

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 15 October 1981

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Acting Chairman:
Mr J. W. Olsen

Members:

Mr R. K. Abbott
Mr H. Becker
Dr B. Billard
Mr G. J. Crafter
Mr R. E. Glazbrook
Mr J. Mathwin
The Hon. R. G. Payne
Mr K. H. Plunkett

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Community Welfare, \$28 472 000

Witness:

The Hon. J. C. Burdett, Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr I. S. Cox, Director-General, Department for Community Welfare.

Mr C. E. M. Harris, Deputy Director-General, Department for Community Welfare.

Mr W. H. Beattie, Director, Resource Services Division, Department for Community Welfare.

Mr G. R. Billett, Senior Finance Office, Department for Community Welfare.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. During answers to questions, the Minister may state that he will obtain information at a later date for the Committee and, in that instance, I ask that the material be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*.

Mr ABBOTT: It is extremely disappointing that, at a time when thousands of individuals and families are suffering hardship and insecurity because of lack of income and employment, we see a cut in real terms to the Department for Community Welfare. With the growing demand for help from people who are battling below the poverty line against rising levels of unemployment and persistent inflation, the Government has demonstrated its financial inability to adequately assist the disadvantaged and the poor. The majority of families were ignored in the Federal Budget, but the cost of living continues to rise, and with the increases in the cost of health cover, sales tax and the many State Government charges, more families will be forced further and further below the poverty line. As a consequence, I have very grave doubts whether the department's allocation of \$28 500 000 will enable it to maintain existing services. Expansion of welfare services cannot take place and the growing demand for assistance will not be met in these circumstances.

On our calculations, the Department for Community Welfare in 1980-81 actually spent \$28 834 000, and an allocation of \$28 472 000 is proposed for 1981-82. If we deduct from that amount the line 'Income support maintenance', on page 93, which involves \$2 373 000 in actual payments for 1980-81, and the sum proposed for 1981-82 of \$472 000, we see that in 1980-81 actual payments were

\$26 461 000, and the sum proposed for 1981-82 is \$28 000 000. The increase in the monetary allowance is 5.8 per cent, and the increase in round sum allowance is 5.8 per cent, making a total of 11.6 per cent. The official estimate of cost increases in the Budget is 12 per cent. Therefore, the Department for Community Welfare is facing a cut in real terms of .4 per cent. A revised unofficial Treasury estimate is that costs will increase by 13 per cent. This would imply a cut in real terms of 1.4 per cent. Perhaps the Minister would like to express his view of the overall Budget proposals and what he believes as the way out of the present gloomy situation.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would like to comment on the general position in regard to the budget for the Department for Community Welfare. There has been no secret that both the Federal and State Governments have found this year a time of budgetary restraint, and of maintaining a standfast Budget. A study of the total figures related to the Budget, as reflected in the Estimates papers, does not give any satisfactory view of the economies that have been made this year—and economies have been made. This is related to the large number of small increases and decreases that are related more to management decisions than to Treasury instructions.

The essential figures that need to be kept in mind in relation to the Budget are that 4 per cent has been allowed on items titled 'Contingencies', but this has not been given to the rates paid for children, either in foster care, private care or intensive neighbourhood care. These have always also been subject to appropriate Cabinet submissions, and this situation, I believe, will remain: where increases are required in that area, we can apply to Cabinet for an appropriate increase. It has been traditional that these increases are not included in the Budget but are applied for to Cabinet from time to time.

In regard to salary increases, of course, it is well known, and it has been made public, that these are not allowed for in the departmental budgets, but will come from Treasury as they occur and an amount of \$78 000 000 has been allowed for salary increases, and \$17 500 000 for increased prices. The salary figure is calculated on an average staff position to be maintained throughout the year. Obviously the average will have highs and lows, depending on the vacancies at the time, but there is an assumption that this average salary figure equals the salary allowance made in the Budget. Any further award changes, as I said, will be obtained from Treasury.

The significant restraints in the Budget are, first, in regard to contingencies. The 4 per cent may not equal some of the cost increases, particularly in the food items for institutions. This means a very careful use of the money that has been allocated for contingencies throughout the department. The department must lose—and these were the increases related to what the member for Spence said—\$375 000. The decision which the department has made is for \$37 600 to be deducted from contingencies and \$337 400 to be deducted from salaries.

The policy relating to staff reductions has been made to ensure that direct service delivery to the community—and that is what the honourable member was talking about—is not affected, and that executive, consultant and administrative positions should be used to cater for the changes. So that is the basic thing that I must say in regard to the real and sincere concerns expressed by the member for Spence: we do not anticipate that the delivery of welfare services to the community will be reduced, and we have absorbed the constraints elsewhere.

The contingency cuts are related to items which may be able to be altered as far as the process is concerned, for example, postage, private motor vehicle reimbursement,

publicity, staff development, or is related to an alteration of use of residential care homes, such as the Central/Northern Group Home, Largs Bay Family Home and Central/Western Group Home. The effects of these changes mean curtailment of some departmental activities, but it is considered that their absorption will not affect the department's services.

I think, in view of the real concern expressed by the member for Spence, that it is worth mentioning in detail our strategy to cope with the situation. The department, as I have said, has had to reduce spending by \$375 000, and this means that we will have to cut staffing in all over the year by 25. Since the department's major expenditure is on salaries (71.6 per cent), and contingencies provide little room for movement, the major part of the economies will be achieved through the salaries vote. The objective of the strategy is to achieve the economies required while maintaining an effective level of service not below that provided in previous years. All programmes and activities were reviewed, particularly those support functions where there has been a change in emphasis or a down-turn in work volume.

I think it is fair to the Committee to say exactly what we will do. The areas identified for reduction were: staff development, student supervisors, a reduction of four; in the executive, a reduction of two; regional youth workers, a reduction of three; family maintenance, a reduction of four—and that, of course, is partly reflected in what the honourable member said earlier, namely, that we do not have any responsibility any more for income support for supporting parents.

Residential care has been reduced by 2½; the Glandore unit, 3½; Lochiel Park, three; the Seaford unit, one; personnel, one; and community and planning services, one. There has not been a reduction in the number of field staff available to service the community; in fact, staff has been maintained at a high level.

Contingencies have been reduced in the following areas: Central/Northern Group Home closure \$3 000, postage \$7 000, publicity \$5 000, Largs Bay Family Home \$600, Central/Western Group Home \$3 000, staff development \$4 000, private motor vehicle reimbursement \$15 000, making a total of \$37 600.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: For the guidance of the Committee, and to facilitate matters, I think we should follow through the general categories that are listed in the Budget papers on pages 93, 94 and 95.

Mr ABBOTT: I refer particularly to the Director-General's office, referred to on page 93: it is noted that a cut of almost \$60 000 is proposed in the Director-General's office, and the overall amount proposed for the administration of the Department for Community Welfare has also been cut, and considerable staff cuts have been made in the areas of social workers and staff development, as the Minister has outlined. Can the Minister say why these two positions have gone from the Director-General's office?

The Hon J. C. Burdett: I think I have already outlined that. I have made it clear (there is no secret about this, and there is no point in trying to ignore the fact) that there have been restraints and that some reductions have had to be made. I have indicated where the reductions have been made. I have indicated in regard to the office of the Director-General that one place has been lost. Previously there were a Director-General, a Deputy Director-General and an Assistant Director-General. When the Deputy Director-General (Gordon Bruff) resigned on about 30 June, Mr Mac Harris became the Deputy Director-General. He was formerly the Assistant Director-General and that position has not been replaced.

We have also lost one position at the Director level. Without in any way suggesting that there was anything improper with the management of the department before, I have certainly found since Mr Bruff retired (and whose services I appreciated very much) that now that we have only two at Director-General level I am in practice being served quite effectively and the department is being served quite effectively. At least in the short term—because these Budget restraints will not be with us forever—I am quite satisfied that losing one of the three at Director-General level will not adversely affect the department. This is especially, I think, because of the effective way that the three former officers (Mr Cox, Mr Bruff and Mr Harris) were able to train their support staff and the Director so well that I have found that the services can be maintained.

I have found that when some Directors have had to stand in at Director-General level their training has been so good that they have been able to provide the service to me and, more importantly, to the department. It is clear, as I have said, that in a time of financial restraint reductions must be made somewhere, and it seems to me that making reductions in these areas will not adversely affect, at least in the short term, the delivery of welfare services to the public, which is what we are all about. I ask Mr Harris to now deal with the area of staff development.

Mr Harris: As a consequence of the necessary Budget restraints it is proposed to centralise, to some extent, the functions of the Staff Development Branch and thereby reduce the number of staff development officers by two positions, that is, from seven to five, and to merge the student unit supervisors section with the staff development branch, which will result in a reduction in the number of student unit supervisors from four to two. I do not believe that the centralising of the functions of the branch will interfere with the general decentralised location of three officers who will be located within regions. A staff development officer will continue to be based in the northern country and to operate for the southern country region separately. In addition, one of the two remaining student unit supervisors will be responsible for the supervision of students from the Institute of Technology and also from Flinders University social work courses, principally. One of those people will be located in the northern country office to be concerned with the continuation of the external studies programme, which is vital to the department in that area, and, also, to service the Whyalla campus of the Institute of Technology.

