, but also the income lost through delays nd inability to let premises because they need repairs, and that should be taken into account.

An honourable member: That's covered by insurance.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Members opposite have a faith in insurance that I think goes beyond what is practical and realistic in terms of what it can achieve. Let us keep our feet on the ground and be a little bit sensible. It is impossible for insurance to cover the continual failure to pay rent and the continual infliction of wilful damage on property. In a year, we might expect 3 500 such instances, and it is those instances which this clause is designed to prevent and protect.

Mr. RUSSACK: After hearing what has been said by members opposite, I feel obliged to participate in this debate. It has been suggested that members on this side would not know such circumstances as those prevailing in suburbs where people are disadvantaged, or in areas where there are wage earners. I want to relate a situation in which I have been involved. I know of a home in an Adelaide suburb, an area in which most of the people are wage earners. It is in a Labor held seat. I am endeavouring to point out that four weeks rent has been suggested as a maximum, and in certain cases I would consider it reasonable to ask for that amount of bond money.

I speak from personal experience. A lady, a pensioner, went to a nursing home and has been there for a number of years. She had a nice home, which was rented out. Over the past nine years, it has been let to five different tenants, each one of whom has been a wage earner, and not a person with an income above average; perhaps some were a little below average. That was the type of person who was chosen to be a tenant in that place.

Mr. Slater: By a letting agency?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, by recommendation. The first tenant was a relative of the owner of the house. The second was recommended by the next door neighbour who was aware of the situation and the deterioration of the premises. So that it would be kept in a reasonable condition, the neighbour recommended a tenant. The third group of tenants were two league footballers whom I would consider to have had discipline through the sport in which they participate. Over the years, the rental charge has been very reasonable. The house is in a suburb which is seven minutes from the centre of the city, and the rent for a two-bedroom home has never exceeded $25 a week.

Over the years, the house has become uninhabitable, and it is now not fit for rent or habitation. When I saw it recently there were no electric light globes in the place and some of the furniture that had been left in the house had been taken. There are tenants who do not play the game, and that type of tenant should be responsible for bond money. In the case I have mentioned, there was no bond money. In my opinion, those tenants who were in full employment, on a wage, did not respond or acknowledge that they were paying a low rental in a good home in which the conditions were excellent.

I am the executor of the will, and I have had to get a court order through the Supreme Court under the Aged and Infirm Persons Property Act to dispose of that property so that that pensioner, who is not able to make decisions for herself, could rescue something from the property. I hope members realise that I know something of the difficulties experienced by people who own homes and who try to do the right thing. Some tenants do not respond in the right way. Therefore, I believe that the period should be increased from three weeks to four weeks, bearing in mind that that is the maximum, and it depends on the landlord to exercise his right to that degree. I believe that is reasonable, because of the experience I have related.

Mr. SLATER: I make clear to the member for Goyder that we believe that some tenants do not play the game. The honourable member gave an example, and all other members could relate similar situations in which people, in good faith, have let premises to tenants who have not responded accordingly. I could give an example in my own family: my son was transferred to the country in his employment and let his home to a relative, who did not do the right thing. Fortunately, it was only for three or four months. There are problems in this situation on both sides, and I believe that this is why the legislation was introduced.

The tribunal considered problems relating to landlords and tenants, and, obviously, the problems have not been solved. I doubt whether the situation cited by the member for Goyder would have been covered under the Residential Tenancies Act, because the Act did not apply in certain situations prior to a specific date. We are trying to establish a fair and equitable situation, particularly for those people on the lower strata of society who do the right thing as tenants and who want to obtain accommodation so that they can have a roof over their heads.

I am sorry the member for Fisher is not in the House at present, because he would be interested to know that last week I was approached by a lady who does not live in my district (and I am not even sure that she does not live in the district of the member for Fisher). She was on a widow's pension, about 50 years of age, and she was renting an upstairs flat, as she described it, at Clarence Park. She approached me as the Opposition spokesman on housing. She had an application with the Housing Trust, not of long standing (which did not put her high on the list), and she told me about the problems she had had in obtaining suitable accommodation. I do not know the extent of a widow's pension, but it is half what it should be. This lady was paying about $40 a week from that pension (probably 70 per cent of her income) on rent. She was distressed and did not know what she would do. She had about $18 or $20 a week to live on.

I do not suggest that the private sector of the housing industry should run a housing organisation: the responsibility in that regard lies with the Government, but unfortunately Governments cannot cope with the demand for housing, not only in this State but throughout Australia. The real problem lies in the fact that the Commonwealth Government has not provided sufficient welfare housing funds to the States. We saw another example of this last Friday at the Housing Ministers' conference. Our Minister has not commented, but the Victorian Minister stated that the Federal Government had further reduced the sum to the States for welfare housing.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Does that apply to the clause?

Mr. SLATER: It is applicable to the clause because we are dealing with rental accommodation. Plenty of people in the community are in the same position as the person to whom I referred. Through no fault of their own, they find themselves in difficulties in regard to accommodation. Should we place additional burdens on them? I say, "No". The working party that was set up by the Government to review the Residential Tenancies Act justified this clause in the following terms:

> Although this will not cover losses sustained by landlords in all cases, it will, in the case of default, provide additional protection and together with the proposed amendment to section 63 (3) should enable the landlord to recover any loss of rent, provided he has proceeded in accordance with his rights under the Act.

The Minister made the point that the Residential Tenancies Tribunal (if I remember her words correctly) dealt with about 450 cases a week. In about 15 per cent of those cases, the bond money held did not cover the landlord's costs. Obviously, in 85 per cent of the cases, these costs were met. Of the 15 per cent of the 450 cases that arose each week, there may be many cases (and I do not know the per cent) in which the tenant might have been disadvantaged to some degree and not the landlord. This depends on the decision of the tribunal, but no doubt in plenty of cases the tenant did not act in the right way and took advantage of the landlord.

We are trying to balance the situation. The situation at present, with three weeks bond money, is adequate, particularly when there have been increases in rentals over the past 12 months to the extent of about 15 per cent. This places a heavy burden on people on minimum incomes. I do not believe the private market will solve the problem of welfare housing. That is not its business. The only reason why the private market can let properties at present is that so many people in the community are not being serviced from the source from which they should be serviced—the Government.

This amendment will place an additional burden on those people in our community who can least afford it. We need to show some degree of compassion for those persons who through no fault of their own, find themselves in a very difficult position regarding accommodation. That is what we should be thinking about, not the position of landlords who in many cases are able to look after their own interests to some extent. I recognise that there are times when tenants do not act correctly, and there are plenty of times when landlords do not act correctly. On balance we ought to consider those persons in the community who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in a difficult position in securing accommodation.

Mr. KENEALLY: One interesting factor to come out of this discussion was brought to the Committee's attention by the member for Fisher. He agreed with his Minister that we need to be able to encourage investment into the accommodation sector. Both he and the Minister said that if we were to place on the private investor in accommodation unnecessary strictures that money would go elsewhere. The member for Fisher went on to say that there is a surplus of rental accommodation in Australia. I want to know what is the logic of bringing this measure forward. The only argument that the Government has been able to put before us in support of increasing from three weeks to four weeks rent is that the requirement in regard to bond money is to encourage investment of money into providing flats and houses.

The Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot say, on the one hand, that there is a surplus of accommodation and, on the other hand, say that we ought to encourage people to go into an industry where a surplus already exists. The Minister must tell the Committee, using her argument as the basis, whether or not there has been a decrease in the amount of rental accommodation available in South Australia as a result of the existing section, which requires three weeks bond money. The burden of the Government's argument is that that is what has happened, that we are discouraging money from entering the accommodation sector. Is there evidence to substantiate that? If the Government cannot provide that evidence, its whole argument falls on that point, and that one alone. I submit that this proof is not available.

At Port Augusta there is a two year waiting list for housing. That area is a growth centre and housing is being constructed at Port Augusta at a higher rate than in any other electorate in South Australia. At the same time, we

have a very high construction rate for private accommodation, particularly for flats—we do not aspire to home units in Port Augusta. One cannot get a flat at Port Augusta for less than $60 unfurnished. One will pay that amount for a hovel in Port Augusta, as the demand for accommodation is extreme. Because of the law of supply and demand, landlords take advantage of that situation. If the Minister has her way, under these provisions people will now be required to pay exorbitant bond money for substandard accommodation.

Mr. Sparrow, of the housing improvement section of the Housing Trust of South Australia, would spend more time in my electorate, in Port Pirie and Port Augusta, than in any other district, chasing after landlords who are charging exorbitant rates for substandard accommodation. I do not have a great deal of sympathy for a great many landlords. I know that some landlords suffer at the hands of tenants. Personally, I have been shown some of these flats by persons who are anxious to show me what some tenants do, but they are not so anxious to take me out and show me the accommodation for which they charge $60 to people who can find no alterative accommodation. To show how completely out of touch the Minister is with the real world, I point out that she says that if people are in such desperate circumstances they can go to the emergency housing section of the Housing Trust and it will look after them. That is absolute piffle.

The overwhelming majority of cases I take up with the Housing Trust of people having difficulty finding housing are urgent welfare cases. There is just not the accommodation there for them. I wonder whether the Minister has lived any part of her life at Port Pirie. I think she has been around long enough to have lived part of her life in each of the 47 electorates. However, I am not allowed to insult the Minister. If she had ever spent part of her life in Port Pirie she would know, as is the case in cities of that nature such as Broken Hill and Kalgoorlie, which are two that come to mind, there is a large stock of substandard housing which the local government would condemn if it were not for the fact that the accommodation is urgently needed to house, not only elderly people who have been living there for most of their lives and who require better housing, but also for young couples who cannot afford better accommodation. That is why we have this type of housing in Port Pirie.

I notice that the member for Rocky River has come in to listen to this, although luckily there is not too much of this sort of accommodation in his electorate. However, there are landlords in Port Pirie who snap up the substandard houses, which have been condemned, provide a minimal amount of improvement to them, and then put people in them and charge exorbitant rates. They provide a whole stock of these houses, and these landlords have come in to complain to me about the activities of the Housing Trust improvement section.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: How many of these landlords have come to complain?

Mr. KENEALLY: Two I think, but each owned a dozen or so houses. I am quite prepared to answer any of the questions, because what I am saying is completely factual. In Port Pirie and Port Augusta there are people who are required to pay exorbitant rents for substandard housing. Under this provision these people will now be required to put up four weeks rent for a bond, for substandard accommodation.

I do not reflect on the member for Goyder, who is a most genuine person, but his argument was in favour of the landlords. It seems to me that no member opposite has been able to put forward an argument that would indicate that the Government has some knowledge of the problems that tenants face, particularly those in extreme circumstances, that is, those who are unable to pay four weeks bond money and who are therefore unable to find accommodation.

I think I have spoken for long enough to give the Minister the opportunity to find out for the benefit of the Committee whether the existing requirement for three weeks bond money has resulted in a reduction of the rental stock available in South Australia. If she is saying that that is the case, how can she then accommodate the honourable member for Fisher's suggestion that there is a surplus of rental requirement in South Australia? If there is a surplus of rental requirement in South Australia, there is no need to give another benefit to the landlord. This is just a straight-out handout to the landlords without the economic fact that the Government wishes to use being substantiated. I am interested to hear what the Minister has to say in answer to the comments I have made.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Members opposite seem to have conveniently overlooked the fact that clause 18 contains a couple of subclauses. In opposing clause 18, they are opposing provisions which are going to be of very great benefit to tenants. I will come to that in a moment. The member for Stuart has made allegations about landlords at Port Pirie buying up substandard housing and renting it out at exorbitant rentals. That is against the law, and if he has knowledge of it he should report it to the authorities.

Mr. Keneally: I do.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am delighted to hear it. The Housing Improvement Act does not allow people to let substandard accommodation. Section 36 of the Residential Tenancies Act allows an application for a reduction in excessive rentals, so if the honourable member is aware of the situation, as he has indicated that he is, it is his responsibility to take action under the law to see that this situation does not continue. I commend those two Acts to him.

In respect of the evidence to indicate that housing stocks are being reduced as a result of inadequate bond moneys, I again refer members opposite to the fact that 15 per cent of the 450 orders for payment of security bonds each week are for payments of bonds to landlords where the money has not been sufficient to cover the landlord's losses. That is the justification of the clause. That averages out at 3 500 such incidents each year. Let me draw attention to new paragraph (1b), which would be eliminated from this Bill if honourable members opposite had their way. That provision is designed for the protection of tenants.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that 32b can be introduced at this time. I am surprised that the Minister with her knowledge of the procedures of the House attempted to go so far forward from clause 18.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Russack): I do not uphold the point of order: New Paragraph (1b) is part of clause 18 as a whole.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The main point of this clause is to take account of the fact that, where some landlords, for example, fix the rent at $100 per week for the first four weeks and $50 per week thereafter, in those first four weeks the landlord, in effect, collects a further security bond of $200 when the real level of rent is $50. This clause deems that the extra $200 is a security bond which must be paid to the tribunal. If, as a result, the sum of the security bond collected exceeds four weeks rent the landlord is liable to prosecution. If members opposite toss out this clause they toss out that provision, which is designed to protect tenants.

Mr. KENEALLY: I asked the Minister a specific

question and she failed to answer it. During the debate on this clause it has been a strong argument used by both the Minister and the member for Fisher that we need to encourage investment in the accommodation industry. They say that, if we were to continue to inhibit the landlord in the way that section 18 does, with three weeks bond money being required, that is preventing investment in the accommodation industry. I have asked the Minister to give the Committee proof of the statements she makes and the arguments she uses. Obviously, there must be some evidence within the Government, whether with departmental officers to whom she has access or other officers, which would show that there has been any reduction in the provision of rental accommodation in South Australia as a result of that measure, because that was the argument put forward by the member for Fisher and by the Minister. The member for Fisher claimed that this measure was inhibiting investment in the accommodation industry. On the other hand, he said that there was an excess of rental accommodation in South Australia. If there is an excess of rental accommodation in South Australia, why would he be busily trying to encourage investment in an industry in over-supply? His argument falls on his own contradiction. I seek that answer from the Minister.

If she is saying that the reason the measure has been brought in is that 15 per cent of landlords have their premises damaged and are unable to recoup the cost of those damages from the bond money, that is one argument, although that also indicates that 85 per cent of landlords are able to recoup the costs, as the member for Gilles has pointed out. If that is the argument, that is a separate argument, and she and her colleagues should not dress that argument up with a lot of irrelevancies. Either they are able to give me the information I am seeking, or they must admit to the Committee that they let their enthusiasm run away with them and brought in aspects of their own philosophy towards rental accommodation. They have to admit that or give me the figures I am looking for.

There are two factors: either the Government has brought in this measure to overcome the difficulties of the 15 per cent of landlords who are unable to recoup the damages through bond moneys, or they are bringing in this measure to take off one more restriction from the prospective investor in the accommodation industry in South Australia. It is either one of the two; if it is both, and the Minister is able to quote 85-15 per cent in relation to landlords being able to recoup the cost of damage, she should also be able to give the Committee the information in terms of statistics as to the reduction, if there is a reduction, in rental accommodation available. The member for Fisher says he can provide that. It is interesting to me that he can and his Minister cannot. Obviously, that information was not supplied in the other place. If the member for Fisher is able to provide that information, either he is not informing his Minister, as he should, or he has information he is keeping to himself for some reason I do not understand.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Or he is a landlord.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, or he is a landlord.

Mr. EVANS: I am not attempting to answer for the Minister, but I want the member for Stuart to know what I have said during the debate on this issue. I said that, during the mid-1970s, a massive over-supply of rental accommodation was created in home units and flats, and I also said that people had stopped building accommodation for rental to a great degree.

Mr. Slater: And had gone into shopping centres.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The member for Gilles could be right; they might have gone into shopping centres. There has been a great reduction in the activity of people creating rental accommodation compared with the situation in the mid-1970's. I said that not only had new accommodation been dropping off, but so had the redevelopment of old buildings into strata titles for rental or flat purposes. It might not be recorded in actual figures, but, if one looks at the papers from 1975 to 1979 as compared with today, one sees that there has been a gradual dropping off in the amount of rental accommodation freely available. However, there is still an excess.

Since 1979, that over-supply has been eroded more quickly than in the previous four years. If the honourable member wants to go to the library and do his own research, he will find that since this legislation became operative there has been a great dropping off in the amount of accommodation vacant and readily available. If that trend continues, we will have an under-supply of rental accommodation and higher rents. That was the whole basis of my argument. I was not saying that there was as great an excess as there was immediately before the legislation came in. I said there was still an excess, especially in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I'll give you a ring next time I'm trying to house someone.

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Mitchell is talking about finding accommodation for disadvantaged people at low rental, I am not arguing that there is an excess of that. To my knowledge, there never has been since the 1950's, and I have been interested in housing since then. I am talking of an excess of accommodation in the market place readily available for the private sector, and I stick by that point. If we do not give an opportunity for those people to be assured of protecting their investment from damage with a reasonable amount—and four weeks is a reasonable amount—we will be creating problems. No-one has proved that until now landlords have always asked for the maximum of three weeks.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Of course they have.

Mr. EVANS: Let the member for Mitchell produce figures to show that in every case the private sector has asked for the maximum of three weeks. We might think that that is the case, but it is not recorded, because no member or no Government department knows of every contract signed.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Nor do you.

Mr. EVANS: I admit that, and that is why we do not know whether three weeks rent has been claimed as the amount of bond money on every occasion. I stick by my argument that there is an excess of rental accommodation in some sections of the metropolitan area, but it is not as great as it was when this legislation became operative.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Fisher has just put the most specious of arguments, presumably to support the Minister, who is in trouble. I have come into the Chamber after being outside, and I am surprised to find the Minister needing the support of that honourable member. He said that no-one can prove that people are asking for the full amount of bond money, and he has asked me to produce figures. I cannot do that, but I am prepared to go on record that I get far more requests for accommodation (and I am prepared to put these figures to the honourable member) than he does. Never have I had a person tell me that he has met the kind landlord who does not require the statutory three weeks rental in advance as a bond.

If the honourable member wishes to stand on his remarks, I will stand on mine. In my area, I get many requests for housing, and one of the greatest problems is

bond money. Referral to the Department for Community Welfare for assistance is not uncommon. If the honourable member gets a difficult problem, he is not loath to refer it down to my area— and I will be interested to see whether he wishes to respond to that. Using the Minister's figure of $50 a week as a handy figure if a person can obtain it, you, Sir, may be shocked, because you live in an area where that sort of rent is still somewhat out of the norm.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I have not mentioned $50.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not believe that I was speaking to the Minister.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: You said you were using my figures.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is my understanding that the Acting Chairman, who may have a little more—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clause.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am speaking to clause 18, which refers to section 32 of the principal Act, which states:

> A person shall not require the payment of or receive more than one security bond in relation to any residential tenancy agreement, or—

and what is more germane to the matter we are now arguing—

> require the payment of or receive a security bond of an amount exceeding three weeks rental.

The amendment we are considering requires that it be four weeks. If ever a member can say in this Chamber, "I am aware of the difficulty people have in being required to meet the three weeks that currently applies", I can claim some knowledge of that matter. I do not know it all, but I know a lot about it, and I can substantiate it to the Committee. If any member wishes to know whether I am telling the truth, I suggest he should ring the Mitcham or Marion office of the Department for Community Welfare, both located in my area, to which I have to have constant recourse to assist families in difficulty.

The Minister tried to winkle out of it by saying that she had not said anything about $50, but if it is $30 it is the difference between $90 and $120. That might be a mere bagatelle to the Minister on $52 000 a year plus other perks, but it is not a mere bagatelle to many people outside. Heaven forbid that we should forget the predicament of those people. I am surprised that the Minister should even suggest that $50 is the point at which we would get this viewpoint. If it is $48, $46, $42, or $38, the problem still exists.

For the Minister's benefit, I point out that there are people in the community who are not able to say that, if four weeks rental is required, they can put their hand in their pocket and produce the $40 or $50 required. If the argument is that it is some kind of holding money against damage which may be suffered by the landlord, what a load of garbage that is. Why is not the Minister saying that they have to put up $2 000 or $3 000? Shall I seek permission from the Minister? Will she allow me to use the figure of $50 by way of an example? What is the difference between $150 and $200 in terms of cover for damage? What damage will be caused that exceeds $150 but will be met by $200? Let the Minister tell us that. The Minister would not have a clue. If I had four hours, I could detail all sorts of false claims put forward by landlords, and all sorts of false arguments put forward by tenants.

This place is charged with deciding what is fair in the circumstances and who is the armed partner in the equation and who is the unarmed partner. Almost without exception the unarmed partner is the tenant. The landlord is better armed. A person who enters into the business of letting premises for rental is usually a member of the association, has given some thought to the business matters involved, and is operating in some way as an investor. Tenants are battling to find somewhere to live within their means. The Parliament is going to say, "Stiff luck, buddy. We are going to make it more difficult for you. You have to put up four weeks rent as a bond instead of three weeks rent."

I take it that the Minister is trying to demonstrate that rents in South Australia are low, because she said, "I did not say $50", so let me suggest a rental of $40 a week. What kind of damage will be covered by the difference between $120 and $160 in bond money? Let us settle on a sum—say, $40. What kind of general panacea will be provided by the fact that tenants are required to lodge $160 instead of $120 as bond money? That is garbage. The Government is seeking to inflict a penalty on those who have to seek rental accommodation. I would think that the Minister owns her own home: I am in that position as well. However, we should dismiss that from our thoughts and try to consider the problems faced by those who are not so fortunate and who are forced to resort to the rental market. I could give the Minister many examples of misuse, and, before the Minister gets too upset, I point out that there is misuse on both sides of the coin. There are poor tenants and poor landlords.

Mr. Slater: Rapacious, I think the word is.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I was not going to say rapacious. Some people are not able to subdue the greed that becomes evident in these matters. I have seen houses that are not worth $20 a week in rent given an overall coat of paint. In one house, even the light switches were painted with the wall colour, and I suppose it could be argued that it would be an interesting puzzle to find the light switches. The whole house was painted with a roller on the end of a 6 ft. rod. I am not exaggerating: I can take the Minister to the house if she wishes. Somewhere in between that example and the tenant who chops up the floor for firewood, there is the reasonable norm. I believe that three weeks rent is sufficient to acquire tenancy, to get a roof over one's head and to provide for one's children.