The other student unit supervisor will be located in the metropolitan area and will organise work through the student placements in that area. The other staff development officers in the metropolitan area will have responsibility for specific regions and will include within that residential care centres and the central office. They will have responsibility for special interest areas which are important to servicing the general functions of the department, including volunteer training and the general support for community groups. Where necessary, they will have some additional responsibilities for student unit supervision or supervision of students coming from the two major training tertiary institutions. That function, as far as the staff development officers are concerned, will relate principally to the group programme, the supervision of seminars and that type of component. I think, with those arrangements, that while it is a reduction we will be able to provide a service which will be of a high standard and will maintain the general staff development function, including within that the servicing of students from the tertiary institutions and also those community organisations that we work closely with, either in the provision and support of volunteers or in support of their voluntary service to the community in general.

Mr ABBOTT: I think we need only look through the Programme Estimates to see the detailed information of the areas where staff numbers have fallen in full-time employment levels, and they occur in many programmes. Social worker appointments have dropped considerably and other staff cuts have been made in social work services, health care, support for the family, residential care, work with children, youth schemes, Aboriginal welfare, family day care, and so on. Families are extremely vulnerable in the present economic climate. If it is the Government's desire to restore family relationships, family support programmes and family counselling must be maintained. I would like to know whether these staff cuts will jeopardise family counselling, particularly out in the field. With so many of these staff cuts, perhaps the Minister will say how the department intends to maintain the delivery of welfare services out in the field.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do not really understand what the honourable member is saying. He is talking about staff cuts, as he said, in residential care, family day care and so on. There are none. I have indicated that there will be a reduction of staff of 25, and I have already said where the reductions will be, and they are not in those areas. I do not propose to read them again as I think that would be wasting the time of the Committee. I have made perfectly clear, and I read out, every area where the staff will be cut by 25, and that is the cut. None of the cuts are in the areas referred to by the honourable member. The cuts were in the administrative, co-ordinating, and consultative areas, and I have said what they were.

I have also said, and I repeat, that we believe that at least in the short term those cuts will not result in any cut in services to the public, in any cut in delivery of welfare services to the people in the field, the people who are in need of welfare, and that is our concern. Of course, we recognise that there must be good administration and research, at least in the long term, but these are things that may be held for the time being. I have listed in detail where the reductions in staff are. If the honourable member wants me to read them again I shall do so. I have said where reductions in staff are, and they are not in the areas he is talking about.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On page 3 of the programme performance document that we have received for the Minister's department, when referring to the programme for social work services in health care it can be seen that there is to be a reduction from 21 to 14 average full-time equivalents. The facility applies in all the department's regions, except northern/country, and I think it does not apply there because there are not too many general practitioners available in the northern/country region. We see also that four out of the five regions show a decrease in expenditure, and one shows a small increase of some 4 per cent to 5 per cent, which would certainly be less than the likely inflationary component of that expenditure and the rise that occurs from year to year.

So a reduction in the direct service is certainly indicated in the information we have been given in both Parliamentary Paper No. 9 and in the programme performance budget documents. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten me as to where our thinking on this matter is wrong.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes, I can certainly do that. The main explanation is a transfer from one area to another. In April 1981 seven health workers funded under the community health programme and employed in community health centres transferred to the South Australian Health Commission. The remaining 14 health care workers attached to district offices remained under the control of the department. The reason for this transfer was to co-ordinate and centralise all the operations of community health centres

under one authority. The savings reflected in this department's estimates, for both 1980-81 and 1981-82 are merely a transfer of funds between the relevant departments. So, there has simply been a transfer of people in the area from D.C.W. to health and there is not any cut in the service.

In addition to the overall reductions, there was also the effect of staff changes between regions. The need for health care workers in this region is continually assessed to ensure that staff are placed in the areas of greatest need. Until 30 June 1981, this programme was funded on a 50-50 basis with the Commonwealth under the community health programme. We can summarise what I have said regarding the regions, but the basic answer to the member is that there is not any cut in delivery of services to the public but there has been a transfer from one department to the other department. In regard to the other matters of detail that the member has mentioned, I ask the Director-General, (Mr Cox) to continue with this explanation.

Mr Cox: Could I have the detail of the question again?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The question was in relation to the statement made by the Minister (and I will quote him accurately: I wrote down what he said so that I could do that) that the direct delivery of service to the community is not affected. Members of the Committee have the programme performance budget document and Parliamentary Paper No. 9, but we have not a blue book with annotated explanations in it that the Minister has. The explanation that the Minister has given that service is not to be affected because some are paid under health and some are paid under community welfare is welcomed by us as indicating that at least in that area the service is not going to suffer. Apparently it is not going to get an increase, either, so one needs to take that point into account and I will develop that matter afterwards.

However, in fairness to Mr Cox, the question was, in effect, that where we showed 21 full-time equivalent persons and we are told that only 14 are to be provided this year, one may be forgiven for asking how we are to know the other bits and pieces of information that we have been supplied with, and it may be that a note in the explanatory documents would have prevented the need for the question. Is that a fair question?

Mr Cox: I think the answer that the Minister has given in relation to transfer to the seven health centres does explain the situation. That may not have come out in the papers but that is not a reduction of services in terms of the general practitioner. The same level of service is being maintained.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am certainly prepared now to accept the information that there is to be no reduction. There is to be no increase. As I have shown by referring to Parliamentary Paper No. 9, four of the five regions are having less funds made available and one has a small increase that would not keep pace with inflation. Irrespective of who pays the salaries of some of the people involved, if there were 21 involved last year and there are 21 involved in the coming year, I wonder how it can be estimated for the full 12 months that the service will not suffer when 21 presumably were fully employed last year and it is proposed to deliver that service again for a full year without any increase in the number of persons.

It could be argued that it is difficult to estimate the need for a given year, but it seems to me that part of the work involved, if one reads the programme documents, is in a fairly *quasi* type area, where social work and health advice to the persons who receive the service through their general practitioner tend to overlap. I think the Minister would agree that it is unlikely that the need in the community will decrease. It seems to me that the likelihood (and that is probably all we can argue on: none of us has a crystal

ball and can say with certainty what will happen) is that the need will increase.

Services to the community are such that there is a period during which, when a given service is introduced, the public at large need to perceive that a service is available to them. They have the need but whether they know that they can get assistance in any programme takes a finite time. Assume that finite time in the case of social work services through the local general practitioner, and I think it can be argued successfully that that is a wellknown and recognised service in the community. My experience is that it is highly unlikely that the demand and need will suddenly reduce from one year to the next, and I would like an assurance from the Minister that, if the 21 persons provided are insufficient to continue the direct service delivery to the community so that is not affected, that matter will be kept under observation and, if necessary, a further provision will be sought.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I thank the member for acknowledging that he accepts the explanation that the service in total between the two departments will not be reduced. He also makes the point that the service will not be increased. I acknowledge that and I think I have said several times that there is no secret that this is a tight Budget and a Budget in which in most areas services in all departments will not be increased.

The member has also referred to the fine line between health and welfare. I have always been saying that the three human service departments, as I term them (and there may be others or aspects of other departments that would qualify for the same description) of education, health and welfare require a very great degree of co-operation and that has always happened under this Government, and I believe it probably happened under the previous Government. There is no cut-off line. We have to acknowledge that there will be some areas where there are shades of grey and one is not quite sure which department is responsible and one has to cater for that. That, I believe, is a good thing. In the United States before about two years ago, when that country had a certain monolith in education, health and welfare in the one department, it was bigger than the Government, and that was totally undesirable.

I think it is better to have the three departments and to have to insist on co-operation between the departments and to acknowledge there will be some areas where it is not known which department ought to be responsible, but in co-operation the matter in question can be properly addressed. The member has acknowledged that it is difficult to know. In fact, I think this was the main point of what he said. I think I said that demand is not likely to reduce. It has not increased. The provision has not reduced, as he has acknowledged, and how do you assess and know? You do not know.

You have to make the best assessment you can, and I think the Government has done that, in a stand-fast Budget, in maintaining this area at the same level as it was at before. I think the member asked for an assurance that he would observe the matter, keep it under observation as to whether the need was being adequately satisfied and to consider some further provision if it became clear that it was not adequately satisfied. I can assure the member and the Committee that this is an area of service that the department and I have always considered to be very important.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Particularly in the country.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes, it has become quite clear, and it is accepted, that this is a most necessary and vital service that should not be cut, and, indeed, it has not been cut. I can give the assurance that the department and I will keep that area under observation, as I was asked to do,

and certainly, if I find that the need is not being met, I will make an application for further funding.

Mr ABBOTT: I would like to clarify for the Minister, as the member for Mitchell has pointed out, that we rely on the information provided in the Programme Estimates. The Minister said that there were no staff cuts in any of the areas that I mentioned. However, in the Programme Estimates (page 4 of the detailed information), the employment level for 1980-81 for the individual and family support programme was 138; the proposed staff level for 1981-82 is 126. Similarly (page 11), the staff level for social worker appointments for young offenders and children at risk was 83 in 1980-81 and is now to be 78 in 1981-82. The total staff for that programme for the current year is 284 as against 291 in the previous year. They were the figures to which I referred. Perhaps I did not include all of the figures, but they were some of the figures. I do not know whether there have been transfers from those areas that I mentioned, but that is the information on which we were relying.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: When I answered the question asked by the member for Spence earlier, I referred to the actual positions that are to be lost, and there are 25 of them. I listed what they were. None of those positions were in those areas. The programme performance budget papers can become very difficult when one comes to the programmes and sub-programmes. I believe that this exercise is useful and necessary, but in regard to a highly decentralised department such as the Department for Community Welfare (and the member for Spence and the member for Mitchell will know that the decentralisation programme was rightly initiated under the previous Government and has been maintained under this Government), all of the activities of the department are undertaken in the various district offices, such as emergency, financial assistance, foster care, young offenders, adoptions, and so on. It can become very artificial when one applies to a decentralised department such as this department the programme performance budget system, especially when one considers sub-programmes, because it may be found that in a district office .2 of a full-time equivalent is being used in one area. The system involves the addition of those equivalents in about 50 points of delivery. I have mentioned the actual positions that are being reduced. In regard to detailed matters—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can we have a copy of that? It might save some useless questioning from both sides. It is not easy to remember 25 positions.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I want the Committee to be fully informed. I will undertake, during the luncheon break, to provide to all members of the Committee a list of what I read out of the positions to be reduced. In the meantime, I will ask the Director-General to give a detailed answer to the matters raised by the honourable member.

Mr Cox: In relation to the first issue that was raised, a reduction of staff of one for family support, I point out that the family support programme is funded by the Federal Government. The person who is doing the evaluation was put on a contract. That is the person who has been lost from the programme. This is a Commonwealth position. Regarding young offenders, the apportionment of social work time has been a problem in regard to programme performance budgeting, and, as honourable members could well imagine, we have had a survey of how people spend their time and we have apportioned the time according to a formula. The figures being compared are not accurate in terms of apportionment of social work time.

I believe that the issue relates to the overall reduction in the basic field staff. To clarify that, I point out that certain factors must be taken into account. The first is that, because

of the employment situation, social workers are staying longer and are not leaving their jobs. Overall, the positions have been better filled than they have ever been in the history of the department, because more social workers have been available. In March, there was an increase in basic staff, over any other time in the history of the department, of four, so that in real terms the department has been better staffed as at March. When I last checked two weeks ago with my regional directors, that was still the position, because vacancies are not occurring at the same rate. Generally, we are keeping a higher level of staff. In the direct field service of the department, these papers contain minuses and pluses, but in the overall situation of staff in the field, there has been a slight increase of people who do that job. The exact name description of the positions that have been reduced is contained in that list.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would like to add to what I said earlier about programme performance budgeting and field work apportionment ratios. I believe that I made clear the difficulty involved in just totting up percentages of officers and saying that there are four full-time equivalents, and so on. A sample of four district offices, including Norwood, Port Pirie, the Parks and Mitcham, which are quite varied district offices with quite different needs, as honourable members would recognise, was taken for a representative week in March 1981. Time sheets were used and only generic social workers were considered in the formulation of the ratios.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Does that mean a person born to be a social worker?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: If you like. I believe it means a genus, a person in a genus or kind, which is a perfectly proper use of the word. Specialist staff, for example student unit supervisors, and staff development officers, attended specific programmes, while clerical and administrative staff attended the support services programme. The apportionment percentage ratios used for 1981-82 programme performance budget papers were as follows: family and individual support, 30 per cent; child protection, 10 per cent; young offenders and children at risk, 40 per cent; foster care, 10 per cent; and emergency financial aid, 10 per cent. Although district offices are involved in several programmes for the 1981-82 programme performance budget papers, expenditure and staff figures were apportioned across those programmes with a 10 per cent or greater involvement. This area will be reviewed again in 1981-82. Let me make quite clear that I am in no way criticising programme performance budgeting, because I believe that, in general and in regard to most departments, it has given this Committee and, therefore, the House of Assembly, more detailed figures and more detailed statements about the figures than has been available in the past.

But when we have a decentralised, fairly small department such as mine, and when we do add together small percentages and come up with a total, it can become rather artificial. What I have told the Committee covers the actual positions that are going to be reduced. In regard to the figures that come, quite properly, through the programme performance papers, generally speaking, as in this case (and it was given by Mr Cox), there are explanations. Certainly, as the member for Mitchell requested, the Committee is quite entitled to know (instead of my just reading them out) what those actual positions are which are going to be reduced, and I will provide that, as I said, during the lunch break.

Mr ABBOTT: I will refer now to perhaps a different angle on the staff problems. I understand that some D.C.W. staff who were engaged on non-statutory work, such as the SACOSS skills bank project, have had to terminate this work because the department is short of staff. How many

other non-statutory projects have had to be terminated as a result of staff and funding shortages?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask Mr Cox to answer that question, because it is a matter of detail and detailed programmes.

Mr Cox: The skills bank programme which was referred to was an attempt to register voluntary labour and reallocate it, and was started by social workers in Adelaide office and eventually moved to western region. It has been a decision of the department to cease that. I think there are some pressures that developed. We attempted to do it within our resources. It grew quite complicated in terms of allocating volunteers to other organisations. It was hoped that it could be tied in with the CYSS programmes. One of the programmes it was related to was the Service to Youth Council, and we were hoping that would be the way it would be tied together. The amount of work and the way in which the staff do developmental work in the department, as against statutory work, is really planned at the district office level and within the region.

The situation is that quite often the staff get themselves hedged into maintaining a system which should be related to the voluntary sector or should be taken over. We do not mind our staff using their creative energies to help establish such programmes, but they can not maintain them because we have never had a budgetary provision for it. So what had started as a small part-time social work situation developed into something which was too big for the sort of situation we were in, and we were not able to make other arrangements for it to be carried on. That is exactly what happened to the skills bank.

Regarding the question on other situations, it differs between the regions. Some programmes start and some programmes stop between the regions. Some of it is related to an increase in statutory work which might happen in a particular area, and some is a change of emphasis. That list would be hard to obtain for the year, because it does refer to local district office initiatives.

Mr ABBOTT: Has there been any increase in the incidence of sick leave and health problems among D.C.W. staff during the last 12 months? Is the department making any special provisions for counselling for D.C.W. staff who are working under greater stress than ever before because of increased work loads and staff shortages?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We may have to get some of the figures during the lunch break and answer that in greater detail after that time. I would ask the Director-General to give such answer as he can at the present time.

Mr Cox: The figures are not immediately available, but we can get them. There does not appear, from my point of view, to be any great absence on sick leave. We will get those figures, if that is in order.

The other question was in relation to counselling of staff and the need to support them in terms of the pressure: there is no doubt that people working with people suffer a great number of pressures because the problems are complicated. There is at the present time a plan. We are looking at the situation of developing counselling with some ex-members of staff who have made a contribution to welfare work and have retired recently. They have offered a support system for social workers who are at present in the system.

The question of burn-out, or the way in which social workers handle the job, is a world-wide problem because of the nature of the job. There does not appear to have been any marked increase, from my observation, but we will get the figures in relation to sick leave.

Mr ABBOTT: Just one more question in relation to staff matters: is it true that the D.C.W. has been asked to provide counselling services for teachers in Education Department schools, where stress levels and work loads

have increased because of staff shortages, uncertainty about future security, and so on?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We have not been asked to provide such assistance, but we always have co-operated with the Education Department. We do provide our services where they are needed in this area.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to the item 'Community welfare advisory committees fees'. What advisory committees does that represent?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The committees concerned, as far as I can recall, would be the Community Welfare Grants Fund, the Children's Homes Advisory Committee, and there may be some other advisory committees concerned. I would ask the Director-General if he could refer to all of those.

Mr Cox: Community welfare advisory committees are established each year as issues arise. I think there has always been a provision for some fees for community welfare advisory committees. Last year, two committees completed their work; one was the Mann Committee, and the other, which reported this week, was on the sexual abuse of children. So the fees there for last year include that total. The provision for this year is \$8 000. That will meet some of those that the Minister has met. It depends whether the Children's Interests Bureau starts and at what time that is proclaimed. Some of those fees will be used for members of that. That is where the amount will be spent.

Mr MATHWIN: Could I have your assistance here, Mr Chairman? Are we going down to the line, \$2 867 000?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is a suggestion from the Chair, but it has been brought to my attention that the Opposition is happy to work above the line 'Miscellaneous' up to the vote \$28 472 000. That being the case, we will work within the area prior to the 'Miscellaneous' vote. That is on pages 93, 94 and 95. Any questions relating to the papers there may be addressed to the Committee.

Mr MATHWIN: That will make it much more difficult and longer, I suggest. I take it, in relation to residential care facilities, that the smaller allocations for the various regions involve accommodation for children and do not include the INC scheme.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The honourable member is quite right. Residential care does relate to children who are in residential care, who are being cared for in homes provided by the department, and INC is not included in those figures.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I want to follow an aspect of social work in the 1980s put forward by the member for Spence, who sought to ascertain whether there was any harmful effect on the health and general wellbeing of social workers in the community at a time of stress and, as he put it, when staff resources were limited. Up until now the Minister has strenuously argued, I think, that there is no harmful effect on the community. I am more concerned at the possible harmful effects on the welfare staff concerned, as distinct from health effects.