I can only say that I wish the Minister was with me to see the lady who lived in a street in my district and who had four children, who received an eviction notice because the rental increased and she could not pay. She had four children and was doing her damndest to look after them in every way. The only place she could find required three weeks rent in advance at the magnificent sum of $45 a week, which amounted to only $135! On a Minister's salary, or even on my salary, that sum is not significant. People here lose sight of what we are really talking about. If the Minister could remember that that lady was on a widow's pension, with four children, and that the kind of bond we are talking about was the total she received for the week, she would see the difficulties that can arise. Presumably, the bond was put up and the family moved into the new premises: perhaps they asked the neighbours for a slice of bread to eat.

I am not trying to introduce pathos: they are the realities of the matter. For us to be expected to agree with this proposition, increasing the burden is beyond my comprehension. I am utterly opposed to such a concept. I am opposed to the provision of three weeks rent as bond money, but that is the position. We should not increase the bond to four weeks rent.

Mr. LANGLEY: I heard the Minister say that 3 600 people—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I am entitled to speak, as the Minister does in Question Time for about 20 minutes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Unley has the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY: This is the first time I have spoken on this clause.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Are you the last?

Mr. LANGLEY: Whether I am the last speaker is none of your business.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Would the honourable member resume his seat. The member for Unley has the floor, and I ask him to return to the clause.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will obey your orders, Sir, but I became irritated. I can remember that, when this matter was first raised, the Government of the day gave the landlord the opportunity to have a say in the matter. Some people in my district were paying $75 to $100 a week in rent for houses that were not worth that much. The Government of the day introduced a Bill, and since that time I have received no complaints, although complaints were received before that time. I assure the Government that it will not be long before complaints are received again, because people, especially low-income earners, cannot afford four weeks rent as a bond. For the member for Fisher to say that conciliation between the landlord and the tenant will solve the problem is nonsense: the maximum will be demanded.

The Labor Government introduced a Bill to ensure that landlords and tenants had a fair go. Only recently one of my constituents and I went to the tribunal, and he was given 120 days to get out of his house. He was given an opportunity, and that was fair, but the landlord knew that he was bound by the Act. Surely members opposite can consider that position. I do not know of too many members opposite who look after the poor people in this State. They are union bashers and do not care about the people who cannot pay the extra week's rent. The average wage is probably $180 a week. Not too many people would have a take-home pay of $180 a week. Normally, one-fifth of one's income pays the rental of a home.

In my area, people pay $75 a week, with no rent books. This is how landlords carry on. It is about time they were brought back into line in many areas. Pensioners are in a difficult position. Housing Trust homes are very hard to get, times have changed. Since people cannot afford to buy houses, they must rent them. We are making it harder for these people, requiring as a bond an extra week's rent. There are not too many places in my area where one can obtain a flat for under $40 a week, and a house would cost $60 or $70 a week.

The Minister said that there were 3 600 cases of losses to landlords. I do not know how many people rent houses in South Australia, but at least 30 000 houses would be available for rent. In my opinion, that would be a conservative estimate of the number of people who rent houses. I can assure the Minister that this provision will not go down too well in my district, and I will certainly tell people all about Mr. Nicholls. This Government has said that it will look after the small people in this State, but it is really looking after private enterprise to such an extent that it cannot lose. How many people in this State who own houses have had to go bankrupt? Not many.

One needs only to look around Parkside, Wayville and Unley to see the number of flats in those areas, and the number is increasing. There are many houses for sale and being sold in my district. The people in my district can ill afford what is proposed under this Bill. I hope the situation can work back in the opposite direction and that it will effect those who want to get rich. Often landlords will not give tenants their bond money back, so they must go to a lawyer, something they cannot afford. By the time they pay for a lawyer, they would lose on the deal. So the money just goes into the coffers of the landlord concerned. I certainly intend to tell people what is happening when the next election comes on, as I am sure this Bill will be passed, since the Government has the numbers.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is the Minister going to sit there mute. Does she not have the guts—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Russack): Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What is the problem?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is to speak to the clause and not refer to other matters as far as the Minister is concerned.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Some of the things that one listens to in this place are rather surprising. The Minister has just been challenged by at least two Opposition members in relation to this provision to change the amount of bond money from a three weeks rent to four weeks rent. Surely that is relevant. I have simply pointed out that the Minister remained mute in answer to the queries raised. If that is not relevant, what is?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I point out to the honourable member for Mitchell that he must speak to the clause. The honourable Minister has the right to reply, if she wishes. If the honourable Minister does not wish to reply, that is her prerogative.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the Minister has a right to reply or a right not to reply, surely a member has a right to refer to whether a Minister replies or does not reply. I seek your ruling.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have already outlined to the honourable member for Mitchell that the member has a right to speak to the clause. Because the honourable Minister has the prerogative to answer or not to answer I see that that is no affair of the member. I will give the honourable member the call again, and ask him to speak to the relevant clause.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In speaking to clause 18 I find it little short of amazing that members on this side, after speaking relevantly to the clause, are not able to receive answers to queries raised. I can only say that it is my impression (and I trust that members on this side are allowed to have impressions, because we do not seem to be allowed to have too much more) that the Minister is unable to answer the questions in relation to this clause raised by members on this side of the House. One of the questions is whether the Minister is aware of the great degree of difficulty encountered by many people, who seek to become tenants of these wonderful landlords who exist throughout South Australia, in finding the bond money required to be allowed to enter these palatial homes. The Bill seeks, by the amendment in clause 18, to increase the bond money to four weeks rent.

I want no member of this place to make any mistake about how I feel about this matter, including you, Mr. Acting Chairman. It is a matter in which I have had a great deal of experience, not as a personal rentee—God forbid that I would ever fall into that category—but I have had a great deal of reference to me from persons who are in that category and who are required to rent premises. I made clear earlier that I realise there are people who are not good tenants, but there are also people who are not good landlords. What we are required to do is to set a reasonable requirement. The Minister refused, by inaction, to answer the question about how much better off a landlord will be, if taking a rental of $40, if the bond lodged is increased from $120 to $160. What will the extra $40 cover? Will that account for another window? Will that okay the switch that went bung and for which the tenant will get the blame, or whatever? It is not logical or

sensible to increase the bond in this way, because the real hardship lies with the tenant. The kind of tenant who will have difficulty in making the payments related to three weeks rental will find it even harder in respect of four weeks rent. The member for Unley said that he will make known, and I promise the Minister and this House that I will take every step in my power to make known, what is likely to happen in this place if the Minister still wishes to remain mute and not answer the questions.

I made a protest to the officers concerned in this matter, and they told me that the real reason for the increase in this area is to account for failure to pay rent. That is not the function of bond money, nor has it ever been. The function of bond money is to provide some sort of security for the landlord. I have already shown the nonsensical argument that has been applied as to the difference between three weeks and four weeks, if we look at it from the viewpoint of the landlord. From the tenants' viewpoint, included are women with children whose sole weekly income is of the order of a couple of weeks bond money. If the Minister does not know that, I am perfectly willing to allow her to come to my district office for a couple of weeks and learn the facts of life.

This is a terrible penalty to inflict on such people. This is not rhetoric I am putting to the House; I am 100 per cent genuinely concerned, and I know from the number of approaches I have had over the years what an insuperable hurdle this could be. It even means that the State can be involved more, and the Minister may not be aware of that. The State is often required to put up this bond—let us be honest about that. Let the Minister ring Mitcham or Marion community welfare office. I do not care who she rings, the answer will be the same as to who needs this type of assistance with rental accommodation and who ultimately may be required to put up the money, anyway.

This does not make sense. If there is something wrong with the system that is set up presumably to give some kind of security to landlords in these matters, it is the responsibility of the Government and the Minister to come up with a new scheme. The answer is not to put a penalty of such severity on the tenant by increasing it by this amount, which will not give the security presumably required by the landlord to give cover for likely damage that we are being told occurs but which will increase hardship in relation to those tenants who are seeking accommodation in a market where rents are rising. I challenge the Minister to tell us that rents are decreasing. Rents are increasing and people are struggling to find somewhere to live, and I am concerned for those who cannot meet the kinds of sums involved.

I wish to hell that it was not a numbers game and that reason and logic could prevail on occasion in this place. If there is a member who wishes to challenge what I have said about the difficulty being inflicted on people who are least able to afford it, I will be willing to listen to their arguments. I know that there will not be any such argument, because there is no answer to what I put forward at a time when the Housing Trust waiting list proves that the need has never been greater, since it is longer than it has ever been before. It is increasing at a rate greater than ever before. The difference between the people on the income levels controlled by the Federal Government and those who are not in need has never been greater.

I hope that in all the words I have said there is something that will reach into the heart of the Minister concerned and cause her to reconsider this matter. It is only one part of the Bill before us, but it is a matter about which I have strong views and about which I have direct knowledge. The Minister, if at all possible, could really take an important step by not supporting the provision, as that action would be of great benefit to many women throughout the community.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to deal in turn with each of the Opposition speakers who have dealt with this clause since last I spoke to it. The member for Stuart alleged that this clause is being introduced only to encourage investment in rental accommodation. That is not the reason why the clause has been introduced. I reiterate that the reason for the clause being introduced is to strike a balance between the rights of landlords and those of tenants. The member for Stuart challenged me to provide evidence that the stock of rental housing has diminished. At no stage did I say the stock of rental housing had diminished. The member for Fisher made that statement, and substantiated it by reference to advertising columns in current newspapers, as compared to newspapers in the mid and late seventies. I made no reference to a diminishing stock of rental housing, except as a possible threat if landlords where discouraged from maintaining the present stocks by virtue of oppressive provisions in the existing Act.

The member for Mitchell, when he first rose, referred to rental figures that he alleged I had used. I think the report will show that at no stage during this debate have I referred to rental figures of any kind.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is it $20 a week?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have not referred to a rental figure of any kind. I do not know why the member for Mitchell is committed to the idea that I have mentioned such figures. What I said was that the tribunal makes on average about 450 orders for payment of security bonds per week. He may have confused the word "fifty" in that 450 and wrongly assumed I was referring to $50 as being a weekly rental payment. I point out that the member for Mitchell described protection of landlords as being a load of garbage.

The Government does not consider that protection either of landlords or tenants is a load of garbage. This clause is introduced because, in the present situation, a high percentage of landlords are not able to cover their losses as a result of tenants who abscond after damaging the property.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Mitchell said that he believed that the difference between three weeks and four weeks rental was not an effective or practical difference, and he asked what damage such a difference would cover. I can provide details of the kind of damage that is done and the cost of repairing it. Damage that is most commonly incurred is damage to doors, through holes being punched or kicked in them by tenants.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How many cases?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Replacement doors cost about $65 each. Other common damage is for paintwork to be marked or scratched, and repainting requires on average between $80 and $150. This cost must be borne by the landlord.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: These figures are provided by officers of the tribunal, and I think it is reasonable that the Committee should believe them. Flywire screens are commonly damaged and torn. There may be more than one of these—quite often three or four—and the replacement cost is approximately $30 each. Another common form of damage is torn holland blinds,

which cost $45 each. Those are examples of the kinds of cost that can be incurred as a result of tenants damaging property and absconding. Another point that should be borne is mind—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want to have to speak again to the honourable member for Mitchell. I have given him considerable licence. I will not ask honourable members again to cease interjecting: I will have to take other unpleasant action.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Section 63 of the Residential Tenancies Act gives the landlord the right to issue 14 days notice of termination once the rent is 14 days in arrears before the tribunal can terminate the tenancy, thereby losing the landlord four weeks rent. It is therefore reasonable that four weeks be incorporated in this clause. That is one of the reasons—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have stated and restated the reasons.

Mr. Slater: That is the first time you have mentioned this.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have stated a variety of reasons and I am stating an additional reason, and I can continue to state reasons as long as the Committee is willing to sit and listen to them. In relation to the comments of the member for Mitchell regarding the function of bond money—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell has had a fair go.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The function of bond money is to provide security to ensure the adherence of the parties to obligations under the agreement. Rent is part of that obligation. The tribunal awards compensation for breaches of the agreement, and that compensation includes non-payment of rent as well as damage to premises. The Opposition seems to be under some kind of misapprehension as to the function of bond money.

The increase in bond money to four weeks rather than three weeks brings South Australia into line with New South Wales, where rents are considerably higher, and into line with Victoria's proposed Bill, which sets the level of one month's rent where the rent is less than $100 a week and sets no limit if rent exceeds $100 a week. I stress that a level of four weeks rent is considered appropriate to provide protection for the landlord's substantial investment.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have listened intently to the Minister. I will not say that she was wong, but I am at a loss to understand how the tribunal can have 450 people making contact in a week. It seems a lot to me, but no doubt the Minister got that figure from her officers.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's 90 a day.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know how many officers it takes to look after that number. I take it that the 450 people who contact the tribunal are worried about getting three weeks rent. I listened to the Minister's remarks about damage to doors and windows and scratched paint—that was a beauty. I have never heard of anyone swinging from the electric light globes.

If the person concerned is not satisfied with what is going on, the property can be sold quite readily. In my area, properties do not remain long on the market, nor do flats in my area stay vacant for long. It is not necessary to sell at a poor price. If the Government wants to increase the bond money, it will happen because of the weight of numbers, but I see no reason why the *status quo* should not remain. I have not had one person complaining to me about the legislation as it stands. I have many landlords in my district, and my office is open to everyone. I did have one complaint which went to the tribunal and the landlord, who knew he was in the wrong, did not proceed. The rent was exorbitant, and the deal had been done before hand. Since the legislation has been in operation there has been only that one complaint in my district, and there would be more flats in Unley than in most other areas. The turnover in my district is one-third in 12 months.

I have had only one complaint about the legislation, so I have no reason to support this clause. My district has areas of flats and home units on strata titles. How the Government can wish to increase bond money by a further $40 or $50 is beyond my comprehension. I see the matter from both sides, and I am sure members opposite do the same. I will not support people who do the wrong thing. I cannot support the clause, and I repeat that I will be telling the people about it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order before this division is taken. Standing Order 214 states:

> No member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed.

That applies even if the vote has been taken. I understand that certain members have a direct pecuniary interest in this matter in that they are landlords and, therefore, they will benefit from the provisions of this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. It is up to the honourable member to bring forward evidence supporting his point of order, and as the vote has not been taken, if he has evidence, he should bring it forward on the completion of the vote for the Speaker's consideration.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A further point of order, Mr. Chairman. Having brought this matter to your attention, I ask that you ask members of the House whether they are in this situation. Obviously, it is desirable that a matter of this type should be resolved prior to the vote being taken, rather than the vote being disallowed subsequently.

The CHAIRMAN: I am advised that it is not appropriate for the Chair to accede to that request and, therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I seek your guidance, Sir. I noted that you referred in your explanation to whether evidence could be brought forward now or later, but what happens if a vote is taken and evidence is brought forward later, if the vote is decisive?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the honourable member reads Standing Order 214.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a further point of order. I seek advice as to how this evidence may be obtained. You, Sir, have informed the House that the member who raised this point must bring forward the evidence. I ask how that evidence can be obtained if the Chairman does not question those people who have been accused.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is making an assertion; it is up to that honourable member to produce the necessary evidence.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A further point of order, Sir. You referred me to Standing Order 214, and I appreciate your advice in this matter. It has cleared my mind.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is a pretty good Standing Order, then.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You can laugh if you like.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must speak to his point of order only, or I will rule him out of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I trust, Sir, that you will allow me to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: I will permit that, but I will not permit talk across the Chamber.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Standing Order 214 states:

> No Member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question . . .

I draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the words "no member shall be entitled to vote on a division." From those words I understand that a member may not vote and have matters decided afterwards. A member may not vote if he has the pecuniary interests referred to in the Standing Order, and I believe that no-one in this House has the authority to obtain information as to whether a member has a pecuniary interest other than the Chairman, who is in charge of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. Every member, when he entered the Chamber, was aware of his obligations and of Standing Order 214.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier has risen on a point of order.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He hasn't got his head covered.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Neither has anyone else except you, making yourself ridiculous.

Members interjecting!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have called the honourable member to order. Interjections across the Chamber must cease.

The Hon. D. O . TONKIN: On a point of order, I submit that there is no pecuniary interest to any member of this Chamber or to any landlord as a result of this legislation, and, unless the honourable member can point to any direct pecuniary interest to any landlord as a result of this Bill, he is wasting the time of the Committee.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Are you asking for a ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have given serious consideration to the points raised. Evidence has not been produced, and I now intend to put the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a further point of order. I ask you to rule, Mr. Chairman, whether, if a member of the House is in the position of a landlord, he would be pursuant to this Standing Order in receipt of a direct pecuniary interest as a result of this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not intend to give a ruling on that matter.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Chapman, Evans and Lewis. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran, McRae, O'Neill, and Peterson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 19 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Discrimination against tenants with children."

Mr. SLATER: The Opposition opposes this clause. We believe that it seriously reduces the level of protection for a family with children seeking rental accommodation, particularly large families or those who may have disabled or retarded children. Under the principal Act, the landlord is prohibited from inquiring of the prospective tenant whether that tenant has children or whether it is intended that any children will live on the premises. If this prohibition is removed, it will enable landlords to seek information about children of prospective tenants and, if a tenancy is refused on the basis of such information, the onus of proof of such discrimination will no longer be on the landlord but will be on the tenant. Therefore, we oppose this clause. This matter very substantially affects families with children. In the second reading debate I asked whether a family impact statement was considered when this matter came before Cabinet, and whether the Minister could indicate the content of any such family impact statement. Will the Minister answer those questions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As has been outlined to the House on at least one occasion, family impact statements are part of the deliberations of Cabinet, and as the honourable member would know the deliberations of Cabinet are not available to anyone outside Cabinet. That answers the honourable member's question in that regard.

Section 58 of the principal Act is designed to prevent landlords discriminating against prospective tenants with children, and it indicates the Government's attitude to the paramountcy of a family. That much can be stated at the outset. The main provisions of this clause are contained in new subsections (1) and (2), which provide that no-one shall refuse to grant a tenancy to any person on the grounds that a child shall live on the premises or instruct anyone to do so or advertise or state his intention or policy of doing so. These main subsections remain as an indication of the Government's support for the family. However, subsections (3) and (4) in the principal Act provide that no-one shall ask prospective tenants if children will live in the premises in determining whether or not to grant a tenancy. If such an inquiry is made, the person is prosecuted, and it is up to him or her to prove that the inquiry was not in order to decide whether to grant the tenancy. Subsections (3) and (4), on the basis of practical experience, have proved to be an obstacle for parties negotiating a tenancy. In fact, these subsections have virtually prevented landlords from asking how many will live on a premises. That is quite plainly a ridiculous situation and one which cannot be allowed to continue.

Furthermore, subsection (4) is yet another example of the reverse of onus of proof where, contrary to the normal rules of evidence, the person prosecuted must prove that his or her inquiries were not for the purpose of discrimination. We believe the onus should rest on a prosecutor to prove that such inquiries were for the purpose of discrimination. The clause revokes section 58 (3) and (4). It has been demonstrated that those subsections as they presently operate are a denial of basic management negotiations. I point out that the law cannot bludgeon people into being sympathetic to children and to the needs of families. The legislation, if this Bill is passed, will try to prevent landlords from discriminating against children, but it cannot do so in the manner which has pertained in the past and which has proved to be unsatisfactory and unworkable.

Mr. SLATER: I refer again to family impact statements. A big announcement was made by the Government that these statements would be prepared on all matters affecting families. Now we are told that is a rather secretive situation and that they are not available for consideration to other than those who are in Cabinet. That is not much assistance to the Parliament, which is entitled to know what those family impact statements contain. We ought to know what effect this legislation will have on families. No doubt the working party report suggested that family impact studies should be undertaken. Perhaps I misunderstood what the Minister of Community Welfare

meant when it was announced with a flourish that these studies would be undertaken and available for public consumption. I believe we ought to know particularly where children are concerned, what effect this clause will have on the family situation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have responded already to what the honourable member had to say about family impact statements. I do not believe there is much that I can do to elaborate on that. Suffice to say that Cabinet did take impact on families into account not only in legislative proposals but also in administrative proposals.

Those deliberations are part of Cabinet's deliberations and are certainly not going to be shared with this House, or anyone else. As I have said, section 58 is designed to prevent landlords from discriminating against prospective tenants with children, and it will continue to do so. The amendment removes that distasteful provision which reverses the onus of proof. I would have thought that members opposite would have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the removal of what most people with a sense of justice regard as a thoroughly offensive provision.

Mr. KENEALLY: Family impact statements have been canvassed on this clause. Has the Minister personally seen the family impact statement relating to this Bill, or has she seen any family impact statements at all?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Obviously, as a member of the Government, I see all material that goes to Cabinet—that includes family impact statements.

Mr. KENEALLY: My specific question to the Minister was whether she had seen the family impact statement relating to this Bill. My second question was whether she had seen family impact statements at all. She has answered my second question by saying she has seen family impact statements—she made that admission in a rather oblique sort of way. More particularly, has she seen the family impact statement which relates to this Bill, and more especially to this clause?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes.

Mr. SLATER: If the Minister has seen the family impact statement, why is it that we are not advised, as members of Parliament representing the public generally, because we ought to know and the community ought to know just exactly what those family impact statements contain. I do not think that they ought to be a document for consideration only by Cabinet. We have to take the Government's word for it; we do not know what is in the report. I ask again whether the Minister can give some indication of what was in the family impact statement, as it affects this legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Beyond in general terms assuring the House that the Government took into account the impact of this legislation on families, I do not propose to go into any of the details discussed by Cabinet in respect of the family impact statement on this legislation.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Chapman, Glazbrook, and Wotton. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran, McRae, O'Neill, and Peterson.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (29 to 44) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3392).

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): The matter of the numeration has been resolved. The two Bills on file were incorrectly numbered. New section 71 was really new section 72, and that error was perpetuated in the second Bill. No-one, including the Parliamentary Counsel or the Government Printer, seems to have noticed it, but the final Act which is now ready for proclamation is correctly numbered, and the Bill before the House is numbered to my satisfaction.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Consitution of Non-government Schools Region Board."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

Page 1—After line 10 insert paragraph as follows:

(aa) by striking out paragraph *(b)* of subsection (2) and substituting the following paragraph: *(b)* four persons appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister, at least one of whom shall be an officer of the department:

The Committee will be aware that, when this measure was previously before us, the Committee of the House amended the Minister's original intention. The effect of the amendment was to reduce by two the number of people who were automatically or directly, as of right, representative of the non-government schools. The effect of that was to leave those representatives as of right of non-government schools in a minority. No proposition that has come before the Committee, either last year or this year, whether it be the Minister's original Bill, my amendment which was accepted at that time, this current Bill, or the amendment which I now move, prevents the possibility of every member of the board being from the non-government school sector. It is open in each case for the Minister to appoint the chairperson, and these additional people, however many they be.

Consistent with the philosophy that I outlined during the second reading debate, whereby we believe that the ring should be held by people who are seen as having no axe to grind, the Opposition seeks to amend the Bill to again create a position where the people who are the direct representatives of non-government schools, as laid out in the Bill, will not be in a majority. Having put that principle, I need only explain why this amendment is different from the one that I successfully moved last year. The effect of my amendment now is to increase the size of the board to nine.

We did not expect that the Minister would be prepared again to accept the amendment that we moved last time, or why would he be legislating again? Secondly, it has been put to us that the problem with having a very small number, say two, as was the amendment I moved last time, of people who are of right from the non-government schools is that perhaps it does not take sufficient account of the diversity that exists in the non-government sector. For example, if you wanted, under my earlier amendment, to appoint someone from the Independent Schools Board and someone from the Catholic schools, that ignores the

fact that there are systemic and non-systemic Catholic schools and that the non-government education people would feel more comfortable with the situation in which both the systemic and non-systemic schools should be represented.

The easiest way around that and to retain the principle which the Opposition seeks to embody in the legislation is to increase this category of persons to four, to have four other people who will be appointed by the Minister, and the chairperson who is also appointed by the Minister. That enables the principle that there will be a majority of people who are seen as having no axe to grind on the board. It still leaves the flexibility of the Minister of the day, if he so wishes, to appoint all nine people from the non-government sector.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government declines this amendment. The original spirit of the Bill is not that the Government should be punitive in any way. The work of the Advisory Committee on Non-government Schools has been undertaken and performed satisfactorily without the sort of criticism and fear now being addressed towards this Bill; in fact, the spirit of the legislation was that the work of the advisory committee would largely have continued through this legislation, and to a large extent the very fact that the advisory committee has worked cheaply but efficiently is another salient point, and it is not proposed to strengthen the bond.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is no punitive aspect in the amendment that I have just moved. I am not quite sure how many people are on the advisory board, the Medlin Committee—it might be about nine. The effect of my amendment is that the Minister can appoint all of those nine people to the board. I do not see what he fears.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, McRae, O'Neill, and Peterson. Noes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, D. C. Brown, Chapman, and Oswald.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4—"Quorum, etc."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Obviously, there is no point in my proceeding with an amendment to this clause in view of the decision that has just been taken by the Committee. This clause relates to the quorum that would apply in the event of the board's being reconstructed along the lines of clause 3. The Opposition was prepared to move an amendment that would provide that two members directly nominated by the non-government schools would have had to be present for the quorum of five to be properly made up.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Registration of non-government schools."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

Page 1. After line 21 insert paragraph as follows:

and *(b)* by striking out subsection (5) and substituting the following subsections:

(5) The Board may impose conditions under subsection (4) either upon registering a non-Government school, or upon subsequent review of the school, and upon any such subsequent review the Board may vary or revoke conditions previously imposed.

(6) Where the Board does not grant an application for registration of a non-Government school, or imposes conditions upon the registration of a non-Government school, the Board shall, within one month after deciding not to register the school, or to impose the conditions, inform the relevant governing authority of the reasons for its decision.

Members will recall the debate that occurred last year in relation to a similar clause in the earlier Bill. The Opposition was able successfully to point out to the Government that the effect of the Bill was that, where a school was given an unconditional registration, it retained that unconditional registration until the end of time. No machinery was available whereby the board could review the matter. Where there was a conditional registration, the board had the power to vary the conditions, which also implied withdrawing the registration altogether. In the situation (and this would happen for most schools) where no conditions were placed on the initial registration, there was no machinery for registration to be withheld in the future. We believed that this was unreasonable. Although it seems fairly unlikely that a situation would arise, such a situation could arise, and we are trying to legislate for all possible contingencies. We could envisage a situation in which a school could have its standards go completely to pot, haywire or into eccentric educational theories, so that the basic education of the children was being neglected. It may have nothing to do with educational questions but may be to do with standards of sanitation and hygiene that were being completely ignored. Moral questions may arise in relation to the conduct of a school.

We believed that, where the Minister was setting up a board, the board should have the power not only to look into these things but also to exercise some teeth in the matter. The Bill before us is no better in this respect than the Bill we successfully amended last year. However, I realise that the Minister will not accept the amendment, else why would he introduce this Bill, so we will have another go along slightly different lines. We strike out the requirement that was provided in the earlier amendment, that review occurs on a five-year basis and that all schools must have their registration reviewed at that time, and instead we seek to insert the provision that the board may impose conditions under subsection (4) either upon registering a non-Government school or upon subsequent review of the school, and upon any such subsequent review the board may vary or revoke conditions previously imposed.

We believe that this is a reasonable proposition with which non-government schools should have no quarrel in this regard, I do not know, but it would seem that, where schools might have objected to the form in which the earlier Bill emerged from Committee because of the amendments that were carried, those objections should no longer apply to the provision before us. I commend my amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This amendment is declined, too. We believe that the existing legislation is quite sufficient to cover the present circumstances pertaining in non-government schools. Those schools are in an extremely healthy condition at present, and we do not foresee circumstances arising in the near or relatively distant future in which we would need to take action to cancel registrations, other than as provided in Division III.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I make perfectly clear that I agree that the non-government sector is in an extremely healthy condition at present, but I find it extraordinary

that the Minister cannot envisage a situation in which the board, having granted unconditional registration to a school, later repents of that decision and, under its charter, which is this Bill, it has no way in which to carry through that repentance. There is no way in which the board can review its earlier decision. For the sake of the Committee, I wish that the Minister sounded a little more persuasive. He dismisses the amendment with the bland assurance that not only are things good and healthy at present (which certainly is the case) but also that they will always be good and healthy.

I remind the Minister that we are not talking about a general degredation of standards across the whole non-government sector: it is sufficient to envisage a situation in which one school, with perhaps an enrolment of 15 children, has its situation so changed, because of a change in its board of governors, a change in its staff, or whatever, that the board is placed in a situation that, in 1981, after this Bill is proclaimed, the school is granted unconditional registration, and in 1986 it finds, because of changes that I have outlined, it wishes it had not done so, but there is nothing it can do about the situation.

Does the Board then have to come back to the Government of the day and ask for an amendment to this legislation purely because of one school, when with a little bit of flexibility written into the legislation for the board here and now, that problem could be avoided. That is all we ask, and that is the flexibility which the Government with its present intransigent attitude is denying us.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, Payne, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Olsen, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, McRae, O'Neill, and Peterson. Noes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Chapman, Mathwin, and Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Minister may provide certain forms of assistance to non-government schools."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not wish to proceed with my amendment to clause 7, because in the Bill as we have it now, it would appear to be redundant.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Inspection of non-government schools."

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is an amendment before the House which was to be moved by the member for Baudin. I have an identical amendment which I will put before the House. I move:

Page 2, line 4—After "amended" insert:

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "an officer of the Department" and substituting the passage "a person or persons approved by the Minister";

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Opposition has no quarrel with this course of action. However, I am a little bemused by the machinery we are using. I can only assume that the Government in fact did not draft its own amendment, but has taken mine over, and that seems slightly peculiar. In any event, the Opposition will support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKERS COMPENSATION (INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February. Page 3126.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition will support this Bill. It is a measure that probably should not have been necessary to put before the House if the Government had prepared the original Bill, which we recall was dealt with only at the end of last year, with sufficient care and attention. As the Minister explained in his second reading speech, this Bill seeks to correct some anomalies that had become apparent in the original Act, the chief of which is a ruling that payments of the levy for insurers would be collected for the year 1980, when the Government's intention was that this levy would only fall due as from 1 January 1981. In other words, there are a couple of technical amendments that need to be made.

I think we should not allow the occasion to pass without pointing out the problems of introducing legislation in the way it was introduced last year. It was a pretty sorry tale. In this State there was not provision for a situation where an insurance company collapsed. Quite rightly, the Government indicated that it was looking at a fund and a method of ensuring that in these situations not only workers but the companies, particularly small employers that might be involved, were protected by a form of reinsurance or fall-back insurance. That investigation was only prompted by the specific collapse of the Palmdale company. One of the extraordinary things about the legislation introduced somewhat hurriedly (and that haste is indicated by the need to introduce this Bill on this occasion) was that it was introduced within a matter of a few weeks after the Minister had said that in no circumstances would such a provision be brought before the Parliament: that is, in respect of rescuing the Palmdale situation and solving the acute problems that had been caused by the collapse of that company.

The House will recall that the Minister was reported on 6 October in the *Advertiser* as saying that legislation could be introduced into Parliament next year (that is, this year) to help protect workers from the collapse of insurance companies involved in workers compensation. For a start, it is interesting that he said it would be this year when, in fact, as we know, the legislation was hurriedly introduced last year. In relation to Palmdale, in particular, Mr. Brown said—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Did you read the second reading speech last time?

Mr. BANNON: I know that the Minister does not want to hear this material.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, I do not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr. BANNON: I think it is relevant in the context of this Bill. I know the Minister does not want to hear it again, nor would I if placed in the invidious position he is in. The Minister said that people affected by Palmdale could be helped only if some voluntary agreement was made. The Minister also said that companies owed money by Palmdale were partly responsible for their dilemma because they had taken advantage of cut-rate premiums. He then went on to evince no sympathy whatever for what turned out to be responsible employers who had been advised by qualified brokers regarding the placement of their insurance.

It is interesting that that statement was made on 6 October: it was only a couple of days later that two letters

appeared in the *Advertiser* which were effectively cries from the heart from employers who had been involved in this area, one pointing out that the Minister seemed more petulant than rational when he denied any obligation to assist employees or employers who had lost through the collapse of Palmdale.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think he likes his own voice.

Mr. BANNON: Again, the Minister seeks to interject because this is an area of acute embarrassment to him, and well it might be. In October, the Minister said that these people could go to the wall and that the Government would wash its hands of their plight. Then, only a short time later, we found that a Bill was to be introduced in Parliament which would apply to Palmdale. That Bill was hastily drafted and poorly thought out. A number of amendments had to be incorporated to cover quite large loopholes in the legislation. Now, here we are again, a few months later, debating further amendments to a measure passed only last November. That is a pretty sloppy situation. I want to ask the Minister particularly to what extent he has consulted with the people involved in the original legislation, the various parties in both the Insurance Council of Australia and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other groups that were particularly affected by the previous legislation. The record of the Government on consultation in that area last year was pretty poor. I would like assurance from the Minister on this occasion that proper and adequate consultation has taken place. As far as I am aware, the insurance industry has not been consulted about this measure. In fact, it was quite surprised at its introduction. I may be wrong about that; I do not have very definitive information. Because of the short time this Bill has been available to us, we have not been able to check that out, but I would like assurances from the Minister on this matter.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: How many weeks would you want?

Mr. BANNON: I do not understand the Minister's interjection. I am not suggesting that we need many weeks to consider it, but I am asking the Minister what sort of consultation took place with the industry in the preparation of this Bill. What notice was given to all those who might be affected that it was coming into this House? What was their response, and what was their view of it? There is nothing in the second reading explanation about that. The Minister tried to make a great thing about negotiations and consultation on the last occasion; I would like to hear him on this occasion. There is no reason to prolong the debate.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr. BANNON: If the Minister wants a further exploration of these matters, he should keep interjecting, and I will try to respond . The technical provisions of the Bill seem to be in order, and its purpose is in order. Our complaint is that the whole thing should have been done properly, efficiently and carefully last year and it would have been if the Minister had been prepared to look at the situation in relation to Palmdale and not simply fire from the hip and make foolish statements which he then had to back away from rapidly indeed because they were inaccurate and unjust. Part of the reason we are considering the Bill on this occasion is the haste and the very poor way in which the Bill was presented to the Parliament on the last occasion. I think that point is worth making, and it is made in the context of support for the Bill.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I suppose that when the Minister rises to close the second reading debate he normally thanks the participants for their contribution to that debate. I am afraid I cannot do that this morning. I thought the Leader's speech was an appalling contribution and a rehash of what he went through in the second reading debate last year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It was the same old tripe, and it shows the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition has nothing new to say. He likes the sound of his voice, and gets up and uses it whenever he can.

The insurance industry obviously wants this amendment. There have been discussions and, if the amendment does not go through, they would be required, if the Leader of the Opposition gave one moment of thought to it, to pay a levy based on last year's collection.

Mr. Bannon: Have you talked to them about it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, we have talked to them about it. If this Bill does not go through, they should be required to pay that levy on last year's insurance when in fact they did not collect the levy. It is for that reason that various people with whom we have consulted have been wholeheartedly behind this proposal, and it was only when a request was put to those companies to come forward with the money that the small slip was made. To reflect on the Parliamentary Counsel about the quality of drafting of this legislation is a sad reflection on the Leader of the Opposition. He would know that the quality of draftsmanship in this State is particularly good. It is most improper for him to reflect on the Parliamentary Counsel and senior public servants in that manner.

Mr. Bannon: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader can say "Nonsense" and "Shame", but that is what he has done this morning in the speech he has given. I hope members will now support wholeheartedly the proposal's going through.

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

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3263.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has come to us from another place where the Opposition gave it broad support. It deals principally with the expiation of traffic offences by what are known as on-the-spot fines. There was some debate in the other place about aspects of this method of expiating offences. Much store has been placed by the Government on the cost savings that will be involved. Any action taken which means that police time is not tied up in minor road traffic offences, so that police officers are released more for their primary job of detection and pursuance of major crime and other offences, is to be welcomed. That is an aspect with which we generally agree.

The other aspect of it, and I guess a counter-argument, is that, although it does save police time and court time, it could be abused. There may well be situations in which an expiation fee being levied on the spot puts an unwarranted pressure on an individual to pay the fine, even though he does not believe that he is guilty, simply to be done with the matter. It would be a great pity if this legislation were seen in that context. The answer to that is that anyone who believes he is not guilty could, under this measure, pay the appropriate expiation fee and still challenge the offence by pleading not guilty and taking the matter through the

courts. There is a fall-back position, and the civil liberties aspect is protected.

The evidence appears to be that on-the-spot fines reduce the number of traffic infringements coming before the courts, and there is no doubt that a lot of paper is generated; there is a lot of wasted time of the courts, apart from the time of policemen in filling out and finalising formal reports that could be done away with. As with parking offences and other areas where expiation fees apply, I think one could see it as of overall benefit to the public. The only qualification I make is that one would hope that the motivation behind the Bill is not primarily that of cost saving.

When we look at our justice system, with offences, be they minor traffic offences or major criminal offences, we have many checks and balances built into the system, and they tend to be costly, but to preserve the rights of the citizens the community must pay, and that is why we have such an elaborate system of justice. It is important that, if the rights of persons are being done away with—and in a sense that is what this legislation does—we are doing it with motives not simply linked to cost or expense. I think that the great stress laid by the Government in the second reading explanation on the whole cost area somewhat distorts the purpose of the legislation, and that is a pity.

In other words, if it can be seen as legislation of which the public will approve because it is a way of solving an offence situation with the least possible trouble, and if it can be seen as saving the time of police and generally helping the regulation of traffic and traffic offences, that is fine, but to see it as a cost saving method would be wrong in general principle. That is an ancillary or attached benefit. I do not think I need make any further major points about this Bill. We generally support the principles behind the Bill, as we did in another place. Amendments were moved in the Legislative Council to clarify and improve the Bill, and at the second reading stage we support it.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3263.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is consequential on the matter that the House has just considered, and I do not believe that any further points need be made. The Opposition supports the Bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF COURTS AND TRIBUNALS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3250.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This matter has not been listed for debate today, and under the agreement it was not to be proceeded with. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: I believe that the Bill was called on incorrectly, so I preserve the right of the lead speaker if that is the case.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.26 a.m the House adjourned until Wednesday 4 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 March 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PRIVATE CONSULTANTS

572. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This series of questions concerning the engaging of consultants by the Government has been answered for the period 18 September 1979-22 October 1980, even in an abbreviated form, at considerable expense and effort to the Government. It is not possible to know the exact cost of answering the questions, but it certainly runs into thousands of dollars and hundreds of man-hours. General and widesweeping questions like this series of questions will not be answered in future if considerable cost and labour is likely to be involved in providing the answer. In addition, before asking such questions members should refer to existing Government publications where much of the information is available already.

Premier's Department:

1. Four.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $21 750.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Treasury Department:

1. One.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Treasury Department:

State Government Insurance Commission:

1. One.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Department of the Public Service Board:

1. Sixteen.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $63 547.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

573. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

Department of Mines and Energy:

1. Seventeen.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $540 000.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Department of Services and Supply:

1. One.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Pipelines Authority of South Australia:

1. Four.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $1 234 003.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

574. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment:

This department has not employed any private consultants since 18 September 1979.

Department of Trade and Industry:

1. Eleven.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $59 527·37.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Public Buildings Department:

1. Eighty-six.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $1 593 802.

4. In all cases, the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?

2. Why are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

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

1. Fourteen.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $22 831·20.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

576. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

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

Police Department:

1. 4.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality, however the aggregate amount is $270 800.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Auditor-General's Department:

1. Nil.

Department of Correctional Services:

1. 1.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Fisheries Department:

1. 2.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $3 200.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Department of Marine and Harbors:

1. 9.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $171 435.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Fire Brigades Board:

1. 3.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however the aggregate amount is $26 700.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 7.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $59 033.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

Minister of Environment:

1. 6.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $374 442.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Minister of Planning:

1. 22.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $68 202.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

Department of Transport:

1. 23.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

Highways Department:

1. 15.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $80 546.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

State Transport Authority:

1. 18.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $2 488 354.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

580. **The Hon. D. G. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directly by the Minister?
2. Who are they?
3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?
4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?
5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

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

Hospitals Department:

1. 3.
2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.
3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $76 000.
4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.
5. See No. 4.

South Australian Health Commission:

1. 5.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $144 900.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Department of Tourism:

1. 4.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $88 840.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

581. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the Minister's control or directed by the Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

Engineering and Water Supply Department:

1. 12.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Department of Lands:

1. 35.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $199 727·18.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the control of the Attorney-General or directly by that Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

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

Law Department, Supreme Court Department and Electoral Department:

1. Nil.

Corporate Affairs Commission:

1. 6

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $10 769.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the control by the Minister of Local Government or directly by that Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and, if that latter, what was the membership of that committee?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

Department of Local Government:

1. 9.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $52 662·95.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

South Australian Housing Trust:

1. 10.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Department for the Arts:

1. 11.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $83 812·65.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

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

1. Since 18 September 1979, how many private consultants have been employed or are currently being employed within each department and instrumentality under the control of the Minister of Community Welfare or directly by that Minister?

2. Who are they?

3. What is or has been the cost of each consultancy?

4. What was the nature of the selection process involved in each?

5. Was the final recommendation in each case made to the Minister by his department or by a special committee set up for that purpose and if the latter, what was the membership of that committee?

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

Department for Community Welfare:

1. 4.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality; however, the aggregate amount is $252·33.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

Department of Public and Consumer Affairs:

1. 1.

2. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

3. The requested information is not available for reasons of confidentiality.

4. In all cases the provisions of the Audit Act were followed. In addition, in some cases the final recommendation was also forwarded to the appropriate Minister or to Cabinet for endorsement.

5. See No. 4.

ART COURSES

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

1. What art courses have been available at the Brighton Further Education Centre and are any of those courses being withdrawn, and, if so, why and how many staff members and students will be affected by these changes?

2. What proportion of students in the art course at Brighton D.F.E. are non-paying students because of concessions, have some of these offered to contribute financially to keep these courses viable, and does anything exist to prevent such an offer being accepted?

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

1. At Brighton College of Further Education, 19 art classes were available in 1980 and 13 art classes will be offered in 1981. All are part-time leisure-interest classes. This means that 80 students will be potentially affected, and the hours of three part-time lecturers will be reduced. Brighton College of Further Education, like all other D.F.E. colleges, has prepared a programme for 1981 which allows each college to meet its revenue target in terms of fee income for enrichment courses.

2. In the 1980 art programme of Brighton College of Further Education, 98 students or 38 per cent were concession students. Some of these have offered to contribute financially to keep the courses viable. Cabinet has ruled that full concessions will be provided for certain categories of students, and pensioners are amongst these. Pensioners are therefore not charged for entry to leisure-interest classes. If a person who would be entitled to a concession elects to enrol as a fee-paying student their enrolment can be accepted as such.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

874. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many emloyees have accepted the motor vehicle industries "incentives" to retire from that industry this year from:

(a) G.M.H. Woodville plant;

(b) G.M.H. Elizabeth plant;

(c) Mitsubishi Tonsley plant; and

(d) Mitsubushi Lonsdale plant?

2. How many additional employees have been engaged in the motor vehicle industry since 1 January at each plant?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

LINK COURSES

876. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How is forward planning carried out in respect of link courses without advice as to the funds available for that purpose?

2. What has delayed the announcement of the amount of money available for link courses for the coming year, and will the Minister announce the amount of funding available forthwith?

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

1. Link courses have for some years been a part of secondary and independent school student's career education curriculum offered by D.F.E. Approximately 70 per cent of link courses programmes have been provided from within further education's college resources. Consequently, planning for link courses occurs irrespective of the availability of additional resources from the Commonwealth. Colleges have already commenced these courses and have done so in conjunction with regional offices of education and secondary schools in their area.

2. A public announcement of the receipt and allocation of transition education funds for 1981 (of which link course funds are part) has been delayed due to protracted negotiations between this Government and the Commonwealth. These negotiations are now complete and the Commonwealth funds allocated for link courses during the 1981 calendar year will be $87 670. In addition, most colleges conduct other link courses within their own budget according to the need in each area and consistent with their overall programme responsibilities.

LINK COURSES

879. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has $30 000 been allocated to Mount Gambier schools for "Link Courses" and, if not, what sum of money has been allocated to those schools?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The South-East Community College has been allocated $25 000·00 for link courses. These funds are to enable the college to provide link course components for secondary school students in the South-East. These funds are allocated in the South-East upon the advice of the South-East Link Course Authority, which represents both the South-East Community College and secondary schools in the region.

URANIUM TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

879. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Has the Minister, or any officer under his control, held any negotiations with or entered into any contracts or agreements with the Daimler-Benz Corporation and/or any subsidiary thereof in respect of the supply of technology and/or equipment for the refining of uranium?