Has there been any lowering of the normally high morale that existed in previous years in the department amongst the social work staff working in the field? I think all of us who have had any connection with social workers would recognise that they do have normally a high degree of commitment, and they give perhaps more than is called for simply on an hours and wages basis. There needs to be a direct commitment often for people to continue in a sustained way in this field. I sometimes think this could apply as well to members of Parliament, but admittedly we are paid much more than social workers are paid. The question that I am perturbed about is that I have had telephone calls from social workers in the department who have told me that they are in some despair, that they find it com-

pletely difficult to cope with staff restrictions at a time when there is an ever-increasing need for their services in the community. Obviously, morale is going to affect how well the social workers will be able to cope when their numbers and resources are limited. Is there any morale problem in the department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. I think it is an important one and I will be pleased to answer it. First of all, of course, on the question of sick leave, and so on, I have undertaken that we will get the figures and have them available after the adjournment. In regard to morale of the staff, the honourable member has asked me for an answer, which I will be pleased to give. I can only answer that from my own impressions. During the time that I have been Minister I have travelled extensively throughout the 50 points of delivery of welfare services in the State. It has been my impression actually that the general morale is remarkably high. I acknowledge what the honourable member has said—that, as with the members of some other professions such as members of Parliament, teachers and others—social work is a profession which does impose strains and stresses on the individual. I think that the social work profession is one on which there are great strains and stresses on its members, and certainly one does from time to time see results of that. It has certainly been my impression that I have achieved, I thought, a good rapport with the staff of the various district offices and regional offices I have visited.

Whenever I visit a regional office I allow the conduct of the meeting to be in the hands of the district officers. I think that is only proper, but what I like and what usually happens is that there is at some time during the visit a staff meeting and the members of the staff meet me; I say anything I want to say, they say anything they want to say, and questions are asked. Certainly my observations from those visits have been that the morale of the staff is very high and that the rapport with the Minister and with the department is high.

The honourable member expressed concern (I do not blame him for expressing concern because, having been the Minister of the department himself, he has the same concern as I have) about the effect of staff restrictions on welfare. I have pointed out that there are no restrictions in the field. I have said that there are 25 reductions, and I have mentioned the areas concerned. I have the figures on reductions, and I will circulate them, and there are no others. In terms of members of staff, not of equivalents—and this is where we have difficulty in relating the programme performance budget papers to reality; reality is the number of members of staff—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You said that last year, by the way, but your Government continued with the exercise.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I take that point, but I also make the point that there is a value in programme performance budgeting if it is properly assessed. However, when you want to talk about reduction in staff you have to look at the members of staff and in what areas the staff numbers will be reduced. I have said where the reductions will be made, and in the field area, to say the least of it, they are minimal.

The honourable member said he had received phone calls from members of the staff saying that they were distressed because of cuts, and that their morale was low, and so on. In any service anywhere at any time there will be some people who are dissatisfied, and whether they are really dissatisfied or not there will be some people who will say that they are dissatisfied. I am not by any means writing off the concerns of those members of the staff who contacted the member for Mitchell, because, doubtless, in most cases, they had genuine concern. I am just saying that there

is nothing strange in any service about getting some people who are prepared to go to an Opposition member of Parliament to say that they have problems. From my observations, which is the only basis on which I can give an opinion (and my observations are supported by my senior staff who have made similar observations), the morale of the staff is high. I do not expect that, in the coming 12 months, there will be any disruption to the service given to the public through any want of morale, because I do not think that that applies.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: First, I did not solicit telephone calls in any way: they came about quite fortuitously. Secondly, in no case did any of the persons who telephoned me (there were a number over several months) indicate any worries about themselves. The concern that they were putting to me was about the inability to cope with what they described as increasing demands on their services. It was my interpretation that that was bad for morale. Nobody telephoned and said, 'My morale is bad, Mr Payne.' What was put to me was that, because these people were unable to cope with some of the demands which were being made or they perceived as being made on them, they were genuinely concerned. I can see that that is not a good scene for welfare workers to operate in, and that takes into account that we are operating in a climate of money restrictions, etc. What we are really talking about, I think, is priorities—the clout the Minister has in Cabinet—because that is what it comes down to.

If the Minister thinks he can judge the morale of the department by meetings held at regional or district offices under the guise of staff meetings, I hope he is not leaving it there because, obviously, some indication could be given at such a meeting, but I do not think that many staff members would waltz up to the Minister and say, 'Excuse me, Minister, my morale is lousy.' I think that there is a certain degree of determination and interpretation needed by the Minister about this matter. He has assured us that, at least judging on those meetings, he has been satisfied. I think that he gave a fairly qualified answer when he used the words 'remarkably high' and 'remarkably good'. If the Minister is sure that he is in full possession of the facts, which is what he implied, one would have thought he would say that morale had never been better. Is the Minister sure that, to the best of his ability to interpret, morale is not deteriorating and that the programmes and expenditure now before us are such that the staff provisions being made will not cause any deterioration in morale?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I acknowledge and accept the honourable member's explanation that the phone calls were not solicited. I did not suggest that they were. Whilst he is a former Minister, and had been such for some time, I do not suggest that those calls necessarily came to him because of that fact. I also accept his explanation that people did not come to him and complain about morale, but his statements about morale were his assessments, and that is all they were. They could not be anything more or less than his assessments. What I gave before was my assessment. As the honourable member apparently wants me to reinforce or make a fresh statement about my assessment, I will give that in a moment. The honourable member referred to priorities and to my, as he so delicately put it, clout in Cabinet.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It depends on your compassion, too.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It must be fairly recognised, and the honourable member did fairly recognise, that the division of that money between the departments was a question of the cutting up of that cake. I will not make any reference to my clout in Cabinet other than to say that the restrictions imposed on both of my departments, particularly on the

Department of Community Welfare, were modest restrictions compared to those placed on some other departments. This Government has recognised that, because it is a time of restriction, welfare is not the place where one makes cuts. The only restrictions which we have suffered have been fairly modest in comparison with most other departments.

I think it is fair to look at this matter in an Australian national and international context. Having been overseas recently, I found that in every country I visited the first thing that anyone did was talk about the cuts. That happened in every country, including Sweden, which is regarded as the welfare capital of the world. It is also very much happening in America, where there have been cuts of 25 per cent to 30 per cent in tax, or about 40 per cent in real terms, in many programmes. I felt when I came back that we were fairly dealt with here and that there was not any question of making welfare the scapegoat, which is a temptation in a period of restriction.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is a temptation for your Government, it was not for mine.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It is a temptation to most Governments. During periods of restriction Governments, to some extent, have to maintain various things, such as highways. Many feel that Governments should not, but can, worry too much about welfare and certain fields like that. I found that in many countries of the world that temptation had been yielded to and that very savage cuts had been made in welfare, America being the worst place for that. That has not happened to us, because I believe I have been listened to by my colleagues; and, more importantly, it has not happened because I believe they are men of compassion who realise that welfare must be maintained as well as it can be with a tight Budget and when the cake to be cut is small. I referred before, when I said that my view was that morale was high, to my meetings with district officers and to staff meetings. I recognise the point made by the member for Mitchell that you would not expect people to take the Minister on. However, I am not too sure that he is right about that. I am not too sure that he remembers how remarkably outspoken social workers commonly are.

I have not based my judgment solely on those meetings: I have based it on the whole period that I have been in office and on the various ways, both formal and informal, direct and indirect, that I have been in touch with social workers. The honourable member said that he thought my previous statement was qualified. I did not think it was qualified. I say quite categorically that in my view the morale in the department is high. The staff of the department are dedicated to their job of giving the best kind of welfare support to the citizens of South Australia.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I refer to page 339 of volume 1 of the Programme Estimates, where there is an item concerning three people being employed on the project of community awareness. Part of that brief, as explained earlier, is the function of communication by way of publications. The amount that has been budgeted is an estimated \$85 000. What is the wage content of that amount for the three people, and what money remaining covers the communication by way of publications, and so forth? It seems that the amount allocated is not very much money at all, and so I assume that there are other lines from where the money is drawn for publications which the department uses in its communication between the department and the public.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The question concerns the matter of money spent on communication between the department and the public, and the honourable member referred to particular lines. There certainly are many other areas where money is used in communication with the public, for prep-

aration of pamphlets, etc. I find that my officers are having some trouble in extracting particular details, so perhaps after the adjournment the honourable member could raise the matter again and I will see that he is given an answer.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I refer again to page 339 of the Programme Estimates and to funding for self-help groups and other organisations. A figure of \$1 129 000 is mentioned. I cannot find that figure in the Miscellaneous lines, so I guess that that amount is included elsewhere. Can the Minister tell me who decides the eligibility of various groups to receive funds, and what criteria are used in determining who receives money?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: As I understand the honourable member's question, he is asking for details concerning assistance given to self-help groups, and he referred to a figure of \$1 129 000. A large part of that amount would be contained within the Community Welfare Grants Fund, which amount comprises \$1 100 000, and the rest of that amount would be in some other area, probably forming part of the Children's Homes Fund. Therefore, I think I will satisfy the honourable member if I refer to the Community Welfare Grants Fund. There is a Community Welfare Grants Fund Advisory Committee which is appointed by me. It is accepted that there are various areas from which nominations should come. There is no finite number with regard to its total; it can be variable. The criteria that I apply for selecting people on that committee are that they should have been involved in community work and community groups.