2. Is the Minister aware of any connections between the Daimler-Benz Corporation and/or any subsidiary thereof and any engineering firms operating in South Australia which could result in such South Australian firm or firms obtaining technology and/or equipment from the Daimler-Benz Corporation and/or any subsidiary thereof for the manufacture locally of gas centrifuges and/or other apparatus for the production of enriched uranium?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. No.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DIVISION

883. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many building inspectors are employed by the Consumer Affairs Department?

2. How many of these inspectors are involved in checking to ensure that building work is only undertaken by licensed persons or corporations?

3. How many reports have there been of work undertaken by unlicensed persons in the 12 months to 30 June 1980?

4. How many persons were prosecuted for undertaking unlicensed building work during that period and how many prosecutions were successful and what amount of fines were imposed as a result?

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

1. There are no officers employed by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs with the title building inspectors. However, there are various inspectors and investigation officers whose duties include the inspection of building work on behalf of the Licensing Court, the Builders Licensing Board, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, and the Public Trustee.

2. There are 24 inspectors and investigation officers who are involved in this work from time to time.

3. Thirty-one.

4. Twelve prosecutions were finalised during the period but not all were in respect of building work undertaken during that period. Ten convictions were recorded and fines totalling $2 173 were imposed.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

885. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has there been any change of policy by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs towards the protection of consumers involved in purchases of second-hand vehicles since 15 September 1979 and if so, what changes have occurred?

2. Were amendments to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act being considered by the previous Government prior to 15 September 1979, what were those proposed amendments, has the current Government examined them and does it intend to proceed with any of them?

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

1. No.

2. A working party is presently reviewing the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act and is undertaking a re-examination of the amendments that were being considered by the previous Government in 1979.

MOUNT COMPASS MEETING

886. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Was a public meeting held at Mount Compass in November 1980 at which officials of the Engineering and Water Supply Department discussed certain problems with local residents and, if so, what were those problems?

2. What report, if any, has the department made to the Minister, and what course of action does it propose to take and when?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The meeting was called to obtain local views on the need for a reticulated supply and the development potential of the township. The problems discussed were centred around the economics of any scheme proposed.

2. No report has been received as yet. A report on this and other similar schemes under scrutiny is expected to be available for my consideration in April 1981. On receipt of the report I will take whatever action is considered to be relevant and appropriate.

WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

888. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What auditing arrangements are there in the Working Women's Centre?

2. What arrangements are there for supervision of purchases and payments?

3. What was the break-down of operating expenses during the last financial year?

4. Does the Centre use a cab-charge account and if so—
   (a) to what extent; and
   (b) how are the costs justified?

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

1. The Working Women's Centre's accounts and expenditure are audited on a regular quarterly basis by J. H. Doyle and Co.

2. Accounts for payment are submitted for the Management Committee's approval each month. Cheques must be signed by two persons—the Director and any one of three nominated members of the management committee.

3. The break-down of operating expenses during the last financial year is as follows:

	$
Salary and wages	22 471
Superannuation	458
Rent	757
Publications, etc.	848
Printing, stationery and photocopying	1 153

	$
Motor Vehicle expenses	2 943
Repairs and maintenance to office equipment	157
Telephone	655
Electricity	97
Audit Fees	335
Postage	279
Advertising	93
Travelling	258
Advance—Overseas travel	500
Staff Education and conferences	228
Sundries	146
Subscriptions	27
Rates and taxes	159
Capital Payments	
Chair and Desk	121
Cabinet	180
Telephone connection	120
Insurance	204
	$32 189

4. The cab charge account for the centre was opened on 15 July 1980 and closed on 12 December 1980.

(a) $190·83.

(b) During this period one of the Directors of the centre was unable to drive a car. The cab was used exclusively for Working Women's Centre business.

CONTRACEPTIVES

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

1. Are contraceptives made available by Government or semi-Government agencies to children under the age of 16 years without the parents consent or knowledge and, if so, which Government or semi-Government agencies carry out this practice, does the Government intend to alter this practice and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

2. If a young person leaves the family home, even before the age of 16, can departmental officers refuse to disclose the child's whereabouts and, if so, does the Government intend to alter this practice and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

3. Is it the Government's policy to take over parental control and guidance of children in cases where departmental officers recommend, regardless of the parents opinions and does the Government intend changing this policy and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

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

1. No sexually active young person is refused contraceptive advice in any Family Planning or Family Advisory Clinic in Government or semi-government agencies. Legally qualified registered medical practitioners may prescribe contraceptive measures to minors, if in their considered opinion it is in the best interests of such persons to do so.

2. Yes, if it appears to be necessary. Efforts are made to contact parents so that they can be assured of their child's wellbeing and so that counselling can be offered to both parties with a view to reconciliation. It is not proposed to alter this practice. There are occasions when children leave home because of serious illtreatment.

3. No. Action to obtain official guardianship can be taken in the Children's Court or administratively on application by the parents. If the child is over 15 years he can make his own application. Where this happens the policy is to consult with the parents before any decision is made. It is proposed to incorporate this policy in legislation.

DRUGS

898. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of the article in the *Australian* of 24 December 1980 concerning "Drug Taking in Sport" and, if so, does he support the views contained therein and, if not, why not and, if so—

(a) what tests, if any, are carried out in South Australia by the respective sporting bodies and what do these tests involve for the athletics associations; and

(b) what has been the incidence, if any, of drug taking in sport in South Australia since 1970 and what remedial action has been taken by the—

(i) respective sporting associations;

(ii) previous Governments; and

(iii) present Government?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have read the article in the *Australian* of 24 December 1980, concerning "Drug Taking in Sport" and agree that this is a matter of serious world-wide concern. As far as I am aware, no tests have been carried out in South Australia by the respective sporting bodies, as the costs are prohibitive. I am not aware of any incident of drug taking by sports people in South Australia since 1970.

S.T.A.

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

1. How many complaints were received from the travelling public relating to S.T.A. bus service operations in 1980?

2. In what categories did these complaints fall, what was the number of complaints in each category and what actions, if any, were taken by S.T.A. management in relation to each type of complaint?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 880.

2.

1. Failing to pick up passengers	146
2. Overcarried	10
3. Discourtesy	94
4. Door operation	22
5. Currency	42
6. Pushers	9
7. Fares	58
8. Early running	44
9. Late running	23
10. Inadequate service	63
11. Traffic Act	22
12. Bad driving	79
13. Incorrect destination signs	11
14. Inconsiderate road behaviour	16
15. Taking wrong route	13
16. Heavy loading	45
17. Refusing to pick up school children	37
18. Employee behaviour	60
19. Students seated	10
20. Employee smoking on vehicle	1
21. Smoking in non-smoking compartments	—
22. Joining and alighting incidents	2
23. Missed connections, rail/bus feeder	18
24. Miscellaneous	55
	880

In each instance the complaint was investigated and action taken where necessary. The complainant would have been replied to by letter, telephone or personal contact as appropriate.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

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

1. What is the cost of a set of traffic lights and the installation thereof at an intersection involving four roads?

2. What is the cost, including installation, of the control boxes for traffic lights?

3. How many—

(a) traffic signals; and

(b) traffic signals control boxes,

have been damaged and/or replaced in metropolitan Adelaide since January 1980 and at what cost?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost of installation of a set of traffic signals (including the signal controller) varies between $25 000 and $44 000, depending upon the size of the intersection and the complexity of the equipment required. The roadworks associated with the installation of traffic signals is an additional cost.

2. Approximately $9 000.

3. *(a)* and *(b)* Traffic signals were damaged on 547 separate occasions; signals controllers were damaged on two separate occasions. The cost of replacement of damaged equipment was $120 148 in 1980.

COASTAL BEACH CLIPPER

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

1. What are the cost sharing arrangements for the Channel 10—Mr. Juicy—S.T.A. "Coastal Beach Clipper" bus service operated between Seacliff and Semaphore?

2. What has been the average patrons age on each run between Seacliff and Semaphore?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The contract covering the Coastal Beach Clipper was arranged between SAS Channel 10 and the State Transport Authority. SAS Channel 10 have agreed to pay the authority the sum of $7 000 and the estimated costs incurred by the Authority were approximately $5 500.

2. No statistics relating to the ages of patrons were collected by the authority.

SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTIONS

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

1. How many of the 29 recommendatins on "Specific Project Actions", as detailed on page 22 of "Adelaide into the Eighties" have been completed or are nearing completion and what are the anticipated completion dates of all the projects?

2. When will copies of these projects be available for scrutiny by Parliament?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The report "Adelaide into the Eighties" was prepared by consultants for the Director-General of Transport. It does not represent a work programme. Along with other documents, the report has provided valuable information which assists the Transport Planning Division in framing its work programme. Thus, not necessarily all projects will be undertaken and certainly not all at the same time.

2. All reports published by the Department of Transport as a result of research and planning work are available in the Parliamentary library.

LINKED TRAFFIC LIGHTS

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

1. When will "linked traffic lights" be operational in the inner city areas?

2. What is the timetable and cost for each set of lights in this programme?

3. What is the anticipated reduction in delays to traffic during—

(a) peak periods; and

(b) off peak periods?

4. What is the anticipated cost of the control and monitoring equipment, respectively?

5. Where will this equipment, including monitoring devices and control equipment, be situated?

6. How many staff will operate this equipment and for what period each day?

7. Where and from whom will the equipment be purchased?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Highways Department will progressively co-ordinate traffic signals on roads under its control in the metropolitan area during the period 1982-84. The Corporation of Adelaide is responsible for traffic signals within its area.

2. The cost of the project is approximately $3 000 000. The detail regarding the timetable and cost of each set of signals is not available at this time.

3. *(a)* and *(b)* A total of 8 000 000 vehicle/hours per year.

4. The cost of the control and monitoring equipment is included in the total cost of $3 000 000.

5. The control and monitoring equipment will be housed at Highways Department, Walkerville, Highways Department, Northfield, and at various roadside locations which are yet to be finalised.

6. The equipment will operate automatically although staff will modify operational strategies from time to time.

7. The required equipment will be purchased in accordance with existing Government procedures from various sources.

S.T.A. DEVELOPMENT ACHIEVEMENTS

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

1. How many copies of the 1979-80 S.T.A. pamphlets depicting development achievements were produced, what was the total cost of production, how many copies have been distributed and to what outlets?

2. Was the Government Printer given the opportunity to print this pamphlet and, if not, why not?

3. Why was the Messenger Press at Port Adelaide given the printing of this pamphlet?

4. Was the opportunity given to other South Australian printers and publishers to give quotes and if not, why not and if so, who were those publishers and printers?

5. Were any departmental employees engaged in editing, writing, or photographic work for the production and, if so, how many were involved, what was the cost and from what departments did they come?

6. What are the conditions for having extra copies of the pamphlet printed if considered necessary?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 10 000 were produced at a cost of $2 480, and 9 700 were distributed to all S.T.A. and "made available" staff, to all S.T.A. depots, offices and to major attended stations for issue to the public.

2. Yes.

3. Messenger Press submitted the lowest quotation.

4. No. Messenger Press was asked to quote because it was considered that they had an excellent art department, they could complete the work in time to meet the S.T.A. delivery date, and their production techniques and quality standards were suitable for this type of publication.

5. A number of S.T.A. staff contributed to the production of the report as part of their normal duties.

6. Additional copies of the report could be printed upon the issue of an S.T.A. order.

SALISBURY BUS ROUTES

921. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister seen the article "Pensioner Rights" in *The Advertiser* of 24 December 1980 complaining, amongst other matters, of no bus service direct to Lyell McEwin Hospital from the Salisbury-Salisbury North area and, if so, what actions will be taken by S.T.A. to overcome the difficulties?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes. The Lyell McEwin Hospital is situated midway between the Salisbury and Elizabeth Town Centres, each of which form the focus for a number of bus routes. The road pattern and general layout of the area are such that it is not practicable to arrange for all bus routes in Salisbury and Elizabeth to pass the hospital. Of the 12 bus routes in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area, two bus routes, 430 and 501, serve the hospital and the two town centres, and passengers are able to transfer to and from other bus routes at those two town centres.

Transfer facilities from the Salisbury North bus services to bus routes 430 and 501 will be improved when a bus-rail interchange now being planned for Salisbury station is complete.

OFFENDERS ASSISTANCE

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

1. What assistance is the Government prepared to offer the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services so that relatives of prisoners, who have neither public transport or their own vehicles, may visit prisons?

2. Will the Government make available one of the S.T.A.'s 140 old Swift buses, which are to be phased out, to OARS and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not practicable to ensure transport facilities are available to meet the needs of all people at all times. No special arrangements are proposed for relatives of prisoners.

2. It is not the policy of the State Transport Authority to make buses available to service organisations at no cost. A bus could be made available for purchase by OARS if required.

MOUNT GAMBIER RAIL SERVICE

928. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister received correspondence from the Minister of Education requesting that some compromise should be reached between the State and Federal Governments about providing another sleeping car on the Mount Gambier Passenger Rail Service, and, if so, what representation was made to the Federal Minister of Transport and what was the response?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

929. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many of the statements made in his speech recorded in pages 426-28 of *Hansard* of 25 October 1977 does the Minister intend to implement and over what period of time in each instance?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Policy announcements on transport will be made by the Government from time to time when appropriate decisions have been made.

BEE LINE AND CIRCLE LINE

932. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to introduce a charge for travelling on the Bee Line and Circle Line bus services and, if so—

(a) what will be the fare system;

(b) when will it be introduced; and

(c) what are the reasons for so doing?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I presume in referring to the Circle Line bus the honourable member means the recently introduced "City Loop" bus service. The Government does not intend to introduce fares on either the Bee Line or City Loop services.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

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

1. Each time premiums for comprehensive insurance on motor vehicles are increased, do an increasing number of vehicle owners fail to renew their comprehensive insurance policies and, if so, what are the figures in each category for each year since 1970?

2. Are the number of third party property insurance policies for motor vehicles on the increase and what are the figures in each category since 1970?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This information is not available to the Government.

O'BAHN

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

1. Can the O'Bahn system be electrified and, if so, what is the estimated cost of electrification at today's prices?

2. What specific alterations and modifications would be involved?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The estimated cost is approximately $18 000 000 higher than the diesel option.

2. The busway/O'Bahn exclusive route will be designed to facilitate future electrification. Alterations and modifications will include provision of overhead power distribution systems, power substations, purchase of a trolley bus fleet including tools and spare parts, construction of a new, or redevelopment of an existing service depot and maintenance facilities.

RAIL CARS

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

1. What are the comparative running costs of the S.T.A.'s—

(a) ¾ rail-car set;

(b) 300 class rail-car set; and

(c) 2000 class rail-car set?

2. What are the reasons for the delays in introducing 2000 class rail-cars into traffic after initial delivery to the Authority?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Authority does not maintain comparative running costs for the various classes of railcars.

2. When the railcars are delivered to the Authority, they are given routine acceptance tests before being released into traffic.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

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

1. How many road accidents occurred within 10 miles of the Adelaide G.P.O. in each year since 1970 and of these, how many resulted in death?

2. How many and what percentage of pedestrian fatalities occurred each year within the Adelaide metropolitan area and within 10 miles of the Adelaide G.P.O., respectively, since 1970?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

Statistics concerning road accidents that have occurred within a 10 mile radius of the G.P.O. are not readily available.

However, statistics are prepared for the city and metropolitan area which extends from Gawler (north) to Sellicks Hill (south) and to Bridgewater (east).

On this basis the following information is submitted:

1.

Year	City and metropolitan No. of road accidents	City and metropolitan No. of fatal accidents
1970	22 022	100
1971	23 928	104
1972	25 120	111
1973	28 601	99
1974	41 012	165
1975	35 517	137
1976	36 828	137
1977	39 647	136
1978	40 292	118
1979	39 200	124

2.

Year	City and metropolitan No. of pedestrian fatalities	% of State Total
1970	43	78.2
1971	41	71·9
1972	47	73·4
1973	38	60·3
1974	47	81·0
1975	50	81·9
1976	45	81·8
1977	47	94·1
1978	36	69·2
1979	37	75·5

S.T.A. BOOKLET

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

1. Is the S.T.A. booklet "How to use Adelaide's Public Transport" written only in English and Italian and, if so, why?

2. Does the Authority intend to print this booklet and other S.T.A. information in various languages and, if so, when and what information booklets will be printed in what languages?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The leaflet "How to use Adelaide's Public Transport" was first published in English and Italian. A Greek translation was ready for printing when the zone fare structure was changed on 17 August 1980. As a consequence new leaflets were prepared. They have been reissued in English and Italian. A new Greek translation is being prepared for printing.

2. Consideration is being given to the issue of this publication in other languages. The question of publishing other information leaflets in various languages is being examined.

S.T.A. COSTS

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

1. What is the annual cost to the S.T.A. of using taxis for "calling in" of—

(a) bus and tram employees for work and for alterations to rosters; and

(b) rail employees for work and/or alteration to rosters?

2. How many telephone calls were made involving "calling in" due to alterations to rosters or rostered workings in 1979 and 1980?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* Nil.

(b) $5 100.

2. No records of the number of telephone calls are kept.

S.T.A. BUSES

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

1. How many S.T.A. buses of each model and make are currently for sale to the public?

2. What is the average price being asked for each year and model?

3. How many buses in each category were sold in 1979 and 1980 and what was the average sale price per model?

4. How many S.T.A. buses were sold or transferred to each Government department in 1980?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2.

	$
1968 Albion VK 43	4 500
1968 Albion VK43L	8 500
1969 Albion VK43	6 500
1969 Albion VK43	8 000
1969 Albion VK43L	8 500
1970 Albion VK43	8 000
1971 Albion VK43	6 000
1966 Bedford SB5	3 500
1970 Ford R226	8 500

3. Buses sold—1979

	$
Leyland Mk. II	900
Leyland Mk. II	900
Bedford SB3	1 350
Bedford SB3	1 800
Bedford SB3	2 025
Albion Viking	5 400
Bedford SB3	1 800
Bedford VAM5	2 250
Bedford 330	3 000
Bedford VAM5	3 000
Bedford VAM5	3 000
Bedford VAM5	3 000
Bedford VAM5	4 500
Bedford VAM5	4 500
Bedford VAM5	4 500
Bedford SB3	300
Bedford SB3	750
Hino BG13	5 000
Hino BG13 semi-coach	5 000
Hino BG13	300
Hino BG13	2 500
Albion VK43	18 732
Leyland Leopard	6 000
Albion 400	7 200
Commer/Perkins	6 300
Hino BG13	6 750
Hino BG13	6 750
Commer/Perkins	3 150
Commer/Perkins	3 600
Commer/Perkins	4 950
AEC Reliance	1 800
AEC Reliance	2 250
AEC Reliance	3 600
AEC Reliance	3 600
Commer/Perkins	1 080
Hino BG13	8 100
Hino BT51	10 800
Albion Viking	450
Bedford SB3	900
Bedford 330	2 700
Bedford VAM5	900
Leyland Tiger Cub	3 150

4. None.

STATE GRANTS (ROAD) ACT

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

1. How many South Australian roads have been declared national commerce roads under the State Grants (Road) Act, 1977, and what are those roads?

2. What sections of the Australian road system in South Australia are to be declared as—

(a) national; and

(b) developmental roads under the Roads Grants Act, 1980,

and will these classifications be permanent, if so, why and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The following six roads were declared National Commerce Roads under the States Grants (Roads) Act, 1977:—

(i) Lincoln Highway-Lincoln Gap to Whyalla

(ii) Port Pirie to Port Broughton Road-Esmond Road to Wandearah Road

(iii) Eastern Parade, Port Adelaide

(iv) Francis Street, Port Adelaide

(v) Western Approach to Port Lincoln-Freezers Hill to King Street

(vi) Flinders Highways-Pines to Tod Highway

2. National Roads under the Roads Grants Act, 1980, comprise National Highways and Developmental Roads.

Declared National Roads are:—

(a) National Highways:—

(i) Adelaide to Melbourne—Glen Osmond to Victorian Border

(ii) Adelaide to Perth—Cavan to Western Australian Border

(iii) Adelaide to Darwin—Port Augusta to Northern Territory Border.

(b) Development Roads:—

(i) Eastern Parade, Port Adelaide

(ii) Francis Street, Port Adelaide

(iii) Western Approach to Port Lincoln.

National Highways are roads which, *inter alia*, link State capitals or are otherwise considered to be of national importance. No variation to the system of declared National Highways is being considered under the Act because of their overall national importance.

Developmental Roads are roads which are considered, *inter alia*, to be of use in facilitating trade or commerce with other countries and are of national importance; and funds are provided to construct or improve them to an approved standard. It is customary on completion of the approved project for the roads to revert to their previous category for maintenance purposes.

Dr. KEITH JONES

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

1. What reports has the Minister received from Dr. Keith Jones concerning the cause of death of thousands of fish along Adelaide seashores in December last year?

2. Did Dr. Jones advise the Minister the likely causes of death and, if so, what were they?

3. Have similar events occurred over the last 20 years and, if so, when and where and what was the cause of the death of the fish on each occasion?

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

1. A report has been received from the Director of Fisheries.

2. No cause of death of the fish has been determined.

3. Fish kills in proximity to Adelaide beaches occur from time to time. The last recorded occurrence was on 29 November 1977, when the toxic chemical chlorphyifos was identified as the causive agent.

FERAL GOATS

992. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is the Government aware of the damage caused by feral goats in semi-arid and arid areas of South Australia and, if so, what action is being taken to overcome this problem?

2. What was the latest study conducted into the feral goat problem, what recommendations were made to reduce this problem, what action had been taken and at what cost?

3. What is the natural rate of increase per year of feral goats and where are they most dense?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is aware of the damage caused by goats and is encouraging the commercial harvesting of these animals off semi-arid areas. The Vertebrate Pest

Control Authority within the Department of Agriculture is carrying out research into methods of controlling goat damage.

2. Responses to these questions should be sought from the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority.

3. As for 2.

INDIGENOUS TREE PLANTING

993. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has a vigorous indigenous tree planting programme commenced in the Eyre Peninsula, Murray Mallee and other areas that have in recent years been affected by drought and, if so, when and at what estimated cost and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The answer to this same question was given to the member for Murray in *Hansard* on 1 August 1978. The average cost of establishing an individual tree would now be in the vicinity of $5.00. The Government has however embarked upon a very successful incentive scheme to encourage private landholders to preserve existing areas of native vegetation throughout the State.

DRUG TRAINING PROGRAMMES

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

1. Are scholarships for Drug Training Programmes offered to students and other interested persons in South Australia and, if not, why not and, if so—

(a) what is the amount of moneys and involvement by Government departments each year since 1970;

(b) how many applications have been received in the above period or since its introduction?

2. Is the Minister aware of the programme offered by the N.S.W. Drug and Alcohol Authority and the courses available in that State and will similar programmes be introduced in South Australia and, if so, when?

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

1. No. However the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board did, on one occasion, in 1977, offer scholarships for four positions of Community Health Nurses, to undertake training at the Sturt College of Advanced Education, with the Board participating in the training programme and the nurses undertaking an elective in addictions. This was a 12-month course, which has since been discontinued by Sturt C.A.E. The amount involved for 12 months of their training was approximately $40 000. This amount does not include salaries and wages of officers of the Board who participated in providing lectures to the course. The Board considers there is a need for an official course in South Australia.

2. Yes. The matter of introduction of a similar programme in the State is constantly under review.

PEST ERADICATION CHEMICALS

1002. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What chemicals are available in South Australia for use by pest eradication firms?

2. What are the brand names of these chemicals and what precautions must be taken when used?

3. What are the toxic properties of each and the relative toxicity level of each product?

4. What precautions are recommended by the Health Commission where these toxic chemicals are used to eradicate white ants in a suburban home?

5. What is the period of time after a household has been sprayed before it is safe for a pregnant mother or other than a pregnant person to safely re-enter such a house?

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

1. The chemicals listed in the South Australian Government publication entitled "Materials registered under the Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955-1975".

2. The brand names of pesticides are detailed in the document referred to above. The health and safety precautions taken when using particular chemicals vary according to the physical properties of the chemical, its toxicity, the method of application, when and where it is being applied and by whom it is being applied. Special health and safety instructions for individual chemicals are detailed on the label in accordance with the requirements of the Food and Drugs Regulations.

3. An indication of the relative toxicity of individual chemicals is provided on the label by reference to the warning statement. More comprehensive information is available from standard toxicology texts or from the information provided by the manufacturer at the time the chemical is registered as a pesticide.

4. The South Australian Health Commission recommends that pesticides to eradicate termites be applied in strict accordance with the manufacturer's instructions as detailed on the label of the relevant pesticide.

5. Persons living in a house which has been treated with chemicals should only re-enter the house after sufficient time has elapsed to ensure that there is no residual health hazard from the chemical concerned. This information is detailed on the label for each pesticide.

CONTROLLED DRINKING

1005. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Did the Minister note the article in *News* of 18 December 1980 entitled "Control Drink and be Merry"?

2. Does a similar scheme exist in this State and, if so, when was it introduced and where can one obtain this material and, if not, will the Minister investigate this British scheme with a view to introducing a similar scheme into South Australia and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. No. With regard to the suitability of the introduction of such a scheme in South Australia, it is thought unlikely that those persons who are excessive drinkers would keep such a record. A large amount of drinking by these persons takes place in a hotel situation and they would feel very self-conscious about keeping such a book. Also, it is extremely difficult for persons who have some degree of memory loss (particularly for recent events), which is a common phenomenon in excessive drinkers, to remember how many drinks they have had. It is true that, for some people, a goal of responsible drinking may be more attainable than total abstinence. However, in general, this goal would be for people in the early stages of alcohol dependency and not heavy drinkers, as indicated by the article.

MALNUTRITION

1006. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many cases of malnutrition have occurred in South Australia year by year since 1970 and what are the age brackets involved?

2. What specific areas, if any, of metropolitan Adelaide and country areas have been defined?

3. How many deaths have occurred each year in this State since 1970 through malnutrition, what socio-economic areas have been defined and where are they?

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

1. Malnutrition in developed Western countries such as Australia has two aspects—overnutrition and undernutrition. Whereas undernutrition is very rare in our society some nutritionists estimate that malnutrition in the form of overnutrition affects 50 per cent of our society. Overnutrition may also contribute to illness and death by its role in obesity, diabetes, hypertension and other diseases.

Because of the complexity of malnutrition it is impossible to give case numbers.

2. Overnutrition is likely to be distributed through all statistical divisions. For undernutrition, because of the difficulty in obtaining case numbers, there is no accurate guide to distribution.

3. The Bureau of Census and Statistics has available figures for undernutrition under the heading "Avitaminoses and other nutritional deficiencies". These figures are obtained from Death Certificates where nutritional deficiency is stated to be the primary cause of death. It should be stated that there may be many fatal illnesses in which nutritional deficiencies occur but where the deficiency is not the cause of death.

No figures are available for cases where overnutrition is considered to be the primary cause of death but it is known that this State contributes to many illnesses which, themselves, may cause death.

ADVERTISING

1007. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Does the TV commercial advertising the use of "Free" non-tobacco filter cigarettes contravene the Television and Radio Broadcasting Act which bans the advertising of cigarettes and, if not, why not and, if so, what action will be taken?

2. Does the Minister consider that this advertising still constitutes cigarette advertising and, if so, why, and, if not, why not?

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

1. This question should be directed to the Federal Minister for Post and Telecommunications who administers the Act referred to in the question.

2. See above.

HEALTH SURVEILLANCE

1016. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What health surveillance examinations and records are carried out in this State to protect employees engaged in areas involving—

(*a*) agricultural and industrial applications of radioactive materials;

(*b*) laboratories and educational institutions using radioactive materials; and

(*c*) hospitals and clinics involved in nuclear medicine (including both staff and patients)?

2. In what years were records kept for these places of work, by what departments and how long will these records be kept, by whom, what access will be available to these records and to whom?

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

1. All persons who are occupationally exposed to radiation must have their exposure monitored by appropriate devices. This applies whether they are working in agriculture, other industry, laboratories, educational institutions, hospitals or elsewhere. In most cases this monitoring is done by means of badges supplied and processed by the Australian Radiation Laboratory. Results are supplied to the employer and to the South Australian Health Commission, and are also retained by the Australian Radiation Laboratory.

2. This personal monitoring has been available for approximately 50 years and has been required in South Australia since 1962. The Australian Radiation Laboratory has kept records since 1940, and will keep them indefinitely.

Access to an individual's record is available to him through his employer. Access by others is at the discretion of State or Commonwealth health authorities. Patients undergoing nuclear medicine procedures are not included in this monitoring program. Details of the radioactive material used in nuclear medicine procedures are recorded in the patient's hospital record.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

1024. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What specific type of waste management system is to be installed at the Glenside Hospital, by whom will it be installed and at what total cost and what is the anticipated commissioning date?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: A central compactor, approximately 20 mobile bins and an hydraulic bin lifter. Tenders are currently being evaluated. Total cost will be approximately $20 000-$25 000 with a commissioning date of late May or early June 1981.

PRESS SECRETARY

1027. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the anticipated amount to be paid by way of remuneration, including overtime, to the successful applicant as Press Secretary to the Minister as advertised on 17 January 1981?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: $24 813·00.

DENTAL TREATMENT

1030. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the waiting time for dental treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for—

(*a*) conservative fillings;

(*b*) crown and bridge work;

(*c*) dentures; and

(*d*) thodontics?

2. Is it proposed to increase the number of dentists and technicians and, if so, by how many and, if not, why not?

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

	Approximate Waiting Time
1.	
(a) Conservative Fillings	6 weeks
(b) Crown and Bridge Work	8 weeks
(c) Dentures	3 years
(d) Orthodontics	3 months

2. It has been recommended that the equivalent of three additional dentists, some of whom may be employed on a sessional basis, and five dental technicians be appointed to the Dental Department for the express purpose of providing routine dental care for pensioners and financially disadvantaged persons.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL THEFTS

1036. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Did a number of cases involving thefts from Government hospitals occur during 1980 and, if so—

(a) what were the names of the hospitals and the dates on which the thefts occurred;

(b) what amount of drugs were stolen in each instance and how many persons were involved; and

(c) what disciplinary action or prosecutions took place in each instance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADMASON:

Royal Adelaide Hospital

(a)

5.2.80	5.6.80
15.3.80	18.7.80
20.3.80	2.8.80
15.5.80	19.9.80
3.6.80	26.9.80

(b) and (c)

Date	Drugs Stolen	Persons Involved	Action taken
15.5.80	1 × bottle sodium chloride	One visitor	Police advised, attended and arrested offender.
3.6.80	12 ampoules of scoline 10 ampoules of pancuronium bromide	One visitor	Police advised and investigation ensued.
19.9.80	2 ampoules of pethedine 20 mg of paraberetum	One Nurse	Police advised. Prosecuted. 2 year bond. Dismissed.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital

(a) 19.10.80
A period up to 1.8.80.

(b) and (c) No reports of drugs being stolen from the hospital.

Flinders Medical Centre

(a)

7.1.80	4.6.80
15.1.80	6.6.80
19.2.80	26.6.80
8.3.80	3.7.80
12.3.80	23.7.80
31.3.80	

(b) and (c) No reports of drugs being stolen from the centre.

Modbury Hospital

(a)

26.5.80	
22.6.80	
25.6.80	

(b) and (c) No reports of drugs being stolen from the hospital.

SUN-TANNING CLINICS

1038. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are sun-tanning clinics on the increase in South Australia and, if so, what has been the number registered each year since 1979 and what are their names and locations?

2. Has the New South Wales Health Commission ordered an urgent inquiry into the effects of exposure to the intensive ultra-violet system used in the tanning equipment and, if so, what investigations have been conducted in South Australia, by whom, when and what was the result of that study and, if not, why not?

3. Have any safety standards been imposed on this type of equipment and, if so, by whom and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes. The Corporate Affairs Commission does not compile a list of registrations under particular business types so the exact number is uncertain.

2. Yes. The New South Wales Health Commission, like the South Australian Health Commission, has an ongoing inquiry into sun-tanning clinics.

The South Australian Survey is being carried out by officers of the Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch of the Health Commission and is not yet complete.

3. No Australian standards have been prepared for this equipment. At present, the evaluation of sun-tanning equipment is based on the United States Food and Drug Administration Sunlamp Products Performance Standard (U.S. Food and Drug Administration 1979).

WORKERS COMPENSATION

1040. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many workers compensation claims have been successful against employers each year since 1970, what were the amounts involved and what were the categories and numbers involved in each category?

2. How many claims involving the death of a workman have been successful since 1970 and what was the number and type of death in each instance?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. The following table sets out the information on the number of claims which were lodged in South Australia under the Workers Compensation Act on which any payment has been or will be made.

Year	Number	Amount $000 000
1970-71	56 600	7·7
1971-72	61 000	10·6
1972-73	75 000	15·4
1973-74	87 000	21·3
1974-75	84 000	36·2
1975-76	78 000	46·7
1976-77	75 100	49·2
1977-78	66 500	54·5
1978-79	64 900	56·4
1979-80	69 100	63·2

The payout for each year refers to all payments made and not just for new claims arising in that year.

The other information requested is not readily available. An "Industrial Accident" bulletin is published annually by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (Catalogue No. 6301.4). The statistics contained in these bulletins were compiled from reports of workers' compensation claims which involved lost time of one week or more, and which were closed during the financial year or were unclosed for three years at the end of each financial year. As at 30 June 1980, the basis of the collection changed from date of claims closed, to date of occurrence.

2. Statistics on fatal accident claims were published in the Industrial Accident Statistic Bulletin up to June 1974. However, the Australian Bureau of Statistics was dissatisfied with the accuracy of the information being provided. This matter is currently the subject of a special joint study between the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It is anticipated that figures will formally be released within the next few months.

EMPLOYEE VICTIMISATION

1041. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many complaints in each year since 1970 have been forwarded to and/or investigated by the Department of Labour and Industry involving victimisation and exploitation of employees in the metropolitan area and non-metropolitan area, respectively, in—

(a) Government instrumentalities; and

(b) private firms,

and what were the names of the instrumentalities and firms?

2. What convictions and penalties were applied under State and Federal awards, respectively, and which instrumentality or firm was involved in each case?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

EMPLOYEES' TIME BOOKS

1043. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What was the number of complaints received each year since 1970 by the Department of Labour and Industry relating to inaccurate keeping of employees' time books?

2. How many employees subsequently received back pay, what were the amounts recovered and what were the names of the firms involved?

3. What prosecutions were taken against those firms?

4. How many inspectors are involved in the perusal of employees' time books and how many firms are inspected each year during routine checking?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

MOTOR INDUSTRY

1044. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many jobs have been lost in the motor industry since October 1979 at—

(a) G.M.H. Woodville plant;

(b) G.M.H. Elizabeth plant;

(c) Mitsubishi plant at Tonsley; and

(d) Mitsubishi plant at Londsdale?

2. How many apprentices have been taken on in each of the above plants since October 1979?

3. How many plants or portions of plants have been closed down at each plant in that period?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

MASSEY-FERGUSON HOLDINGS

1045. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many workers at each depot in South Australia are likely to be affected by Massey-Ferguson Holdings going into receivership, where are those depots and how will employees be affected in each?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

GENERAL MOTORS-HOLDEN'S

1046. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many jobs have been lost since October 1979 at component manufacturing industries that supply parts to G.M.H.?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

S.A. PLYWOOD PROPRIETARY LIMITED

1047. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What was the result of the investigation into the death of a Camden Park man on 6 January 1981 at the factory of S.A. Plywood Pty. Ltd.?

2. What malfunction of equipment occurred and why?

3. What unsafe practices occurred on this and other occasions when this machinery was being serviced and, if any, for what period had they been carried out?

4. What actions have been taken, and by whom, to prevent a similar accident?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Departmental investigation of this accident has not been completed. It is probable that a Coroner's Inquiry will be held and, in that event, the result of the investigation cannot be released until after the Inquiry.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING ESTABLISHMENTS

1048. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many employees in each classification are engaged in operations at each Government printing establishment?

2. How many apprentices have been engaged at each location in each year since 1978, what is the apprentice intake for 1981-82 and what classifications will be involved?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

PART I

Classification	Location						Totals
	Document Reproduction Units				Micrographics Bureau		
	Netley	Education Centre	Grenfell Centre	Parks Community College	Education Centre	Adelaide Gaol	
Leading Hand Compositor	5						5
Leading Hand Printers Engineer	1						1
Leading Hand Graphic Reproducer	1						1
Leading Hand Printing Machinist	2	1					3
Leading Hand Binder/Finisher	5						5
Printers Engineer (Electronics)	1						1
Compositor (Keyboard and Systems Operator)	17						17
Graphic Reproducer (Dot Etcher/Retoucher)	4						4
Printing Machinist (Multicolour)	2						2
Graphic Reproducer	8						8
Reader	8						8
Compositor	39						39
Senior Printing Machinist	1						1
Printing Machinist	36		1	1			38
Binder and Finisher	33						33
Printers Engineer	6						6
Bindery Machine Mechanic	1						1
Printers Joiner	1						1
Senior Reprographer—Grade I					1	1	2
Reprographer	4	7	2	1	8	3	25
Monotype Caster	1						1
Senior Folder	1						1
Sewer	3		1				4
Folder	34						34
Copyholder	3						3
Storeman	5						5
Senior Storeman—Grade I	5						5
Senior Storeman—Grade II	1	1					2
Forklift Operator	1						1
Driver—1·2 tonnes or less	4						4
Over 1·2 tonnes less than 3 tonnes	2						2
Assistant Offset Machinist	5						5
Security Officer	2						2
Cleaner	4						4
Tea Waitress	2						2
Apprentice	30						30
Junior	6	1					7
	284	10	4	2	9	4	313

PART II

		Location	Total
(a) Apprentices engaged	1978	Netley	8
	1979	Netley	4
	1980	Netley	6
	1981	Netley	6

	Classification	No.
(b) Proposed apprentice intake for 1982	Printing Machinist	3
	Graphic Reproducer	2
	Binder/Finisher	1
	Total	6

PETROL PRICE RISE

1049. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: What will be the cost to each Government instrumentality as a result of the Federal Government decision to raise the price of petrol from 1 January 1981 and what is the overall cost that taxpayers will be asked to bear through Government departments as a result of this increase?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Only time can tell.

ALBERT PARK ELECTORATE

1050. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many industrial sites are available in the Albert Park electorate and—

(a) where are they located;
(b) how many hectares are involved in each instance;
(c) what facilities are available in each instance;
(d) what are the types of industries that are being encouraged to use these industrial sites; and
(e) how many new industries commenced operation in this area in 1979 and 1980 and what were their business names and locations?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

1051. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice): asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many investigations involving industrial accidents have been carried out by D.L.I. inspectors each year since 1970?

2. How many inspectors are employed by the D.L.I. and in which country and metropolitan areas are they located?

3. How many firms have been prosecuted each year since 1970 for using unsafe machinery and/or practices which resulted in—

(a) loss of life;
(b) loss of limb; and
(c) an employee being partially or permanently incapacitated?

4. What were the fines imposed in each instance on those firms where negligence was proven?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. In 1980 there were 1 590 investigations carried out by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment inspectors. Statistics are not available before 1980.

2. As at 26 February, 1981 there were 49 positions for Inspectors of Industrial Safety operating from the following offices:

Head Office		3
District Offices		
Metropolitan	Adelaide	7
	Eastern	4
	Northern	6
	Southern	7
	Western	7
	Port Adelaide	7
Country	Whyalla	3
	Port Pirie	1
	Mount Gambier	3
	Berri	1

3. From 1978, statistics of prosecutions for breaches of Acts or Regulations have been tabulated in the appendices of the Departmental Annual Report.

4. This information is not available.

VISUAL DISPLAY UNITS

1052. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many Visual Display Units are there in each Government department in South Australia, which are those departments and how many V.D.U.'s and operators are in each department?

2. What eyesight tests for V.D.U. operators have been carried out annually in each department since V.D.U.'s were brought into operation and what adverse affects, if any, have those tests revealed, who conducts the tests in each department and if no tests are carried out, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY

1053. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

How many—

(a) industries closed down in South Australia in 1980;
(b) industries moved interstate during 1980;
(c) small businesses closed down in South Australia during 1980; and
(d) jobs were lost in *(a)*, *(b)* and *(c)* in each instance and what was the overall loss in wages?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The information requested is not readily available to the Government.

PAY-ROLL TAX

1055. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will the Minister provide details of the names and addresses of those businesses and the number of employees taken on at each business place as result of the Government's pay-roll tax incentive scheme and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is confidential and will not be released. However, in the month of December 1980, 527 employers were receiving pay-roll tax exemption in respect of 2 250 young people.

NUMBER PLATES

1056. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has the Minister made representations to the Minister of Transport concerning the quality of personalised number plates and, if so, when, what form did the representation take and, if not, why not?

2. Has the Minister personalised number plates on his own vehicle and, if so, when were they purchased?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. This question is not pertinent to Government policy or activities.

2. No.

APPRENTICES

1058. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Did, at the last call for apprentices at G.M.H. Woodville, 1 020 persons apply and were 40 taken on by that company and was the Government aware of this fact and, if not, why not?

2. What contact and/or assistance did the Government make to try and assist those other persons who are seeking apprenticeships?

3. Were other companies contacted by the Government advising such companies of the large number of persons looking for apprenticeships and, if not, why not?

4. Did at least 800 of those persons have sufficient education suitable for apprentice training?

5. What liaison does the Government have with management of G.M.H., Woodville?

6. How many persons applied for apprenticeships during 1980 and how many were successful?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested is not readily available to the Government. It is estimated that to obtain such information would require approximately one man year of effort.

RENTED PREMISES

1060. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many premises rented or leased to Government departments were not occupied during 1980, which departments were they, for what periods of time and what was the overall cost of such rental and leasing?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is not intended to answer this question as it would require an excessive amount of time and money to be expended in obtaining and printing the relevant information.

POT PLANTS

1061. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many and what type of potted plants are there in each Government department?

2. What is the overall value of these pot plants?

3. What has been the cost of purchasing pot plants for these departments during the period from October 1979 to 31 December 1980 and how many were purchased?

4. From whom were these pot plants purchased in that period and what was the number purchased from each?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's question is not warranted.

SCHOOL BUS

1071. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Did the Taperoo district school bus have to journey to a Mobil service station on Henley Beach Road to fill up with petrol on each occasion during 1980 and if not, where is the petrol obtained from and on how many occasions in 1980 was the bus filled with petrol and, if so, what is the reason, what is the distance travelled to fill up on each occasion and why cannot petrol be obtained from a local service station?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The bus which was allocated to the Taperoo High School in 1980 used diesel fuel and travelled to the Mobil service station to obtain fuel as that station was the closest contract supplier of diesel fuel.

The diesel fuelled bus was necessary to comply with safety regulations as it was stored at the Outer Harbor terminal. The bus presently in the area is based at the Largs Bay Primary School, is petrol driven and fuel is obtained locally.

ACRYLIC CARPET

1076. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is acrylic carpet installed in the following schools—

(a) Seaton North Primary;
(b) Seaton High;
(c) Findon Primary;
(d) Woodville Primary;
(e) Hendon Primary;
(f) Semaphore Park Primary;
(g) West Lakes Shore Primary; and
(h) West Lakes High?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Acrylic carpet is not installed in any of the schools listed, but was fitted into Findon Junior Primary School building constructed in 1971.

SECURITY

1087. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What security arrangements exist for the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers in the administration offices in Adelaide?

2. What are the types of equipment involved in such security, what was the initial cost and what are the yearly maintenance costs for each Minister's office?

3. How many security guards are employed in each instance and for what periods?

4. What is the firm's name in each instance and what is the annual cost?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Questions as to detailed security arrangements will not be answered for security reasons.

NUCLEAR SHELTERS

1090. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What are the locations and numbers of underground nuclear attack shelters in South Australia, how many persons can be housed in each shelter and for what periods of time?

2. What discussions has the Government had with the Federal Government with respect to building nuclear attack shelters in this State, when did those discussions occur, what locations are being considered and at what cost?

3. How many key personnel and civilians can be housed in each shelter and for what period of time?

4. What is the estimated loss of life in the event of a nuclear attack on Adelaide?

5. If one or all of the above are not likely to occur what are the Government's reasons?

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

1. There are no underground nuclear attack shelters in South Australia which would be proof against a direct hit from a nuclear device. The State Emergency Centre has a supply of booklets concerning fall-out shelters which could be constructed by citizens who are so motivated.