The committee meets on a regular basis, particularly at this time of year when they are going to be allocating the amounts of money available to them after the Budget is passed. It is a very hard working committee, and the members are assisted by officers of the department. The procedure for the allocation of funds set up by the previous Government, in my view is very good and one which I have strictly adhered to (apart from a small amount of that fund which I keep available to myself to allocate personally, and I might say that the part that I keep available to myself is usually for one-off projects).

The \$1 100 000 in the Community Welfare Grants Fund is generally for ongoing projects. That sum represents a considerable increase, but increased demands on the fund have been quite great. There is a list of guidelines, a set of criteria which I would be pleased to make available to the honourable member. The traditional users of the fund are sent an application form each year. Application forms are readily available. I shall outline the criteria very briefly, although they are set out in much more detail on the set of guidelines provided. Very briefly, there should be a welfare content; this is quite difficult, of course, because there are about nine departments which make funds available to various groups which could broadly be classified as self-help groups. The first, I think, was the Department for Community Welfare, and sometimes people make calls on us where there is not really any welfare content. We do expect there to be a welfare content and we have regard to an organisation's ability to raise funds for itself.

Some people seem to expect to be able to say, 'There is an area of need here (very often they are quite right) and, therefore, the Government should fund it.' That is not entirely acceptable to us. A large number of bodies are funded, I think about 300, although perhaps one of the officers can correct me if I am wrong on that. What the department is looking at is relatively small amounts of ongoing funding, from a few hundred dollars to a typical amount of about \$5 000. In regard to some organisations, such as SACOSS in particular, which is a co-ordinating body that will not get much funding of its own accord, we

would be looking at about the \$60 000 mark, and there are a few other similar organisations.

Recommendations are made to me, and I have made it (as I believe previous Ministers have done) a fairly strict rule that I do not try to interfere with the recommendations. Generally speaking, I accept the committee's recommendations; they are presented in detail and very methodically, and I look through them carefully. Of the total number, in only a very few cases do I ask to see the Chairman and the committee to raise matters that I think they have overlooked. However, in the net result I have never rejected a recommendation; I have always accepted the recommendation that has finally been made, and I consider that it is a system that has worked very well.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The Minister has partially answered the question that I want to raise, but I refer to page 336 of the Programme Estimates. In the staffing column 18 people are listed as being employed in 'Emergency Financial Aid', and yet the allocation of funds for this particular line this year is \$1 800 000 less than it was last year, however, the staffing is only two down. Can the Minister explain what other duties the staff have, in view of the difference in the staff to fund ratio?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am not quite sure whether the member's question is in relation to the difference between staff and funding.

Mr GLAZBROOK: It is the ratio. For instance, last year there was funding of \$3 100 000 and a staffing ratio of 20. This year, funds amount to \$3 000 000 and there is still a staff of 18, so there are two fewer staff and a vast difference in the amounts. I am referring to emergency financial aid, which is dealt with on page 337 of Volume I of the Programme Estimates. It shows that for 1981-82, an amount of \$1 320 000 is proposed and for the staffing figure under 'Emergency financial aid', there is a figure of 18.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The items included in that provision in the programme performance document include various aspects of emergency financial aid, not only what we usually refer to as emergency financial assistance. I ask Mr Cox to give a detailed answer.

Mr Cox: The staffing figure of 18 relates, again, to the apportionment of social workers, and that is according to the formula. The support staff, the administration staff, who do a considerable amount of work, is included in the support staff of the department. There is the figure for social work apportionment but administration staff is not in that. The emergency financial aid in the document is inclusive of a lot of rates and taxes, and this sort of concession.

Mr CRAFTER: I wish to go back over some comments that the Minister has made about fear in the community that there would be some cut-backs in the general welfare area. The Minister has tried to dispel those fears that there would be cut-backs under this Government in community welfare and similar programmes. He referred to the situation in numerous overseas countries. That is the basis of a great amount of fear, because there is generally in association with Governments similar to his own that these cut-backs occur and where a monetarist theory is being applied and the victims of that are often the poor people and those who are helped by welfare programmes. They depend very much on the social security system of a State or a Commonwealth for their basic dignity. I am pleased that the Minister has dispelled those fears, although I think the facts do not bear that out.

I will refer briefly to some things which are happening and which I see as putting great stress on the department and the need for there to be an extension of the works programme and increased funding, rather than diminished funding as there is and a reduction in staff. I refer first to the problem of unemployment, particularly amongst young

people. One cannot deny that there are social effects as a result of high unemployment that are wreaking havoc on families and the very fabric of our society communities.

Secondly, there is an undeniable crisis in public housing. The report of the Housing Trust that has just been released refers to people dying before they can be placed in public housing. That is an untenable situation and my experience is that often it is the staff of the Department for Community Welfare who are the first point of contact in many of these problems relating to housing and unemployment.

The third fundamental area is the need for adequate health care. I believe that there are many people who traditionally have not used the services of the Department for Community Welfare, those who are above the working poor category, that new category as it has been defined by the Commonwealth Government, and who will be looking for help and financial support when they are not insured and are not able to pay increasing health costs or who do not obtain health care because they cannot afford it.

The fourth area is the trend that the Minister has spoken of on many occasions of the greater involvement of the voluntary sector in the delivery of welfare services. We on this side support the use of volunteers wherever possible, but that places an increasing burden on the professional staff who have to guide, support and follow up the work of the volunteers. The welfare services in this State are the envy of other States and other parts of the world and, when the Labor Party took Government in 1965, the work of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department was an absolute disgrace. It was the worst in Australia and was recognised as such. That has been taken by successive Ministers of Governments to a very enviable position.

The community, and particularly the staff, do not want that position to be detracted from or run down in any way. It is not only a matter of increased funds or legislative enactments that give that: it is the staff, the morale of the staff, and the way they are cared for, supported and paid that counts. Those people have built up a valuable service in our community. In the Estimates of Payments, there are two quite savage reductions in cash for two vital staff areas. One is in the resource services area, in the Personnel and Industrial Relations Branch. Last year actual expenditure was \$200 183 and this year proposed expenditure is \$176 500, which is a reduction of about \$25 000, quite a percentage drop.

Further, on page 95, under 'Centralised Facilities and Services', for the Staff and Volunteer Training and Development Centre, expenditure in 1980-81 was \$149 939 and there has been a reduction to \$137 600 in the amount proposed for this year. That is reflected in the figures that the Minister has given on staff cuts. There is a staff reduction of four in the staff development and student unit supervisor's area and of one in the personnel area. By the way, my adding of those figures means that there will be 24 fewer staff, not 25. However, in those two vital areas of support and care for staff, who are in the front line of conflict, stress and care, often it is impossible for the staff not to be affected emotionally and mentally by that process and degree of commitment that they experience.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member whether he would like to come to the specifics of his question. He has been speaking for nearly four minutes, and we have allowed a general statement earlier in the proceedings.

Mr CRAFTER: I understood that members were allowed five minutes initially. Those two areas are very important to the support of staff. Will the Minister explain the priorities that brought about the loss of five staff members and the reduction of funds in those key areas?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I commented earlier on the fact that, in times of budgetary restraint all over the world, as far as I could see, in a broad sort of way we had been less severely dealt with than had anywhere else, and not only Governments that could be said to be of my political complexion were involved. The Swedish Government is not of the political complexion of my Government and it also had made budgetary restraints.

The honourable member referred to the voluntary sector and stated that professional staff were needed to support volunteers. I entirely agree with that. However, it should be pointed out that last year, in the 1980-81 Budget, the Community Welfare Grants Fund was increased by 40 per cent, which was a massive increase. Against that high base, we have again increased the allocation. That very much demonstrates our support for the voluntary sector. The honourable member has stated that he agrees with that.

The honourable member also said that the South Australian community welfare services are the envy of the world, and I believe that they are. That was certainly my assessment. It has been my assessment in Australia and, as a result of my trip, in which I looked at welfare services, I believed that we were up with the best and second to none. I acknowledge that the previous Government can take a considerable amount of credit for having developed the South Australian welfare services to that point, although this occurred during the period when most other Governments were upgrading their welfare services. This has occurred in Victoria and in other places where the Governments have certainly not been Labor orientated. I believe the honourable member is quite right in saying that the welfare service provision in South Australia is second to none, and it is certainly my intention and determination and that of the Government that I represent to see that the situation stays that way as far as possible.

The member for Mitchell clearly acknowledged the important fact that there is a cake. We cannot expand the cake: we have to cut it up. The way in which the cake has been cut up is fairly equitable in regard to welfare services. The honourable member mentioned particularly the resource services and training, and I have stated that in these areas restraints are being made. I have said that we have tried not to remove field staff and not to take people away from the provision of services in the field, and we have succeeded in doing that. If the honourable member who asked the question agrees with the member for Mitchell that there is a cake, surely he would also agree that the Government has done the correct thing. If restraints have to be made, they should be made in areas which can be held and reserved to be completed and upgraded later. Restraints should not be made in areas that directly affect the clients of welfare services.

Resource services (administration) and staff training are areas to which one looks for restraint at a time such as this. Certainly, the staff needs all the support it can get, but the period of restraint and the time of restricted resources will not last forever. This matter can be taken up again. As I said before, I suggest that, if one acknowledges that there must be some reduction, one should look to the areas where they can be made with the minimum impact on the people who are in receipt of the welfare services of the department. That is what we have done. I ask the Director-General to provide more details in regard to resource services and staff training.