2. The matter of a fall-out-proof emergency operations centre is being given some consideration in connection with the construction of a centre for natural disaster operations. Some advice was taken from Commonwealth officers last year when it was indicated that the risk is not high.

3. Not applicable.

4. The question is hypothetical—it would depend on the size of the bomb and the impact area.

5. This question is quite meaningless.

UNEMPLOYMENT

1091. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does South Australia continue to have the highest unemployment figures in Australia?

2. Do the Australian Bureau of Statistics job vacancy figures for South Australia during 1980 per 1 000 persons show a deterioration from the 1979 figures?

3. Did, in the six months ended March 1980, 2 925 people leave South Australia for other States as against 2 109 in the six months ended March 1979 and what are the figures for 30 April to 31 October 1980?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: All of the information requested can be obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

1097. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How much money was spent in 1980 by the Premier's Department on entertainment expenses involving—

(a) alcoholic beverages;

(b) meals at restaurants;

(c) working luncheons; and

(d) night club entertainment?

2. Who were the dignitaries involved and what where the purposes of those functions?

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

1. The records maintained by the department do not provide precise answers to the questions asked. However, the funds spent on entertainment during 1980 were $23 255, which compares quite favourably with the previous year (1979) when a total of $29 458 was spent. These costs include alcoholic beverages, meals at restaurants and working lunches. There is no record of any funds having been spent on night club entertainment.

2. Information sought is not readily available. The department does have a special miscellaneous line headed "Official Visitors to the State and Receptions" but it is not possible to separate entertainment costs from all other costs incurred. The total spent on this line in 1980 was $58 872 compared with $39 300 in 1979. Costs in 1980 were higher due to visits by Princess Alexandra, the Lord Mayor of London and several Japanese groups.

URANIUM

1100. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What sites are being considered by the Government for the establishment of a uranium treatment plant in South Australia?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. The Uranium Enrichment Committee has stated that requirements for this facility can be met in the Iron Triangle area. However, at present, the Government does not have before it any proposal for a specific site.

1102. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What infra-structure, necessary for the establishment of a uranium treatment plant, does the Government intend, or has agreed, to provide at Government expense and how much will such a commitment cost the taxpayers of South Australia?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. I refer the member to my speech to House of Assembly given on 20 February 1980 and to the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee's Annual Report 1979-80 which deal with the matters raised.

1103. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Does the Government intend to acquire any equity in any uranium treatment plant built in South Australia and, if so, how much will the purchase of such equity cost?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. I refer the member to my speech to House of Assembly given on 20 February 1980 and to the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee's Annual Report 1979-80 which deal with the matters raised.

1104. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What benefits will equity in a uranium treatment plant bestow upon the Government and what obligations will such equity impose on the Government?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. I refer the member to my speech to House of Assembly given on 20 February 1980 and to the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee's Annual Report 1979-80 which deal with the matters raised.

1105. **MR. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Does the Government intend to supply water and electricity at concessional rates to any company or consortium establishing a uranium treatment plant in South Australia and, if so, what are the details of any such concessions?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. The Government has not yet made any final decision on the matter of concessional rates.

1106. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What demands will be placed upon the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline by the establishment of a uranium treatment plant in the Iron Triangle area, how will such demands affect the supply of water to domestic and other industrial customers in the area and what will be the additional costs to the people in this area?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed that the uranium treatment plant referred to by the member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. The Uranium Enrichment Committee has advised the Government that the location of such a plant in the Iron Triange can be achieved without any adverse affect on the supply of water to domestic and other industrial customers in the area.

1107. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What safeguards does the Government intend to implement to ensure that the public is protected from any dangers associated with the processing of uranium and the movement of radioactive and/or toxic substances by any of the various transport modes?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: National codes of practice for the protection of the people of Australia and the environment from possible harmful effects associated with nucleur activities are being developed in close consultation with the Governments of the States and the Northern Territory. The first such code, the Code of Practice on Radiation Protection in the Mining and Milling of Radioactive Ores (1980) was formulated under provisions of the Environment Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act, 1978 and has been tabled in Federal Parliament. The Proposed Code of Practice for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials has now been released for public comment.

The proposed Code of Practice on Management of Wastes containing Radioactive Material from the Mining and Milling of Radioactive Ores is being developed by a Commonwealth/State working group. These codes will be adopted under appropriate South Australian legislation.

MURRAY RIVER BRIDGE

1108. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Where will the next bridge over the River Murray be built and when will this project commence?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The next road bridge to be constructed over the Murray River is expected to be in the vicinity of Berri. At present plans are on display for public comment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1111. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What links exist between the Department of Further Education and the National Centre for Research and Vocational Education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is presumed that the reference is to the National Centre for Research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University visited by the Director-General of Further Education in 1979. The principal link which presently exists between the Department of Further Education and the National Centre for Research in Vocational Education is through the National TAFE Clearinghouse system. The National TAFE Clearinghouse is associated with the Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) Clearinghouse. The latter is housed within the National Centre for Research in Vocational Education. It is intended that details about the 1980-81 National Centre products catalogue should be included in the National TAFE Clearinghouse publication *Initiatives in Technical and Further Education* in the same way as the latter has been included in the ERIC Clearinghouse. In this way, research in technical and further education in both countries will be linked.

TEACHERS

1113. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are plans in hand to increase the number of fixed-term contract staff in the Department of Further Education at the expense of tenured employees and, if so, why and in what areas will these appointments be made?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: An agreement has been negotiated between the Department of Further Education and the South Australian Institute of Teachers concerning the appointment of temporary lecturers. After excluding temporary appointments to replace permanent staff on leave and those appointed to Commonwealth funded activities, the agreement states that there shall be a maximum of 7½ per cent of temporary to permanent staff. Currently the figure stands at 2.8 per cent. In keeping with departmental policy while still remaining within the above agreement, the majority of new and replacement appointments will continue to be on limited tenure up to three years. This policy will apply equally across all program areas although each vacancy will be considered individually to establish the best course of action. For general management and administrative purposes it is desirable to have some temporary appointments in all areas. With the rapid changes in technology, community and industrial needs it is essential to maintain flexibility in order to satisfy that changing demand.

SEAFORD LAND

1114. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: When will the Rural A land at Seaford be released for private development?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Metropolitan Development Plan currently provides for the automatic release of all areas of Rural A land for urban development after 1981. However, based on present patterns of demand, it is unlikely that Rural A land at Seaford will be required for urban use for some years.

FURTHER EDUCATION FEES

1115. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What changes are being considered to the fees charged for Department of Further Education stream 6 courses?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Fees for stream 6 courses are reviewed annually to compensate for unavoidable periodic increases in salary payments for part-time instructors and contingency costs. In line with this approach the student hour fee was increased by 10 per cent to $1.10 per hour effective from 1 January 1981. It is proposed to review fees late in the 1981 academic year with any further increase in fees effective from 1 January 1981.

POST-SECONDARY CREDITS

1118. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What steps have been taken to facilitate the transfer of course credits between post-secondary sectors and institutions in South Australia?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the honourable member is aware, the institutions of post-secondary education have considerable autonomy in the development and conduct of their academic programmes including the extent to which a student may be granted advanced standing in recognition of studies or training he has previously completed in another institution. That freedom is constrained in the cases of institutions in the technical and further education and the advanced education sectors by the need for courses to be approved and accredited by the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia.

The authority which was established relatively recently, is developing procedures for academic planning, course approval and accreditation which place great emphasis on co-operative relationships between institutions both within and between sectors. This includes the elimination of unnecessary restrictions in the granting of credit or advanced standing. I should add that in recent years, with the full support of the State coordinating authority, the institutions themselves have initiated liaison intended *inter alia* to facilitate transferability of credit.

ALFALFA APHID

1123. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What programmes have been initiated in South Australia to control alfalfa aphid?

2. How successful were the programmes, when were they introduced and how much have these programmes cost each year since they were introduced?

3. Does the Government intend to continue these programmes and, if so, why, and, if not, why not?

4. What damage has the alfalfa aphid caused in South Australia to lucerne and how wide-spread is this damage?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Thirty-two research projects have been initiated in South Australia since June 1977 to control pasture aphids. They have aimed at achieving integrated control using parasites, predators, insecticides and the breeding and introduction of resistant pasture cultivars.

2. To date the research programme has established throughout the State an effective parasite for spotted alfalfa aphid control and devised useful chemical control programmes. Two new medic cultivars have been released to commerce which are largely resistant to aphid attack. Other varieties including lucerne cultivars with good resistance are almost ready for release.

Total costs of the projects each year have been:

Prior to 30/6/77	$614 275
1977/78	$668 390
1978/79	$662 347
1979/80	$577 161
1980-31/3/81	$226 272

3. The Government is continuing programmes which deal with problems which have not yet been fully solved.

4. The spotted alfalfa aphid has destroyed approximately one third of the lucerne stands in South Australia since 1977 and thinned other large areas. It has caused damage throughout South Australia. This damage was aided by three years of drought just before the aphids arrived and may not be the pattern in future years.

PINE PLANTATIONS

1124. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many hectares of pine planting has been carried out in South Australia in each year since 1970, at what locations and how many hectares were planted in each instance?

2. What is the pine planting programme for South Australia in the next 10 years?

3. Is the pine felling programme reducing the number of hectares of pines available in South Australia and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Pine planting since 1970:

Year	Hectares	Annual Report page
1970-71	2 652	37
1971-72	2 279	43
1972-73	1 816	52
1973-74	1 963	51
1974-75	2 042	56
1975-76	1 840	63
1976-77	1 621	45
1977-78	1 115	45
1978-79	1 196	47
1979-80	1 495	—

Specific details appear in the Annual Reports of the Woods and Forests Department each year.

2. Forward normal planting targets for the next ten years are—

South-east Region—approximately 1 300 hectares.

Central Region—approximately 200 hectares.

Northern Region—up to 40 hectares.*

*Depending upon present market developments.

3. No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BORROWINGS

1132. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What has been the total loan borrowings for each local government authority for each year since 1977?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No statistics are kept by the Department of Local Government and the Government is not prepared to spend the large amount of time needed to collect the data from the 128 local government bodies.

URANIUM

1141. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the Government grant free annual medical checks to all those employees who previously worked at the Port Pirie uranium enrichment plant and if so, when, and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Government grant free annual medical checks to all past and present railway employees who carted uranium ore to the above plant in Port Pirie and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

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

1. No uranium enrichment plant has ever operated in Australia. A chemical treatment plant for the extraction of uranium oxide concentrate commenced operation at Port Pirie in August, 1955, under the aegis of the Department of Mines, and continued until 1962. Persons employed at the plant during that period, like those at Radium Hill, are eligible for a free medical examination at Flinders Medical Centre.

2. The railway workers were not directly concerned with loading and unloading of railway trucks; these operations were performed by Mines Department personnel, therefore medical examinations on these workers are not necessary.

TIME IN LIEU

1142. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: During 1980, how many State Government employees were forced to take time off in lieu of overtime worked and what was the number of hours in each department?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

1148. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many pedestrian crossings were erected during 1979-80?

2. How many are to be or have been installed during 1980-81 and how many of those are school crossings, what are their locations and what is the cost of each?

3. How many school crossing lights are being upgraded or are to be replaced with traffic signals at adjacent intersections or junctions during 1981-82?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. In 1979-80, 30 pedestrian actuated crossings (26 by department and four by local government authorities) and eight school pedestrian crossings (four by department and four by local government authorities) were installed.

2. *(a)* In 1980-81, 18 pedestrian actuated crossings and one school pedestrian crossing are scheduled by the Highways Department for installation. The department is not aware of the number of installations by local government authorities.

(b) The details concerning pedestrian actuated crossings for school, location and cost are set out hereunder:

Pedestrian Actuated Crossings for Schools
(Conversion from School Crossings)

	$
Bagster Rd. near Kelsey Rd., Salisbury North (Funded by CC Salisbury)	16 000
Churchill Rd. near Goodman Ave., Kilburn	15 000
Diagonal Rd. near Keynes Ave., Warradale	14 000
Grange Rd. near Hart St., Kidman Park	18 000
Kensington Rd. near Victoria St., Rose Park	18 000
Morphett Rd. near Sunshine Ave., Warradale (estimated cost to be funded by CC Marion)	13 000
Port Rd. near Webb St., Queenstown (estimated cost)	27 000
Portrush Rd. near Hay Rd., Linden Park	15 500
Sturt Rd. near Grandview Cres. Sturt	11 000
Tapleys Hill Rd. near Chippendale Ave., Fulham	17 000
Crittenden Rd. near Amanda Ave., Woodville South (Estimated cost)	24 000
Cross Rd. near West Ter., Highgate	15 000
Main North Rd. near Potts Rd., Evanston	16 000

(c) A school crossing will be installed on Diment Road near Mannara Drive, Salisbury (estimated cost to be funded by Education Department 9 500

3. The Highways Department has not finalised the 1981-82 traffic signal programme at this time.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE RAIL ELECTRIFICATION

1149. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government intend to electrify the Noarlunga S.T.A. rail service and, if so, when, and what is the anticipated cost and, if not, why not?

2. Have representations been made by the Government requesting financial assistance from the Federal Government and, if so, when was such application made and what was the reply?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Investigations are presently being carried out into the feasibility of electrifying the metropolitan rail system. However, the Government has no proposal to electrify the Noarlunga Centre rail line at this time.

2. No.

MOTOR TRIALS

1151. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What controls will be introduced by the Government to regulate motor vehicle reliability trials and rallies?

2. What restrictions will be placed on country and district council roads usage and, if none, why not?

3. Will these trials be restricted to certain times of the year and, if not, why not?

4. Will organisers of these trials be compelled to liaise with corporations and district councils and, if not, why not?

5. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation requiring organisers and sponsors of those trials and rallies to pay compensation for damage occasioned to roads in district council areas and to provide for fines?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No specific controls are planned to regulate motor vehicle reliability trials and rallies. Vehicles taking part in such rallies must conform to the requirements of the Road Traffic Act and Regulations and drivers must comply with all road laws.

2. No restrictions on usage are considered necessary on country and district council roads for the reasons stated above.

3. No restrictions are planned to prohibit such trials at certain times of the year. In the past organisers have co-operated with all involved authorities and as the vehicles and drivers must comply with the requirements of the Road Traffic Act, such restrictions are not considered to be necessary.

4. Organisers of trials and rallies are not compelled to liaise with corporations and district councils. Because of their past responsible attitude such controls do not appear to be warranted.

5. Section 106 of the Road Traffic Act deals with damage to roads and compensation and section 164a covers offences and penalties.

VEHICLE INSURANCE

1152. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to introduce legislation on no fault motor vehicle insurance and, if so, when, and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This matter is still under consideration and an announcement will be made in due course.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

1154. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many phone calls complaining of malfunctions of traffic signals during the months of December 1980 and January 1981 were received by the Highways Department—

(a) between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.; and

(b) between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m.?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reply is as follows:

(a) 7 a.m.-5 p.m.
December 1980—652
January 1981—543

(b) 5 p.m.-7 a.m.
December 1980—76
January 1981—37

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

1155. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What financial assistance is given to parents of children in isolated areas who are required to transport their children to school by private vehicles or school buses?

2. How many departmental vehicles are available for such transport?

3. Does the Government intend to let contracts for these services to private firms and, if so, how many and what services will be affected?

4. How many services are currently let to contract and where?

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

1. The department provides financial assistance to children who reside beyond 5 km of the nearest school or school bus route. This assistance is by way of a travelling allowance. Examples of the allowance paid are as follows:

5·0 kms distant but less than 7 km—$0·85 per day
11·0 kms distant but less than 13 km—$1·87 per day
21·0 kms distant but less than 23 km—$3·57 per day
27·0 kms distant but less than 29 km—$4·59 per day

The allowance is payable per family. If children use departmentally owned or controlled buses no payment is made, but if private or State Transport Authority buses are used fares are paid to a maximum of $240 per year.

2. The department owns and operates 415 buses on route service and a further 273 are contract operated.

3. There is an ongoing Government policy to call tenders for Education Department runs where private interest is expressed.

4. There are 273 bus services operated under contract to the department and these services are provided throughout the State. These services operate in an area between Andamooka, Streaky Bay, Mount Gambier and the South Australian/Victorian border towns.

VENEREAL DISEASE

1156. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many cases of venereal disease involving males and females, respectively, were reported during 1980?

2. What were the various types of venereal disease reported and what was the incidence in each category?

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

1. Gonorrhoea:

Males	558	
Females	308	886
Syphilis:		
Males	160	
Females	98	258
Total		1 134

2. Gonorrhoea and syphilis are the only common venereal diseases which are notifiable by Statute to the Central Board of Health. Figures for genital herpes and non-specific urethritis are collected from some venereal clinics in South Australia. The various types of disease seen in the Venereal Diseases Clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in 1980 were:

Gonorrhoea	514
Syphilis	56
Genital Herpes	391
Non-specific urethritis	1 196
Total	2 157

HOSPITAL VISITORS

1158. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many disturbances caused by visitors have occurred during 1980 at—

(*a*) Queen Elizabeth Hospital;

(*b*) Flinders Medical Centre; and

(*c*) Royal Adelaide Hospital?

2. Has security been increased at these hospitals and, if so, what form has that security taken?

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

1. It is not possible to provide an answer without knowing what exactly is meant by a "disturbance".

2. (*a*) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—Approval has been given for the employment of a security officer and the introduction of a photographic identification system. The patrols by an outside security fire engaged by the Hospital have been re-routed and extended.

(*b*) Flinders Medical Centre—A programme to upgrade the level of security for the residential accommodation is currently being developed.

(*c*) Royal Adelaide Hospital—A security patrol of four officers has been established with two of them on duty at any one time during the hours of 7.25 p.m. to 4.00 a.m. The patrol has two-way radio communication with a base manned by a security officer.

AGED HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

1161. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What reduction in the financial triennium 1980-83 Commonwealth funding for the South Australian programme for the aged or disabled persons accommodation has occurred, what are the respective names of the hospitals and amounts involved and has the Commonwealth indicated when funds will be available to those hospitals?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This question should be directed to either the Regional Director of the Department of Social Security or to the Commonwealth Minister.

MILLIPEDES

1168. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What moneys were made available during the 1980-81 financial year for research into the control, whether biological or otherwise, of millipedes and, to whom was it provided?

2. What approaches have been made to the Federal Government for funds to assist this research, when were they made and what expenses and amounts of money were made available?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:

1. $30 000.

2. The Federal Government, through C.S.I.R.O., was successfully approached by the South Australian Government to initiate a research programme in Portugal to study the feasibility of biological control of the Portuguese millepede in South Australia. C.S.I.R.O. agreed to a collaborative programme and made available a matching contribution of $30 000 for the 1980-81 financial year.

SALVATION JANE

1169. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What controls has the Government introduced for salvation jane?

2. What effects will such controls have upon the apiary industry?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:

1. None, although the Government supports the introduction of a biological control programme.

2. The question is academic in that it is being debated before the courts.

WORKER'S DEATH

1171. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What were the circumstances that led to the death of a tradesman at the Ottoway Engineering and Water Supply depot?

2. Is it a fact that the temperature at the time of the accident was 40·6° Celsius and that the high temperature was a contributing factor in the death of this worker and, if so, how and, if not, why not?

3. Why did not the manager of the Ottoway depot "knock off" workers during the extreme heat?

4. Are evaporative cooling systems installed at this depot and, if so, how many and of what size in each workshop and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Departmental investigation of this accident has not been completed. It is probable that a Coroner's inquiry will be held, and in that event the result of the investigation cannot be released until after the Inquiry.

PRISONERS

1172. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What was the cost of keeping prisoners in each gaol in South Australia during 1980?

2. What was the cost of keeping juveniles in each Government instutution during 1980?

3. How many prisoners and juveniles were released on bonds or parole, respectively, during 1980?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA:

1. The annual average net costs per prisoner for the institutions were as follows:

Institution	1979-80
Adelaide Gaol	$10 707
Country Gaols (3)	$14 448
Women's Rehabilitation Centre	$22 468
Yatala Labour Prison	$13 180
Cadell Training Centre	$10 886

2. The daily costs per juvenile for the Centres were as follows:

Institution	1979-80
S.A. Youth Training Centre	$119.63
S.A. Youth Remand & Assessment Centre	$112.24

3. Prisoners 1 552; Juveniles 1 152.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE STAFF

1173. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many people are employed in Parliament House in permanent and casual employment and what are their respective positions, responsibilities, hours worked per week and salaries?

2. By whom is each member of the staff employed and to whom are they responsible?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN:

1. There are twelve (12) personnel employed at Parliament House who are on the pay-roll of the Public Buildings Department and who undertake duties for the Public Works Standing Committee, Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly), Members of the House of Assembly (2) and Members of the Legislative Council (4). Details of the personnel are as attached.

2. Information included in 1 above. To obtain information on Parliament House staff, other than those on the pay-roll of the Public Buildings Department, the Honourable Member should contact the Speaker, House of Assembly and the President, Legislative Council.

QUESTION ON NOTICE 1173—PARLIAMENT HOUSE EMPLOYEES

Name	Classification	Salary $	Hours Basis	Office	To whom responsible
L. Hourigan	AO-4	26 702 p.a.	37·5	P.W.S.C.	Chairman
L. A. Brookes	MN 2	12 672 p.a.	37·5	P.W.S.C.	Secretary
G. R. Maguire	Ministerial Officer Gd. 2	23 392 p.a.	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
B. W. Muirden	Ministerial Officer Gd. 2	23 392 p.a. (Plus 5 848 allowance)	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
G. M. Anderson	Ministerial Officer Gd. 3	19 912 p.a. (Plus 1 991 allowance)	37·5	Leader of the Opposition	Leader
M. D. Rann	Ministerial Officer Gd. 3	19 912 p.a.	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
P. E. Robinson	MN 4	14 750 p.a.	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
M. Carmichael	MN 4	14 750 p.a.	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
W. Jaffer	MN 3	13 870 p.a.	37·5	Leader of the Opposition (House of Assembly)	Leader
P. Forster	MN 3	13 870 p.a.	37·5	Legislative Council	Mr. R. C. DeGaris and 3 other members
A. Fullarton	Personal Assistant	14 750 p.a.	37·5	House of Assembly	Mr. P. Lewis, M.P.
M. Kourtesis	Personal Assistant	14 750 p.a.	37·5	House of Assembly	Mr. G. Gunn, M.P.

TRAFFIC COUNTS

1176. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the most recent traffic counts on Tapleys Hill Road between Trimmer Parade and Old Port Road?

2. What has been the annual increase in traffic on the above section of road in the last 10 years?

3. What are the departmental projections of traffic densities, based on available information for—

(a) the next 5 years; and

(b) the next 10 years?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON:

1. *(a)* Tapleys Hill Road at Old Port Road: 12 900 vehicles per 24 hours

(b) Tapleys Hill Road at West Lakes Boulevard: 16 550 vehicles per 24 hours

(c) Tapleys Hill Road at Trimmer Parade: 24 200 vehicles per 24 hours.

2. 3.0 per cent.

3. The predicted 24 hour traffic densities for Tapleys Hill Road at the undermentioned locations are as follows:

	Next 5 years	Next 10 years
Old Port Road	15 600	16 700
West Lakes Boulevard	21 900	24 800
Trimmer Parade	21 000	22 100

TEACHERS SALARIES

1180. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How long has it been the practice for the Education Department's accountancy section to refer salary over-payments to a debt collection agency and how much warning is given to teachers who may have erred in this regard?

The Hon. H. ALLISON:

1. Cabinet approval was obtained on 21 December 1971 and an agency was appointed on 23 February 1972.

2. The first letter advising of the overpayment requests that the debtor contact the Department within 14 days to arrange repayment. If there is no response, the second and final letter advises that the matter will be referred to a debt collection agency without further notice if the debtor does not contact the Department to arrange repayment within a further 14 days. The debtor is also advised in this letter that further costs will be incurred by him if this step is taken. If there is still no response approval is obtained and action is then taken to refer the case to a debt collection agency.

ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

1181. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Oaklands Road Safety Centre recently lost two field officers through illness and/or resignation and, if so, have these vacancies been filled and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

BEER PRICES

1182. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What price increases have recently occurred with low alcohol (L.A.) beer, how do these price alterations compare with other beer and does there exist a financial disincentive against consuming L.A. beer?

2. What proportion of hotels selling L.A. beer do so "on tap", and is a "corkage" fee normally charged in the other hotels where L.A. beer is only available over the counter in bottled form?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:

1. The following retail increases have recently occurred for low alcohol beer:

	18 July 1980	19 January 1981
740 ml bottle	5 cents	2 cents
375 ml bottle	4 cents	2 cents
170 ml butcher	1 cent	1 cent
225 ml schooner	2 cents	2 cents
425 ml pint	4 cents	3 cents

Low alcohol beer sells at the same wholesale and retail prices as ordinary beer and therefore there is no financial disincentive againt consuming low alcohol beer.

2. I understand that under 10 per cent of South Australian hotels sell low alcohol beer "on tap". A "corkage" fee is charged in hotels where low alcohol beer is only available over the counter in bottled form. The fee is 40 cents for a 740 ml bottle and 25 cents for a 375 ml bottle.

ROADWORTHY VEHICLES

1185. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is there any requirement for a motor vehicle priced below $500 to be roadworthy when sold and, if not, does the Government have any plans to introduce legislation such as that which exists interstate requiring a mechanical examination of all vehicles and the issuing of a roadworthiness certificate whenever a vehicle changes ownership?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is no requirement for any vehicle being sold to be sold in a roadworthy condition. However, it is an offence to use any vehicle in an unroadworthy condition. The Minister of Transport is presently studying interstate leglisation concerning mechanical examination of vehicles and the issuing of roadworthiness certificates when vehicles change ownership.

CLUBS

1186. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Do any restrictions apply to licensed clubs that would inhibit them from granting concessions to pensioner members?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No. The provisions of sections 88, 89 and 98 of the Licensing Act enable the Licensing Court to approve rules for Licensed clubs which provide membership concessions for pensioners.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

1187. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:—Is the Minister aware of a "primary school readiness screening programme" conducted by the Burckhardt Clinic of 3 College Street, Glenelg, and how effective are assessments of this nature.?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes. The effectiveness of such programmes is a matter for academic debate and therefore it is not possible to make a statement about their effectiveness.

LEIGH CREEK

1189. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Is the Minister aware that 400 houses in the company town being established at German Creek in Queensland by Capricorn Coal Ltd. will use 400 domestic solar hot water systems and, if so, why was a similar proposal not adopted for the new Leigh Creek township?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The installation of solar water heaters for houses in the new township at Leigh Creek was considered in the design stage of the project. It was decided not to install them because the high cost of this type of heater would add appreciably to the cost of houses and the additional rent that would have to be charged to cover this cost would in most cases exceed any savings tenants would make in electricity charges. However, provision has been made in the design of the houses so that tenants may readily install their own solar heaters if they wish.

KINDERGARTENS

1190. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—Why is there a delay in granting permission to build the kindergartens at North Haven and West Lakes Shore?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Investigations involving both the Childhood Services Council and the Kindergarten Union are currently in progress to determine the need for, and priority rankings of proposed new kindergartens at West Lakes Shore and North Haven.

NORTH ARM MARKET

1193. **Mr. L. M. F. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

1. Did the Department of Agriculture recommend to the Department of Marine and Harbors review of the operation of the North Arm Market that space be allocated to market gardeners only?

2. Did the Minister have consultations with the Minister of Marine on this matter and is the Minister of Marine correct in his assertion that "in collaboration with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, it has been decided to maintain the market on its existing basis"?

3. If the answers to parts 1 and 2 are positive, why did the Minister reject the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:

1. No, that recommendation was made by the Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Working Party on which the Department of Agriculture is represented.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT RATES

1195. **Mr. L. M. F. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment—

1. What form of assessing rates is used by each local government body in South Australia and in which does differential rating apply?

2. What is the—

(a) rate revenue for 1979-80;

(b) number of ratepayers; and

(c) minimum rate,

for each local government body?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. See attached schedule (A).

2. *(a)* Information not available.

(b) Information not available as to ratepayers (or electors). However population figures as at 30 June 1979 are appropriate (Schedule B).

(c) As per schedule (A).

COUNCILS' ESTIMATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION 1980/81

Council	Assessment		Basis of Assessment			Assessment Adoption			Rates				Differential		214a Consent		Minimum Rate			Special Rate Coll.	Separate Rate Coll.
	Govt.	Own	AAV	ULV	Comb.	Date 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Date Decl. 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Amount Coll.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Amount		
Adelaide		X	X			7.7	10.7	214	7.7	10.7	213	9 904 710		X	X			X		213 490	
Angaston	X		X			11.8	21.8	622	11.8	21.8	622	591 501		X		X	X		100		45 678
Balaklava	X		X			13.8	28.8	740	13.8	28.8	740	218 654	X			X	X		See Att.		
Barmera		X		X		7.7	17.7	276	19.8	28.8	740	316 410		X		X	X		125		
Barossa		X	X			18.8	4.9	810	18.8	4.9	811	381 242		X		X	X		120		21 890
Beachport	X		X	X		20.8	28.8	741	29.9	18.12	2353	386 510	X			X	X		See Att.		
Berri		X	X		X	2.9	11.9	856	2.9	11.9	856	467 602	X			X	X		See Att.	46 700	
Blyth	X		X			25.8	11.9	857	25.8	11.9	857	183 430		X		X	X		See Att.		
Brighton	X		X			11.8	14.8	570	11.8	14.8	570	1 407 151		X		X	X		120		
Brown's Well	X			X		8.10	18.12	2353	8.10	18.12	2353	35 287		X		X	X		25		
Burnside	X					21.7	24.7	346	21.7	24.7	346	3 685 711		X		X		X			
Burra Burra	X			X		14.7	7.8	514	14.7	7.8	514	285 058	X			X	X		See Att.		6 369
Bute		X	X			7.7	17.7	276	8.9	18.9	935	172 013		X		X	X		See Att.		
Campbelltown	X		X			28.7	14.8	570	28.7	14.8	570	2 975 490		X		X	X		100		
Carrieton	X			X		9.9	18.9	935	9.9	18.9	935	21 857	X			X	X		See Att.		
Central Y.P.	X		X			15.9	25.9	1000	15.9	25.9	1000	365 959	X			X	X		See Att.		
Clare	X		X			25.8	18.9	935	25.8	18.9	936	282 833		X		X	X		See Att.	34 665	
Cleve		X		X		12.9	18.9	936	12.9	25.9	1000	345 069	X			X	X		62		5 740
Clinton	X		X			1.9	11.9	857	1.9	11.9	858	137 103	X			X	X		See Att.		
Coonalpyn D.		X	X			8.9	11.9	858	8.9	11.9	858	354 172		X		X	X		70		11 709
Crystal Brook	X		X			29.7	7.8	515	29.7	7.8	515	100 455	X			X	X		110		24 242
Dudley	X		X			26.9	9.10	1142	26.9	9.10	1142	90 700		X		X	X		See Att.		
East Torrens		X	X			30.9	23.10	1246	30.9	23.10	1246	461 363	X			X	X		See Att.		
Elizabeth		X	X			22.7	31.7	469	25.8	4.9	804	3 004 469	X			X	X		157		
Elliston	X		X			19.9	9.10	1142	19.9	9.10	1142	191 779		X		X	X		See Att.	3 926	
Enfield	X		X			15.9	18.9	934	15.9	18.9	934	5 701 642		X		X	X		150		
Eudunda	X		X			18.8	28.8	741	18.8	28.8	741	109 971	X			X	X		See Att.		13 849
Franklin Hbr.		X		X		15.8	28.8	741	15.8	28.8	742	184 548	X			X	X		65		

COUNCILS' ESTIMATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION 1980/81—*continued*

Council	Assessment		Basis of Assessment			Assessment Adoption			Rates				Differential		214a Consent		Minimum Rate			Special Rate Coll.	Separate Rate Coll.
	Govt.	Own	AAV	ULV	Comb.	Date 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Date Decl. 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Amount Coll.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Amount		
Gawler	X			X		27.10	6.11	1368	27.10	6.11	1368	806 029	X			X	X		150		
Georgetown	X		X			5.8	21.8	623	5.8	21.8	623	121 461		X		X	X		See Att.		
Gladstone	X		X			31.7	7.8	515	31.7	7.8	515	93 949	X			X	X		See Att.		
Glenelg	X		X			29.7	7.8	512	29.7	7.8	512	1 392 670		X		X	X		120		
Gumeracha	X				X	17.7	14.8	572	17.7	14.8	572	517 182	X		X		X		120		
Hallett	X		X			22.8	4.9	812	22.8	4.9	812	95 994	X			X	X		See Att.		
Hawker	X				X	15.9	2.10	1068	15.9	2.10	1068	43 454		X		X	X		See Att.		
Henley & G.	X		X			25.8	4.9	804	25.8	4.9	804	1 185 132		X		X	X		145		
Hindmarsh	X			X		11.8	21.8	622	11.8	18.9	935	1 047 631		X	X		X		80		
Jamestown DC	X			X		18.8	28.8	742	18.8	28.8	742	158 823	X			X	X		See Att.		2 216
Jamestown CT	X		X			11.8	4.9	808	11.8	4.9	808	84 108		X		X	X		120		33 681
Kadina	X		X			21.7	28.8	742	21.7	28.8	742	367 373	X		X		X		See Att.		47 790
Kanyaka-Quorn	X			X		3.9	18.9	936	3.9	18.9	936	125 004	X			X	X		See Att.		
Kapunda	X			X		20.8	28.8	743	20.8	28.8	743	203 444	X			X	X		See Att.		
Karoonda E.M.	X		X			21.10	30.10	1308	21.10	30.10	1308	209 318		X		X	X		10		
Kensington & N.	X		X			18.8	21.8	620	21.7	14.8	570	1 075 634		X		X	X		90		
Kimba	X			X		9.9	18.9	936	9.9	18.9	936	218 232	X			X	X		See Att.		20 248
Kingscote	X			X		22.9	2.10	1068	22.9	2.10	1068	434 238	X			X	X		See Att.		
Lacepede	X		X			15.9	2.10	1068	15.9	2.10	1068	426 000		X		X	X		90		
Lameroo	X		X			19.8	28.8	744	19.8	28.8	744	237 241		X		X	X		See Att.		10 539
Laura	X			X		22.9	2.10	1069	22.9	2.10	1069	68 241		X		X	X		117		
Le Hunte	X				X	22.9	30.10	1308	20.10	13.11	—	256 161	X			X	X		See Att.	3 779	
Light		X	X			18.8	28.8	744	18.8	28.8	744	423 633		X		X	X		100		
Lincoln		X	X			29.9	30.10	1309	29.9	30.10	1309	567 243	X			X	X		See Att.		
Loxton	X			X		8.8	28.8	744	12.9	18.9	936	441 528	X			X	X		See Att.		31 489
Lucindale	X		X			10.9	18.9	937	10.9	18.9	937	367 377		X		X	X		20		
Mallala	X		X			18.8	28.6	745	18.8	28.8	745	303 230	X			X	X		See Att.		

COUNCILS' ESTIMATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION 1980/81—*continued*

Council	Assessment		Basis of Assessment			Assessment Adoption			Rates				Differential		214a Consent		Minimum Rate			Special Rate Coll.	Separate Rate Coll.
	Govt.	Own	AAV	ULV	Comb.	Date 1980	*G.G.* Date 1980	*G.G.* Page	Date Decl. 1980	*G.G.* Date 1980	*G.G.* Page	Amount Coll.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Amount		
Mannum	X		X			28.7	7.8	516	28.7	7.8	516	297 604		X		X	X		See Att.		
Marion	X			X		11.8	14.8	570	12.8	14.8	570	5 014 409	X			X	X		145		
Meadows	X		X			14.8	28.8	745	14.8	28.8	745	2 120 822		X	X		X		130		
Meningie	X		X			11.11	20.11	1957	11.11	20.11	1958	322 392		X		X	X		See Att.		49 612
Millicent	X		X			16.9	25.9	1001	16.9	25.9	1001	806 001	X			X	X		See Att.		
Minlaton	X				X	11.8	21.8	624	11.8	21.8	624	310 567		X		X	X		See Att.		
Mitcham	X		X			11.8	14.8	571	11.8	14.8	571	3 774 421	X			X	X		100		
Moonta	X			X		26.8	4.9	809	26.8	4.9	808	194 305	X			X	X		138		
Morgan		X	X			11.7	24.7	349	8.8	21.8	624	126 338	X			X	X		See Att.		
Mt. Barker	X		X			25.8	4.9	814	25.8	4.9	814	636 984	X			X	X		90		46 838
Mt. Gambier DC	X		X			4.11	27.11	2015	4.11	27.11	2015	621 883		X		X	X		60		
Mt. Gambier CC	X			X		18.10	25.10	1088	29.8	4.9	804	1 582 400	X		X		X		138		
Mt. Pleasant	X			X		13.8	28.8	747	10.9	18.9	937	218 253	X			X	X		See Att.	6 300	5 355
Mt. Remarkable	X			X		28.10	30.10	1310	28.10	13.11	1911	261 252	X			X	X		See Att.		
Munno Para	X		X			5.8	14.8	573	5.8	14.8	573	2 098 714	X			X	X		140		
Murat Bay		X		X		1.8	4.9	816	1.8	4.9	816	434 708	X			X	X		See Att.		25 780
Murray Bridge	X		X			6.10	6.11	1370	6.10	6.11	1370	1 129 810	X		X		X		See Att.		
Naracoorte DC	X		X			26.8	4.9	816	26.8	4.9	816	526 446		X		X	X		25		
Naracoorte CT	X		X			9.9	25.9	999	11.9	25.9	999	421 786		X		X	X		110		
Noarlunga	X		X			18.8	28.8	737	18.8	28.8	737	4 349 653	X			X	X		130	336 568	
Onkaparinga		X	X			28.7	20.8	574	28.7	20.8	574	419 592		X		X	X		90		9 480
Orroroo	X			X		28.8	11.9	859	23.9	2.10	1069	120 284	X			X	X		See Att.		
Owen	X		X			4.8	21.8	625	4.8	21.8	625	196 904	X			X	X		See Att.		
Paringa	X		X			20.8	28.8	748	20.8	28.8	748	107 412	X			X	X		See Att.	CED 5 610	
Payneham	X		X			21.7	31.7	469	21.7	31.7	469	1 296 252		X		X	X		120		
Peake	X		X			25.8	28.8	748	25.8	28.8	748	126 970		X		X	X		15		
Penola		X	X			20.9	2.10	1070	20.9	2.10	1070	401 056	X			X	X		40	CED 18 558	
Peterborough DC	X			X		12.9	25.9	1002	12.9	25.9	1002	44 176		X		X	X		See Att.		
Peterborough CT		X	X			18.8	28.8	740	25.8	4.9	809	134 975		X		X	X		100		
Pinnaroo	X		X			9.9	25.9	1002	9.9	25.9	1002	184 236	X			X	X		See Att.	15 261	11 582

COUNCILS' ESTIMATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION 1980/81—*continued*

Council	Assessment		Basis of Assessment			Assessment Adoption			Rates				Differential		214a Consent		Minimum Rate			Special Rate Coll.	Separate Rate Coll.
	Govt.	Own	AAV	ULV	Comb.	Date 1980	*G.G.* Date 1980	*G.G.* Page	Date Decl. 1980	*G.G.* Date 1980	*G.G.* Page	Amount Coll.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Amount		
Pirie D.C.		X	X			22.8	28.8	749	22.8	28.8	749	265 650		X		X	X		116		
Pt. Adelaide	X		X			8.9	18.9	934	15.9	16.10	1184	3 341 946	X		X		X		125		
Pt. Augusta	X			X		28.8	11.9	854	28.8	11.9	854	958 240	X		X		X		See Att.	5 553	
Pt. Broughton	X		X			6.8	16.8	425	6.8	16.8	425	184 095		X		X	X		See Att.		
Pt. Elliot & G.	X		X			28.8	4.9	817	28.8	4.9	817	756 032		X		X	X		100		56 713
Pt. Lincoln		X		X		7.7	17.7	275	14.7	24.7	347	844 298		X		X	X		140		6 716
Pt. MacDonnell	X		X			1.9	18.9	938	1.9	18.9	938	272 997	X			X	X		60		
Pt. Pirie	X			X		4.8	14.8	571	15.9	25.9	997	1 046 509	X			X	X		156		
Pt. Wakefield	X		X			2.10	9.10	1143	2.10	9.10	1143	104 864		X		X	X		See Att.		1 086
Prospect	X		X			4.8	7.8	513	4.8	7.8	513	1 512 149		X		X	X		110		
Redhill	X	X			X	12.8	21.8	625	12.8	21.8	625	89 141	X			X	X		See Att.		
	Rl.	Twn																			
Renmark	X			X		22.7	31.7	470	26.8	4.9	809	493 896	X			X	X		70		
Ridley		X	X			25.8	4.9	817	25.8	4.9	818	232 168		X		X	X		See Att.		
Riverton	X		X			28.8	4.9	817	28.8	4.9	818	140 000		X		X	X		See Att.		
Robe	X		X			8.8	28.8	749	8.8	28.8	749	207 169	X			X	X		100		
Robertstown		X	X			15.8	28.8	749	15.8	28.8	750	66 217		X		X	X		40		
Saddleworth & A.	X		X			11.9	25.9	1003	11.9	25.9	1003	178 063		X		X	X		See Att.		6 067
Salisbury	X		X			28.7	14.8	572	28.7	14.8	572	6 104 310		X		X	X		150	5 391	
Snowtown	X		X			17.9	25.9	1003	17.9	25.9	1003	190 458		X		X	X		See Att.		
Spalding	X		X			11.7	11.11	1860	25.8	11.11	1860	93 849	X			X	X		60		
St. Peters	X		X			7.8	14.8	572	7.8	14.8	572	663 798		X		X	X		100		
Stirling	X		X			26.8	4.9	818	26.8	4.9	818	1 044 352		X		X	X		110		
Strathalbyn	X		X			6.10	9.10	1144	6.10	9.10	1143	469 650	X			X	X		See Att.		
Streaky Bay				X		21.11	27.11	2017	24.11	4.12	2103	294 700	X			X	X		See Att.		
Tanunda		X	X			14.7	24.7	353	14.7	24.7	353	281 390		X		X	X		80	2 377	42 470
Tatiara	X		X			12.8	28.8	750	12.8	28.8	750	1 075 162		X		X	X		60	34 224	10 063
Tea Tree Gully	X			X		27.8	4.9	806	27.8	4.9	806	4 900 920		X		X		X			
Thebarton	X		X			27.8	4.9	810	27.8	4.9	810	799 974	X			X	X		120		28 539

COUNCILS' ESTIMATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION 1980/81—*continued*

Council	Assessment		Basis of Assessment			Assessment Adoption			Rates				Differential		214a Consent		Minimum Rate			Special Rate Coll.	Separate Rate Coll.
	Govt.	Own	AAV	ULV	Comb.	Date 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Date Decl. 1980	G.G. Date 1980	G.G. Page	Amount Coll.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Amount		
Truro	X		X			8.9	18.9	939	8.9	18.9	939	101 250	X			X	X		60		
Tumby Bay		X	X			15.8	28.8	750	15.8	28.8	750	349 329	X			X	X		See Att.	2 841	
Unley	X		X			28.7	7.8	513	28.7	7.8	513	3 125 748	X			X		X			3 141
Victor Harbor	X			X		15.8	11.9	860	15.8	11.9	860	893 599		X		X	X		142		
Waikerie		X	X			26.9	9.10	1144	26.9	9.10	1144	399 562	X		X		X		50		18 404
Walkerville	X		X			28.7	7.8	513	28.7	7.8	513	789 821		X		X		X			
Wallaroo		X	X			8.7	17.7	276	4.8	14.8	572	187 593	X			X	X		105		14 686
Warooka	X		X			9.8	26.8	758	8.9	18.9	939	178 073		X		X	X		87		
West Torrens		X		X		15.7	24.7	347	1.8	7.8	513	2 342 378		X		X	X		90		
Whyalla	X			X		28.7	14.8	572	11.8	21.8	620	1 958 531	X			X	X		156		
Willunga	X		X			4.8	28.8	751	4.8	28.8	751	649 582	X			X	X		90		
Woodville		X	X			25.8	4.9	808	25.8	4.9	807	6 310 862	X			X	X		140		
Yankalilla	X		X			12.9	18.9	939	12.9	18.9	939	325 313		X		X	X		82		
Yorketown	X		X			4.8	7.8	517	4.8	7.8	517	308 580		X		X	X		Town 80 Rural 60		
Total												116 445 842	64	63	10	117	122	5		735 243	611 972