Mr Cox: There has been a reduction of one in the personnel and industrial relations section (page 93 of the Programme Estimates). I mentioned earlier the changing nature of staff and recruitment. Less energy is needed to recruit, because we do not have itinerant staff. The staff members remain with us. The personnel and industrial

relations section is not so much involved in interviewing and general recruitment drive. Therefore, we have reduced the staff level by one. Obviously, the tasks could be reallocated, but, in terms of the work they were doing, there had been a reduction in those tasks.

Volunteer training and development was referred to. Mr Harris spoke earlier of the reduction in the staff of this section and the restructuring and regrouping of this section that was done. Certainly, there was a reduction in staff. We hope that, by centralising in certain ways, we can tackle some of the new tasks and change the nature of staff development. Over many years staff development has involved training or retraining in social work skills. That was necessary because there were many changes in staff. The staff now is becoming more experienced, because it has become stable. The staff development task for this year hinges around some of the new changes contained in the Community Welfare Act Amendment Bill, which has just passed the House, and some overall development that has to occur, rather than around specific training and skills. We hope that we can obtain the skilled training that is needed through the Institute of Technology. There is a regrouping of resources and a change in the nature of the work.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The member for Norwood mentioned that the numbers added up to 24, not 25. I must apologise for the fact that some of the sheets that were photocopied cut off before the last place and, in fact, after 'Personnel' there is 'Community and Planning Services', one, and so the total is 25.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Did you try to hide something else on the sheet?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No, we did not try to hide anything. I will leave the sheets on the front of the table so that members who have incorrect copies may obtain correct copies.

Mr CRAFTER: I would like to receive a categorical statement from the Minister that no member of the staff will receive less support services because of the reduction of five staff members working in that area of the department than was the case in years gone by.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It is certainly my determination and that of the department as far as possible to see that individual members of the staff do not receive any less support. In regard to making a categorical statement, I am not aware that anyone has not received that support and, if that happens, I will want to know, and I will do what I can to see that the support is provided. I do not believe that members of the staff are receiving less support.

Mr CRAFTER: The Minister referred very briefly to a number of areas of concern in the community and to trends that would, in fact, put greater pressure on the Department for Community Welfare, particularly on the staff. I notice that there has been a decision not to take staff members out of the field but to take them from the central administration of the department, traditionally where the planning and research has been done in regard to the relationship between other Government departments and people in the private sector. Regarding the last category to which the Minister referred, the loss of one person from community planning services, I notice that three regional youth workers are to be taken from that work.

I notice the three regional youth workers are to be taken out of that work and, with the whole dissolution of the Community Development Department prior to the change of Government, I wonder what the Minister's policy, or planning is, with respect to trying to tackle these quite massive problems (and I am quite sure the Minister agrees with that) that are a reality in the community, and the traditional work that has developed in the Department for

Community Welfare in recent years of preventive welfare work rather than the band-aid type of welfare programme, or that of administering the various Acts for which the Department is responsible. That is a role which I do not believe any other department can achieve. I see in my own electorate the very effective preventive work done in the community development or community support sphere. How will that be maintained with fees cuts and with current policies?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The honourable member referred to the reduction of one staff member in community and planning services. That is a clerk, not a field worker. I think the honourable member has overlooked the work of the Youth Bureau, in the Department of Industrial Affairs, in the areas that he is talking about. The neighbourhood youth workers we have maintained. Probably the time when additional pressure came on welfare services was a couple of years back. It has been maintained. It has not, in my view, substantially increased. In regard to the field services, which are the responsibility of my department, the Department for Community Welfare, we have maintained those field services and maintained that staff. I think that is the answer to the honourable member's question.

Mr MATHWIN: I would like to refer to book 11, volume two on page 10. The Minister deals in some part with what I would read as community service orders, because there is reference to the development of community work programmes as a direct sentencing alternative for serious young offenders. What progress has been made on this matter? It is about 18 months, I think, since it came in, and I wonder what has occurred.

There is also reference to intensive personal supervision by a member of the community having been arranged for a small number of offenders on bonds. I imagine that it is intended to train the members of the community. How many have been trained, and who gives the training? Are they dealing also with people put on community service orders, if any? Who is in charge of the administration of that programme? I think that some organisations or persons forwarded areas in which this work could be done, and I would like to know how far that has been followed up by the department and whether or not it is in progress.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That is a very interesting area raised by the honourable member, and one that I know is very close to his heart. It is one on which we have been working very hard, and it does take some time to develop. First, the work orders in regard to young offenders have been developed and have operated successfully and continuously in regard to defaults of warrants. In the case of young offenders who have been fined and who have defaulted, the process of following them up and trying to get them to pay the fine or, in default, to carry out community work orders, has been in progress, and has been successful.

That is obviously a very useful and sensible programme, because it does not really do anything to rehabilitate or help the young offender, if he does not pay his fine, to serve some time in SATAC or SAYRAC in secure care. That does not really help him at all. On the other hand, he must not be allowed to disregard the law. The main success, I think, in this scheme has been to persuade young offenders to pay their fines, usually on an instalment basis. In other cases, work orders have been worked, and they have been worked out. The Deputy Director-General, Mr Harris, will be able to expand on that shortly, and probably give some figures.

The next question asked by the honourable member was about special mentors, persons in the community who were asked to supervise young people. That was part of our young offenders in the '80s programme. It has been put

into effect in a fairly small way, as has always been intended. About 14 young people have been through the scheme, and I think there are eight currently.

The first criterion is that they be acceptable to the young person concerned, and suitable. They have been used in some cases in regard to Aboriginal young offenders. In one case I can think of, the mentor has been a well-known and reputable Aboriginal sportsman. The mentors must be people to whom a young person can relate, and people who are regarded by the court as being suitable. The plan in regard to work orders other than the warrants default scheme is being developed, it will go ahead, and it is really in the process of coming into full operation now.

I have had discussions quite recently with members of the Children's Court and other people whose co-operation is needed in this regard. I think that it is obvious, and I think the honourable member would agree with me, that generally speaking the scheme ought to be an alternative to secure care; it should not be used for strengthening bonds. Perhaps that is warranted in some cases, but I think probably the special mentor scheme can usefully be used where strengthening of a bond is needed. However, where young offenders can be kept out of secure care that, I think everyone would acknowledge, is advantageous, for two reasons: the main reason, of course, is for the young offenders themselves. Very often, secure care is not what is going to help them and not what is going to bring them back to being useful members of the community, particularly in regard to young offenders who otherwise would be ordered to a period of detention of less than three months.

The young offenders who are ordered longer periods of detention generally serve their time. They can be helped during that period, and useful programmes can be developed. But otherwise they would go into secure care for periods of three months or less, they cannot be helped very much, and I think we should be looking at ways of using work orders as an alternative, particularly to periods of secure care of less than three months.

The main factor is the young person. He must come number one. The second factor which must be looked at is the cost of secure care, which is very high, being of the order of \$44 000 per year per offender. Of course, if the period in secure care is not of much use to him it is a very great burden on the taxpayer. That is the area at which we should be looking, particularly of work orders being an alternative to short periods of detention in secure care.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: There have been some changes on the Committee. Mr Mathwin has been replaced by Mr Randall; Mr Olsen has been replaced by myself. When the sitting was suspended, the Minister was answering a question from the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Regarding community work orders for young offenders, we are consulting, as I had indicated, first, with the courts, to see that they know the nature of work orders that we can provide, and what work will be available. So far, we have found that the courts have not been aware of what has been done regarding the warrant scheme; perhaps that has been the department's fault. Quarterly reports made to the department have not been provided to the courts, but they will be in future. As a result of a meeting I had recently with the most senior judge of the Children's Court, we have agreed to provide those reports to the courts and also to change their nature and the information contained in them, so that the kind of information the courts are seeking will be made known.

There are two ways in which work orders could be ordered in lieu of secure care. This could be done initially

by the courts, and that is probably where that order should be made. Alternatively, it may be after the child is placed in secure care by the advisory boards applying to the two secure care centres. However, I think it would be better if the courts were informed about the options and what could be provided by community work orders. I have set in train, with the most senior judge's approval, a programme to set up a seminar towards the end of this year between the department and the children's court system, the judges and magistrates who constitute that court, to discuss the matter, ways in which it could be improved and made more workable and more useful, matters about which we and the courts would want to know.

I envisage that further consultations will be put in train rapidly, because one of the important things is to see that suitable work is there, properly supervised, by people who know something about work themselves, especially those who have worked with their hands. I have in mind consultations with unions to discuss the matter fully, so that they understand the nature of the scheme, and are aware that there is no intention to use the work order system for young offenders to take away work from anyone who would be gainfully employed.

I intend to set up a committee, initially on an informal basis, to advise me about the operation of the community work order scheme for young offenders. I think that union members should be on that committee, because they know what work is all about. Within the next month or so I intend to consult community groups, service clubs and people of that kind who would be the most likely, apart from unions, to know where suitable work is, such as assisting older people. That is my general answer, but I ask the Deputy Director-General, Mr Harris, who has been closely associated with this scheme and who has done most of the work on it, to give a more detailed answer.

Mr Harris: The community service work order scheme was introduced first to find a way of satisfying the default of court-ordered monetary penalties. It was intended that it would, to some extent, reduce numbers entering secure care on warrants. It was hoped that it would have other benefits of enabling community members to establish positive relationships with young people, and to provide young people with worthwhile experience in undertaking tasks which have a community value, in terms of social benefit. The scheme initially operated from the central eastern region of the department, which was one of the questions asked, and was put in operation at the beginning of July 1980. An early problem was that, because of the need for an amendment to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, we had to deal with a backlog of unsatisfied warrants. In fact, over the period, until early August this year, a total of 2 129 default warrants had been received under the scheme, and 1 575 had been dealt with in ways which I could describe as follows: those satisfied by payment, 690; those satisfied by community work, 81; those satisfied by secure detention, some of which was done at the end of a detention order, 310; and those that we were unable to deal with because the youth could not be located or was unwilling to enter into the scheme, which were returned to the police for action.

The scheme has usefully meant that young people concerned have found means of meeting penalties and assuming the responsibility required of them. That was one part of the scheme, the intention of which was, when we had dealt with the backlog and got the scheme operating satisfactorily, to move into the second phase of a generalised community service work programme based on the Magill Project Centre at the project base. It was a two-part scheme. One was as part of an initial court order in the first instance as an alternative to secure care, which the court may order

under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, and also to reduce time spent in detention of those on short-term detention orders by the review board releasing them early to a work programme. The Minister has described the means by which we hope to introduce the second phase of that programme, including co-operation with the court, judges, magistrates, the court systems as a whole and the union movement, and other people involved. The type of work the young people are doing and will do is normally performed by volunteers, and would not cut across union principles.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What are the numbers of people who avail themselves of the alternative?

Mr Harris: The number who worked until August this year was 81, but a high proportion have satisfied their penalty by paying the monetary fine involved.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is the point I was leading up to: what are the respective numbers? If 81 worked on a community work programme, how many opted for the other alternative?

Mr Harris: There were 310 satisfied by secure detention. Some of those completed it at the conclusion of a detention order; in other words, they were on a detention order. It was recognised by checking that they also had a warrant outstanding and it was arranged that the warrant be served. Mostly in those cases at the end of that term they refused and chose to do the detention rather than work. Because of the backlog, there was a group of 494 which we returned to the police for action because either the young persons could not be located or did not want to get involved in the scheme and the normal procedures would flow from there.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think we have to make it clear that we are looking at two things. One is the warrant default scheme, and that is what the honourable member referred to. That relates to young offenders who have been fined and who failed to pay their fine, and that was what the question involved. The question asked by the member for Glenelg earlier was a wider one: it related also to work schemes, work orders, in place of secure care or to strengthen a bond; that is, orders that would be made by the court in the first place when the young offender first came before the court, or made by the review board after the young offender has been placed by the court in secure care. They are two different matters, but it appears to me that the member for Mitchell clearly recognises that and recognises that the question that he just asked did relate to the warrant default scheme.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I was interested in what might be described as the efficacy of the warrant default scheme. For that reason, it would seem at this stage, with a backlog of 494, that perhaps some work is needed in that area to make the scheme more attractive or that something else is needed, because it does not seem to be working.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do not think it is fair to say that the scheme is not working, because the number of young offenders who have been kept out of secure care has been quite significant—those who have done their work orders and those who have paid (and perhaps that is more significant), and of those who have not paid and who have served their time in secure care a lot of it has been at the end of an existing period of detention. I do not think it can be claimed that the scheme is not working. It will never work fully. It will never keep all young people who decide not to pay their fines out of secure care, but I think that if it does keep some of them out of secure care, which, as I said this morning, is not very productive for them, then the scheme is effective to the extent that it does do that.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Earlier this morning a question was asked about workers within the education system. Yesterday

during the education lines the member for Mawson asked the Deputy Director-General of Education:

Will the Deputy Director say how many social workers are employed and whether they are paid for by the department or by the Department of Community Welfare?

The reply by the Deputy Director-General was:

I would prefer to address precise information subsequently on the number of attendance officers and social workers but I can respond to the second part of the question: social workers are paid by the Education Department and not by the Department for Community Welfare.

Are those social workers seconded from the Department for Community Welfare, or are they employed separately from your department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No, they are not seconded. Social workers are employed by quite a number of different departments and Government agencies; they are employed, of course, by my department, by the Education Department, by the Health Commission and by individual councils in some cases. Various Government departments, agencies and voluntary agencies employ social workers, and I am quite sure that the social workers referred to were simply social workers employed by the Education Department.

Mr GLAZBROOK: It has been stated to me by some teachers—which incidentally reinforces comments which have been attributed to the Minister in the last few days in relation to child abuse—that they often see marks on children that would indicate some abuse. In relation to the co-operation between teachers in the Education Department and officers of the Community Welfare Department and seemingly the reticence of teachers to ensure that reports are made to the relevant authorities, is there any provision within the department so that a number of schools can be covered by one particular worker from your department, or are other methods available within your department to address this problem?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: First, there have been a few areas where composite methods between the various departments and disciplines involved have been used between the D.C.W., Education Department and other organisations to achieve an amalgam of the various services involved. The particular question referred to child abuse and the co-operation of teachers. Teachers are among the professions which are obliged under the 1976 amendment to the Community Welfare Act to report. The report has to be made to the department and the Education Department, and the teachers have co-operated very well in that; in fact, I am not sure of the figures as to who reports to whom, but the number of cases of child abuse which have been reported by teachers has been very high. That would be one of the most significant areas from which reports come and the Act does provide privilege for persons obliged to report or persons not obliged to report but who do, in fact, report in good faith, in case they are wrong in making the report.

There has not been any kind of problem in regard to teachers reporting cases of child abuse. They have been amongst the most prolific reporters. There has not been any difficulty with their co-operation, and I do not think that any further steps need to be taken to procure this. Members of the teaching profession seem to be among the people who particularly notice, as the honourable member suggested, the indications of abuse, who pick them up more rapidly than most people do. I do not see any problems in the area. As to the body to whom it should be reported, it is required to be reported to the department. One of the recommendations made in the recent report on sexual abuse of children to which the honourable member has referred was that the district officer in each district should be designated as the co-ordinating person for the purpose of

reporting. All the recommendations have been evaluated, and this one has been evaluated as to be put into effect.

Mr ABBOTT: I want to follow up the question on default community works schemes. Has the introduction of community work orders reduced the cost of keeping young offenders in secure care? I note from an answer to one of my questions that 1 035 juvenile offenders have been offered community work projects since those projects were introduced under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, and 866 youths refused consent to serve the work period, 803 of that number offered to pay the fine, and 88 accepted the work orders but failed to appear on the job. What is the main reason for their non-appearance? Are the work orders too hard? What type of work is ordered?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Deputy Director-General to answer in a moment as to why young offenders do not appear to carry out work orders. I am sure that the work is not too hard. I will ask Mr Harris to elaborate on the exact nature of the work. I think that the first part of the honourable member's question whether so far it has effected any saving is that it is too early to assess. Certainly, I could not say categorically at present that it has effected any saving, although it certainly has not cost the department money. It has had the benefit that more young offenders meet their obligations in one way or another, whether they pay their fine, carry out a work order, or whether warrants are executed.

There was a big backlog, which was referred to before. In the past, many young offenders did not pay their fines, and nothing ever happened to them. I do not think that that is desirable. I think that young offenders ought to be shown that they have to meet their obligations to society in one way or another and that the scheme has been effective to that extent. I do not think that we can yet say that it has so far proven to be cheaper. As to the reasons why the young people do not attend to carry out the work orders, and as to the nature of the work, I ask the Deputy Director-General, Mr Harris, to respond to that question.

Mr Harris: As to the first part of the question, whether it is likely to reduce the cost of secure care, I do not think it will do that. It will reduce the numbers in secure care and will prevent those numbers from getting so high that an additional unit would need to be established. If an additional unit was needed it would have to be established and would have to provide staff across each 24 hours, which is an expensive proposition. While it is difficult to show an actual reduction in cost, it would be a reduction in numbers and therefore, in the long term, a reduction in cost. I am not in a position to say what type of work is being done right now. However, I mentioned that 81 offenders had satisfied orders, not defaulted on work. I think that some people are reluctant to undertake the work offered because they feel that they would prefer to serve a period in detention, or to take their chances.

The work that has been offering in the past has been of a type involving Kesab, an aged pensioner organisation or a children's home. We have tried, as far as we could, to provide work compatible with the interests of the young person concerned. In other words, it has been something that they were more likely to be willing to do because they find it satisfying. We have tried to maintain some supervision of the way these people are operating, so we have had to find organisations that are prepared to offer some supervision during work periods. Those who do not want to work may feel that they prefer to take their chance and serve their periods of detention. Generally speaking, I do not think that this work has ever been so difficult or dissatisfying that offenders have rejected it purely on those grounds.