ATTACHMENT A
Details of Minimum Rates

Council	Minumum Rate $
Balaklava	
Town	130
Other	75
Beachport	
Beachport	97
Mount Burr	111
Rural	55
Berri	
Townships	100
Other	80
Dry Blocks	20
Blyth	
Blyth	80
Brinkworth	50
Rest	30
Burra Burra	
Burra Burra	100
Mount Bryan, Farrell Flat, Booborowie	85
Rural	60
Bute	
Bute	75
Rural	65
Highways Land	20
Carrieton	
Town	30
Other	15
Central Yorke Peninsula	
Maitland	75
Ardrossan	75
Other	70
Clare	
Town	140
Other	75
Clinton	
Town	50
Other	45
Dudley	
Penneshaw	60
American River	60
Other	45
East Torrens	
Urban	105
Rural	85
Elliston	
Elliston and Lock	84
Venus Bay and Port Kenny	60
Crown Land	4
Other	25
Eudunda	
Town	56
Other	35
Georgetown	
Town	46
Other	25
Gladstone	
Town	110
Other	55
Hallett	
Hallett	30
Whyte, Yarcowie, Terowie	25
Rural	12

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Hawker	
Hawker	80
Craddock	30
(Commercial)	52
(Garbage, Domestic)	12
Jamestown	
Urban	85
Rural	25
Kadina	
Kadina	140
Other Towns	100
Rural	70
Kanyaka Quorn	
Urban	85
Rural	40
Kapunda	
Town	100
Helston Water Area	170
Ebenezer Ward	100
Rest	80
Kimba	
Urban	80
Rural	40
Kingscote	
Kingscote	100
Parndana	80
Rest	60
Lameroo	
Urban	50
Rural	20
Le Hunte	
Wudinna	103
Minnipa	91
Pygery, Yaninee and Kyancutta	79
Warramboo	68
Other	62
Lincoln	
Coffin Bay, Boston, Louth Bay, North-shields, Cummins, Lincoln Ward (rural)	100
Lake Wangarry, Coulta, Wanilla (rural)	70
Edillilie, Mortlock, Shannon, Yeelanna, Mount Hope (rural)	50
Loxton	
Town	110
Town—CED	120
Unoccupied	122
Serviced Block	140
Irrigation	60
West Ward	80
Mallala	
Towns	125
Rural	115
Beaches	100
Mannum	
Mannum Town	110
Rural	82
Meningie	
Urban	115
Rural	68
Millicent	
Central Ward	100
Southend—North Ward	85
Other	45

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Minlaton	
Towns	95
Other	70
Morgan	
Morgan	90
Cadell	75
Mount Mary	27
Florieton	7
Rural	55
Mount Pleasant	
Town	90
Rural	25
Mount Remarkable	
All except	60
Bruce, Hammond, Pinda, Moockra	10
Murat Bay	
Thevenard/Ceduna	100
Smoky Bay and Denial Bay	80
Other	50
Murray Bridge	
Town	125
Outside	105
Orroroo	
Orroroo	127
Other	20
Owen	
Owen, Hamley Bridge	143
Pinery	77
Rest	38
Paringa	
Paringa	110
Lyrup	77
Other	27
Peterborough D.C.	
Yongala	40
Oodlawirra	30
Dawson	25
Broad Acres	10
Pinnaroo	
Town	40
Rural	30
Port Augusta	
Town	158
Stirling North	130
Port Broughton	
Town	95
Holiday Homes	80
Rural	55
Port Wakefield	
Goyder Ward	90
Inkerman	135
Part Town	135
Shack Area	100
Redhill	
Town	45
Rural	35
Ridley	
Town	65
Rural	40
Riverton	
Riverton	110
Tarlee	100
Rest	50

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Robe	
Central Ward	100
Saddleworth and Auburn	
Saddleworth, Auburn, Manoora	85
Marrabel, Waterloo	60
Rural	40
Snowtown	
Snowtown	98
Brinkworth	62
Lochiel	40
Strathalbyn	
Strathalbyn Ward	120
Rest	100
Streaky Bay	
Streaky Bay	145
Wirrula/Poochera	65
Haslam	55
Shack Sites	45
Remainder	20
Flinders/Eyre Wards, Outside Streaky Bay Township	60
Tumby Bay	
Tumby Bay/Port Neill	100
Shacks	60
Rest	40
Owen	
Owen, Hamley Bridge	143
Pinery	77
Rest	38
Paringa	
Paringa	110
Lyrup	77
Other	27
Peterborough D.C.	
Yongala	40
Oodlawirra	30
Dawson	25
Broad Acres	10
Pinnaroo	
Town	40
Rural	30
Port Broughton	95
	80
	85
Port Wakefield	
Goyder Ward	90
Inkerman	135
Part Town	135
Shack Area	100
	110
Redhill	
Town	45
Rural	35
Ridley	
Town	65
Rural	40
Riverton	
Riverton	110
Tarlee	100
Rest	50
Robe	
Central Ward	100

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Saddleworth and Auburn	85
	60
	40
Snowtown	
Snowtown	98
Brinkworth	62
Lochiel	40
Strathalbyn	
Strathalbyn Ward	120
Rest	100
Streaky Bay	
Streaky Bay	145
Wirrula/Poochera	65
Haslam	55
Shack Sites	45
Remainder	20
Flinders/Eyre Wards, Outside Streaky Bay Township	60
Tumby Bay	
Tumby Bay/Port Neill	100
Shacks	60
Rest	40
Kanyaka-Quorn	
Urban	85
Rural	40
Kapunda	
Town	100
Helston Water Area	170
Ebenezer Ward	100
Rest	80
Kimba	
Urban	80
Rural	40
Kingscote	
Kingscote	100
Parndana	80
Rest	60
Lameroo	
Urban	50
Rural	20
Le Hunte	
Wudinna	103
Minnipa	91
Pygery, Yaninee and Kyancutta	79
Warramboo	68
Other	62
Loxton	110
	120
	122
	140
	60
	80
Mallala	
Towns	125
Rural	115
Beaches	100
Mannum	
Mannum Town	110
Rural	82
Meningie	
Urban	115
Rural	68

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Millicent	
Central Ward	100
Southend—North	85
Other	45
Minlaton	95
	70
Morgan	
Morgan	90
Cadell	75
Mount Mary	27
Floreton	7
Rival	55
Mount Remarkable	60
	10
Murat Bay	
Thevenard/Ceduna	100
Smoky Bay and Denial Bay	80
Other	50
Murray Bridge	125
	105
Orroroo	
Orroroo	127
Other	20
Balaklava	
Town	130
Other	75
Beachport	
Beachport	97
Mount Burr	111
Rural	55
Berri	100
	80
	20
Blyth	
Blyth	80
Brinkworth	50
Rest	30
Burra Burra	100
	85
	60
Bute	75
	65
	20
Carrieton	
Town	30
	15
Central Yorke Peninsula	
Maitland	75
Ardrossan	75
Other	70
Clare	
Town	140
Other	75
Dudley	
Penneshaw	60
American River	60
Other	45
Elliston	
Elliston and Lock	84
Venus Bay	60
Crown Land	4
Other	25

ATTACHMENT A—*continued*
Details of Minimum Rates—*continued*

Council	Minumum Rate $
Eudunda	35
	56
Georgetown	
Town	46
Other	25
Gladstone	
Town	110
Other	55
Hallett	
Hallett	30
Whyte, Yarcowie	25
Rural	12
Hawker	
Hawker	80
Craddock	30
(Commercial)	52
(Hawker Garbage, Domestic)	12
Jamestown D.C.	
Urban	85
Rural	25
Kadina	
Kadina	140
Other Towns	100
Rural	70

CHAPTER 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region and Local Council	Population at 30.6.79
Northern Metropolitan Region—	
Elizabeth City Council	34 300
Gawler Town Council	6 300
Munno Para District Council	26 200
Salisbury City Council	83 800
Tea Tree Gully City Council	63 300
	213 900
Western Metropolitan Region—	
Glenelg City Council	14 000
Henley and Grange City Council	16 300
Hindmarsh Town Council	8 200
Port Adelaide City Council	36 400
Thebarton Town Council	9 700
West Torrens City Council	46 100
Woodville City Council	76 600
	207 300
Metropolitan Central Region—	
Adelaide City Council	13 400
Enfield City Council	70 200
Mitcham City Council	59 500
Prospect City Council	18 600
Stirling District Council	12 900
Unley City Council	35 700
Walkerville Town Council	7 000
	217 300
Metropolitan Eastern Region—	
Burnside City Council	37 800
Campbelltown City Council	42 300
East Torrens District Council	5 200
Kensington and Norwood City Council	9 400
Payneham City Council	17 100
St. Peters Town Council	8 900
	120 700
Southern Metropolitan Region—	
Brighton City Council	20 700
Marion City Council	69 700
Meadows District Council	21 150
Noarlunga City Council	57 700
Willunga District Council	6 800
	176 050
Eyre Peninsula Region—	
Cleve District Council	2 900
Elliston District Council	1 400
Franklin Harbour District Council	1 250
Kimba District Council	1 850
Le Hunte District Council	2 200
Lincoln District Council	4 850
Murat Bay District Council	3 800
Port Lincoln City Council	10 250
Streaky Bay District Council	2 450
Tumby Bay District Council	2 850
	33 800
Yorke Peninsula Region—	
Bute District Council	1 200
Central Yorke Peninsula District Council	4 150
Clinton District Council	1 150
Kadina District Council	4 650
Minlaton District Council	2 450
Moonta Town Council	1 650
Port Broughton District Council	1 350
Wallaroo Town Council	2 050
Warooka District Council	1 050
Yorketown District Council	2 800
	22 500
Northern Region—	
Carrieton District Council	200
Crystal Brook District Council	1 850
Georgetown District Council	800
Gladstone District Council	1 050
Hallett District Council	800
Hawker District Council	650
Jamestown District Council	1 050
Jamestown Town Council	1 300
Kanyaka-Quorn District Council	2 450
Laura District Council	750
Mount Remarkable District Council	3 800
Orroroo District Council	1 050
Outback Areas Community Development Trust	11 538
Peterborough District Council	400
Peterborough Town Council	2 750
Pirie District Council	4 600
Port Augusta City Council	14 400
Port Pirie City Council	12 150

Region and Local Council	Population at 30.6.79
Northern Region—*continued*	
Redhill District Council	500
Spalding District Council	550
Whyalla City Council	31 000
	93 638
Mid-North Region—	
Angaston District Council	6 250
Balaklava District Council	2 000
Barossa District Council	3 200
Blyth District Council	800
Burra Burra District Council	2 250
Clare District Council	3 650
Eudunda District Council	1 400
Light District Council	4 700
Kapunda District Council	2 500
Mallala District Council	3 400
Owen District Council	1 250
Port Wakefield District Council	1 000
Riverton District Council	1 400
Robertstown District Council	750
Saddleworth and Auburn District Council	2 050
Snowtown District Council	1 450
Tanunda District Council	3 000
Truro District Council	600
	41 650
Southern Hills and Kangaroo Island Region—	
Dudley District Council	600
Gumeracha District Council	4 100
Kingscote District Council	2 900
Mount Barker District Council	8 700
Mount Pleasant District Council	1 600
Onkaparinga District Council	6 150
Port Elliot and Goolwa District Council	4 450
Strathalbyn District Council	4 050
Victor Harbor District Council	6 300
Yankalilla District Council	2 900
	41 750
Murray Lands Region—	
Brown's Well District Council	400
Coonalpyn Downs District Council	1 850
Karoonda-East Murray District Council	1 800
Lameroo District Council	1 700
Mannum District Council	3 050
Meningie District Council	4 400
Monarto Development Commission	250
Murray Bridge District Council	13 350
Peake District Council	950
Pinnaroo District Council	1 500
Ridley District Council	1 900
	31 150
Riverland Region—	
Barmera District Council	4 050
Berri District Council	6 050
Loxton District Council	6 550
Morgan District Council	1 250
Paringa District Council	1 400
Renmark Town Council	6 400
Waikerie District Council	4 650
	30 350
South-East Region—	
Beachport District Council	1 800
Lacepede District Council	2 350
Lucindale District Council	1 500
Millicent District Council	8 350
Mount Gambier City Council	18 950
Mount Gambier District Council	6 250
Naracoorte District Council	2 100
Naracoorte Town Council	4 800
Penola District Council	3 900
Port MacDonnell District Council	2 300
Robe District Council	1 100
Tatiara District Council	6 950
	60 350
Total	1 290 438

CATARACT OPERATIONS

1196. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the present delay in admission to each of the Health Commission hospitals within the metropolitan area for operations for the removal of cataracts?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The reply is as follows:

Royal Adelaide Hospital—Up to three months
Queen Elizabeth Hospital—Up to two months
Flinders Medical Centre—Four to six weeks

Eye operations are not performed at Modbury Hospital.

STRATHMONT CENTRE FIRES

1199. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the minister of Health:

1. What caused the recent fires at the Strathmont Centre?
2. Who was responsible for lighting the fires?
3. How many persons were endangered by the fires?
4. How much will it cost to repair the damage?

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

1. Although it has not yet been conclusively determined, it is strongly suspected that two of the fires in adjoining villas were deliberately lit.

Evidence suggests that the third fire which occurred outside the Industrial Therapy Building was accidentally lit.

2. Not known at this stage.
3. None.
4. Approximately $60 000.

STRATHMONT CENTRE SECURITY

1200. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Following the outbreak of fires at the Strathmont Centre, has the Minister taken any steps to upgrade security at the Centre and, if so, what is the nature of the security arrangements and will they be carried out by Government employees or private enterprise?
2. Will the Minister install boom-gates and a watch house at the vehicular access points to control entry to and egress from the premises?

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

1. Yes.

The services of a security firm have been engaged and four random patrols are being undertaken each night between the hours of 8.00 p.m. and 6.00 a.m., as well as personally checking each unoccupied building. In addition, police patrols from the Holden Hill Police Station are patrolling the Centre on numerous occasions each night.

2. Consideration has been given to the installation of boom gates at the vehicular access points on a number of occasions. These would only be effective if implemented as part of a total plan designed to ensure perimeter security and due to the location of the Centre this would necessitate enclosure of Hillcrest Hospital as well. This proposal has been rejected on the grounds that it would create a false impression of Strathmont Centre as a closed or security institution and by implication, foster an unfortunate public image of Mentally Handicapped persons. The Government is concerned for the safety of both residents and staff at the Centre and in addition to the steps already instituted, urgent consideration is being given to the introduction of a staff identification system and to ways and means by which staff can contribute towards increasing safety measures.

ENVIRONMENT OFFICERS

1207. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the 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. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1, 2 and 3. There are no consultants contracting to the Department for the Environment that fall within the question the honourable member has raised.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

1213. **Mr O'NEILL:** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the control of the Minister of Local Government 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. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICERS

1214. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the control of the Attorney-General 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. H. ALLISON: There are no retired officers of departments under the control of the Attorney-General contracting in a private enterprise capacity.

However, it is pointed out that there are retired personnel (magistrates, clerks and reporters) who provide a casual service if required and the former Director-General is Acting Coroner on an hourly basis.

O'BAHN

1219. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it a fact that $39 million will be spent on the proposed O'Bahn busway to Tea Tree Plaza?

2. Will the Minister explain the reasons why this project will not be subject to a Public Works Committee inquiry?

3. Is it a fact that the construction of a railway normally requires a special Act of Parliament and, if so, why is this not necessary for the building of a roadway?

4. Is the Government intending to avoid a special Act by initially building the busway as a roadway and then subsequently dedicating the completed roadway as a private access road and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

5. Does the Minister support the view that a restricted road for buses only is not the equivalent of a railway and therefore should not be subject to a similar Parliamentary procedure before approval is given to commence construction and, if so, why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. A proposal to improve transport in the Modbury Transportation Corridor has been approved in various forms by successive governments since 1968.

3., 4. and 5. The Northeast O'Bahn Busway is a successor to the tramway formerly proposed for the corridor and is similar to a tramway in many of its characteristics. Hence no special legislation is necessary.

LINK COURSES

1224. **Mr. TRAINER:** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What are the current and projected numbers of students undertaking Department of Further Education Link courses at Kilkenny College and what is the cost of these programmes?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are no Link courses (that is, courses for secondary school students) currently being offered at, or planned for, what was formerly known as Kilkenny Technical College. However, parts of the formerly used electrical workshops are being converted for use as metal fabrication and welding workshops as part of the transition programme for unemployed youth. These workshops and associated classrooms have become an annexe of Regency Park Community College, which is administering part of the State and Federal-funded pre-vocational (metal-trade), pre-vocational (electrical trade) and foundation course programmes. It is expected that the workshops will cater for 60 full-time students in metal fabrication and welding in the second half of 1981.

JAPANESE LANGUAGE

1225. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many students were enrolled for matriculation Japanese at Christies Beach High School at the start of the 1981 school year, why was the teacher of this subject suddenly transferred to another school and what alternatives were made available to students affected by this transfer?

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

(a) None.

(b) The teacher of Japanese was transferred because after the first week of school for 1981 enrolments at Christies Beach High School were 44 below the number estimated at the end of 1980. This, according to the staffing formula used indicated, that the school was approximately three teachers over allocation. After considering the need of other schools in the Central Southern Region, together with the needs of the Christies Beach High School, the Principal of the school was advised that the staff would be reduced by the equivalent of 1·4 teachers by voluntary transfer, voluntary reduction in time or by relocation according to the accepted procedures. The school, after considering the options, nominated the Japanese teacher for relocation and also the reduction in time for English staff.

(c) One year 11 student, 12 year 10 students and 13 year 9 students would have continued to study Japanese and most year 8 students would have been given a limited exposure course in Japanese. Japanese is available at Daws Road High School, which will accept any students from Christies Beach who wish to continue courses already started, and transport is available from Christies Beach to Daws Road High School.

BIRDWOOD MUSEUM

1231. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the size of the present staff of the Birdwood Mill Museum and what are their duties?

2. What major collections are held by the museum and what investigations have been conducted into the deterioration of exhibits and by whom?

3. How is the museum currently administered, when did it come under the control of the Department of the Minister of Arts and what Government funding does it receive?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Ten permanent full-time employees, three casual employees and two permanent part-time employees. These employees are engaged in the management, clerical, maintenance, cleaning and food preparation and service work at the Birdwood Mill Museum.

2. The major collection at the museum comprises a large collection of historic motor vehicles, some of which are owned by the museum and some of which are owned by private individuals. The remainder of the collection comprises a very broad range of "folk" artefacts. The curation of the museum's exhibits is one of the aspects investigated by Mr. R. Edwards during the preparation of his report.

3. The museum is currently administered by the Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietry Limited board and assistance towards operating costs of the museum is provided through the Minister of Arts and the South Australian Development Corporation. The Birdwood Mill received $35 000 towards its 1979-80 operating costs in November 1980. Cabinet has approved $85 000 towards costs of capital projects, together with provision of a $50 000 overdraft towards operating costs for the 1980-81 period. These amounts have been provided at the request of the Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietry Limited to enable it to complete necessary capital works and to provide operating capital for the remainder of the current financial period.

NOARLUNGA LIBRARY

1235. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. When will the Noarlunga Library be relocated from the old Morphett Vale Primary School to the Noarlunga Community College?

2. To which local organisation will the vacant floor space so produced be allocated?

3. What plans, if any, has the Government for the future use of this school property?

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

1. It is expected that the Noarlunga Community College will be ready for occupation in January 1982 and at that time the Noarlunga library will be transferred from the old Morphett Vale School.

2. As vacant floor space will not become available until 1982 the question of occupancy by other local organisations has not been considered. There is, however, a management committee, which keeps the operations at the old school under review and which would make recommendations on occupancy at the appropriate time.

3. The property is occupied by the Noarlunga District Library and the Karuna Community Centre, which provides a number of services. While there are no firm plans for the future of the property, it is possible that some of the Karuna activities will continue and that the Central Southern Regional Project Team will occupy some rooms. It is also likely that some rooms will be used for educational activities associated with the adjacent pioneer village.

WOOD CHIPS

1242. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Did the Minister receive a report on discussions held between Mr. L. N. Dalmia of Punalur Paper Mills and Mr. P. N. South, Director of Woods and Forests, in Kuching on 4 February 1980 and, if so—

(a) did that report say in part: "If chip becomes available and he (L. N. Dalmia) cannot take it immediately for reasons of shipping, for example or unloading facilities, it is agreed that 'spot sales' to other customers will be made"; and

(b) does the last paragraph of the report say: "Needless to say, Mr. Dalmia will not have a copy of this report. I am confirming with him the vital points of our discussion and will despatch a copy of my letter to him when it is available. Actually, I will write it tonight"?

2. Did the Director of Woods and Forests in confirming with Mr. Dalmia the "vital points" of the discussions in Kuching include in his agreement that "spot sales" to other customers could be made and, if not, why not?

3. Did the Minister inform the Premier that the Director of Woods and Forests had agreed to "spot sales" to other customers if shipping or unloading facilities were unavailable and, if so, when did the Minister inform the Premier of this agreement?

4. Does the Minister consider that the discussions in Kuching on 4 February 1980 were "in breach of Indian law" or "in breach of an international situation"?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
   (a) Yes, the honourable member is referred to a reply given by the Attorney-General in the Legislative Council on 24 February 1981 that explains the circumstances under which spot sales were to be made.
   (b) Yes.

2. Copies of he Director's confirmation of vital points with Mr. Dalmia are not available. However, the question is irrelevant in view of the explanation given in regard to "spot sales" and the fact that Mr. Dalmia did not return to India between leaving Kuching and arriving in Australia on 18 February.

3. This was quite unnecessary, as it was an arrangement of longstanding and would not have been applicable until Punwood Pty. Ltd. (60 per cent owned by SATCO) had established chip export facilities at Portland.

4. No.

1244. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Did Mr. Tony Cole, Assistant Director, Woods and Forests Department, communicate with "a senior managing director" of Marubeni on the instructions of the Director of Woods and Forests during the period 27 February to 5 March 1980?

2. Did Mr. Cole report any communication between himself and the senior managing director of Marubeni to the Minister?

3. Did Mr. Cole report that he failed to contact the senior managing director of Marubeni during that period?

4. Is the Minister aware that Marubeni officials in Western Australia have denied that a senior managing director of the company was in Australia at that time?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

4. It was mentioned in the *National Times* 8-14 February, page 14, but the Minister had no cause to follow that statement up; it is quite irrelevant.