Mr ABBOTT: In answer to a question asked in the Legislative Council recently concerning the Mentor scheme for serious young offenders, the Minister replied that up until 19 August nine youths had been placed on the scheme and 27 referrals had been made to it, but that many did not meet the criteria. He said that three youths had completed that programme and fully achieved the supervision time. Does the Minister feel that this scheme is operating successfully yet, or do new measures need to be worked out to make sure that it will work? What criteria are not being met with this major problem?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I gave those figures earlier this morning. Since then more information has been received. There are 14 young offenders who have completed Mentor courses. I think that eight persons are currently involved in those courses. It was never considered to be a massive scheme, or one which would involve a great number of people. The Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme (INC) established by the previous Government, to its credit, has been most successful. However, there are only 80 to 90 INC parents. Smaller numbers of children than that are involved at any one time in intensive neighbourhood care, so we are not looking at massive numbers. The Mentor scheme has developed to a point where there are 14 people who have completed it, and there are eight people currently involved. That scheme is progressing.

I never expected this scheme to involve massive numbers of young people. However, if it can serve its purpose of effectively helping some young people to rehabilitate themselves, then it will have achieved its purpose. I did not ever suggest that it was something of the magnitude or importance of the INC scheme. I did suggest that it was a way that would help some young offenders to rehabilitate themselves and to return to the mainstream of life as useful members of the community. In its small way, I think that the indications are that it is being successful, because it is a relatively new scheme, and will advance more in numbers.

Mr ABBOTT: I would like clarification about the justice information service. On page 23 of the Premier's second reading explanation on the Budget he said that the Department of Community Welfare will continue its programme of system upgrading, including working with other relevant departments in an examination of the practicability and cost benefit of introducing a justice information system. Will the Minister say what a justice information system is, how it works, what it costs, and what will be the benefit to the community from it?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Obviously the matter is not mainly in my court: it involves the Chief Secretary, police, Attorney-General and myself. The general nature of a justice information system is to provide necessary information about offenders, offending, what has happened to them, their past pattern, and so on, to the departments concerned so as to enable people who have offended and been fined to make sure that something is done about it. The general need for a justice information system is borne out by the present situation in New South Wales, where it has been established that if a person is fined and does not ever pay that fine the chances are that nothing will ever happen to that person because the information system there is so poor that the chance of a warrant following if a person does not pay a fine is very remote.

Probably the most effective justice information system, certainly the most effective that we know of in legal systems similar to our own, is in New Zealand. That is a very comprehensive system. It has been suggested that there are some problems there also, but the idea of the justice information system is that there are some statistics and facts collected by my department, for example, in regard to young offenders, some collected by the police which are

contained in their records, those relating to fines, others by the Law Department, and perhaps some others, which information could be fed into a common point to enable general output.

What has been done in this area is that a working party has been set up, and I attended a meeting where the working party was set up. My department is not fully involved in the working party, because it is a fairly small contributor in regard to input and output of the scheme. I do not know the cost involved; it is certainly not in my portfolio area, and I do not think anyone knows the cost yet. However, the scheme has been looked at and evaluated by a working party, and such a system could overcome the very undesirable aspect that occurs, as I said, in New South Wales, where there is not even one department—for example, the Police Department—which has knowledge of people who have not paid their fines, to make sure that they do pay them.

Mr ABBOTT: I turn now to the matter of family impact statements. The Department for Community Welfare recognises that the welfare of the family is at the basis of the welfare of the community. A special family research unit was set up to assist the State Government to assess the likely impact of legislation on families. Unfortunately, family impact statements are not enforceable; they are merely a statement of social effect. I ask the Minister, therefore, whether a family impact statement was prepared on this 1981-82 Budget. Was one prepared individually on the Department for Community Welfare's Estimates of Payments and, if so, what was the social effect from that budget, and what will be the social effects from the whole State Budget?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The system of family impact statements has been operating very well in exactly the way that was indicated in the Liberal Party's election policy. The Liberal Party's election policy for community welfare indicated that every Cabinet decision, every submission for legislation or for a major administrative change would have to be accompanied by a family impact statement setting out the expected impact of that legislation or administrative decision on the family. That, and precisely that, has been done. Another important part of the Liberal Party policy was to set up a family research unit. Within, I think, two days of being in office I set up that family research unit and its first task was to prepare a family impact statement, *pro forma*, which was tried out over some time, and it was put into effect. The effect of it was exactly as described, namely, that either every submission to Cabinet had to be accompanied by a family impact statement assessment as to the effect of that submission on the family, or a statement had to be made that the submission was not suitable for family impact assessment.

Later on one of the things that I also did, which was at the end of last year, was institute an inquiry into the way in which family impact statements were made and were being seen by various departments. That inquiry was carried out by the family research unit. I think the general feedback was that the departments were not unhappy with the procedure; they felt it was useful, and one or two departments found that it meant some extra work for them. I might say that at no time did I ever suggest that family impact statements were a big deal. I did not ever intend—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The policy did.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No, it did not. I did not ever intend, and neither did the policy—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A world first!

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It was a world first, in fact, because no-one else had ever done it. The honourable member was kind enough to say that it was a world first, and

it is, and I certainly found this to be the case in Washington, where a family impact seminar is conducted on a permanent basis. When I went to see them and told them what we were doing, they said 'We are talking about it; you are doing it.' It is a world first, but it was never intended to be a big deal. It was not intended to hold up legislation or administrative decisions; it was not intended to cost a great deal of money.

However, what it was intended to do was to be an awareness-arousing exercise, just to make sure that the case of the family did not go by default in regard to submissions made by a Minister to Cabinet. It was recognised that there would be some exceptions, with obvious exceptions such as appointments, which were not suitable for family impact assessment. The idea was that the impact on the family be considered before submissions were made to Cabinet. These are part of the confidential documents like many others which go to Cabinet.

It has been my personal assessment that the standard of family impact statements that have gone to Cabinet has been good. As part of the scheme, one officer in every department is delegated to prepare family impact statements. They have access if they wish to the members of the family research unit, and a very good rapport has been set up. The answer to the specific question of the member for Spence is that the Budget was not itself a submission by any Minister, and therefore, in accordance with the system, which applies only to submissions by Ministers, it was not accompanied by a family impact statement.

Dr BILLARD: I refer to the matter of crisis care mentioned on pages 32 and 33 of volume 11 of the Programme Estimates, and to a comment in the section on issues and trends, which indicates that there has been a gradual increase in the work load of crisis care, including both telephone and face-to-face counselling. Under the subtitle '1980-81 Significant Targets and Objectives' the statement is made that during the last year there were approximately 30 000 telephone requests and 2 126 attendances. Can the Minister expand on those figures in light of the assertion that there has been a gradual increase? I am asking this question because I note that the 1979-80 annual report of the department indicates that in 1978-79 there were 37 651 phone calls, and in 1979-80, 38 223 phone calls. So, 30 000 phone calls this year would indicate a decline rather than a growth. With regard to attendances, the report indicates that in 1978-79 there were 1 984, and in 1979-80 there were 2 248. So, the figure of 2 126 attendances this year appears to indicate that there has been a drop of 5 per cent on the previous year.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Crisis Care unit of this department provides a 24-hour emergency welfare counselling service in the Adelaide metropolitan area. It is essential that staff levels be maintained to provide an effective service at all times. The 1980-81 Budget allocation was based on an establishment of 19 staff. However, in cases of extended sick leave, long service leave and leave without pay, staff are replaced from other areas of the department to maintain the same working establishment level. This resulted in double counting of salary costs. Also, in 1980-81, staff replaced through normal turnover came in on higher salary classification levels. The Public Service Board also approved seven staff to jump two increments.

It is very hard to assess the actual work load of Crisis Care. The work load has not got less. The honourable member referred to the number of telephone calls. The main basis on which Crisis Care operates is not so much in regard to matters that can be resolved by a telephone call. Doubtless, organisations such as Life Line do that sort of work very effectively. Where problems can be solved by a telephone call, that will be done. However, where a problem

cannot be solved in this way, some other form of service is necessary, and that is the purpose of the existence of Crisis Care. People are available around the clock; after a telephone call, they go out to help clients, and cars have been provided in this regard. Skilled professionals assist people who may be contemplating suicide, wives who are being physically abused and have nowhere else to go, or people in similar situations.

I do not believe that the nature and the level of the work can be assessed in terms of telephone calls or even the number of attendances. I have been on calls with Crisis Care workers to assess the nature of the work. There are some cases where a small amount of time is sufficient to solve the problem, but in some cases it takes hours and hours to give service for which the client is looking. One cannot quantify the work of Crisis Care in terms of telephone calls or attendances: it is necessary to assess the overall work that is being done by that unit within the department. It is certainly my assessment that the total work load is increasing. It is very necessary to maintain this service, and, as I have said, that is what we are doing. Perhaps the Deputy Director-General may be able to answer in more detail as to the figures.

Mr Harris: The number of telephone contacts for 1980-81 was 36 000, and of those 2 105 resulted in further face-to-face contact. By far the greater proportion of cases were those involving violence, domestic discord and child-related difficulties (such as runaways and things of that kind). A very high proportion of the calls involved a lot of time, either on the telephone or in the subsequent face-to-face contact.

A very high proportion of the contacts were the result of referrals by the police. If the police receive a telephone call and if they believe that the matter is more in the nature of a social problem than a police action problem, they call in Crisis Care to attend. A high proportion of the calls resulted from police contact. While it is difficult to quantify, as the Minister said, 36 000 is a very high proportion of contacts. In addition to police referred contacts, a lot of people made their own referrals, and this category of people who sought help at a time of crisis from Crisis Care was the highest, and that speaks for itself.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would like to add to that. I believe that the Deputy Director-General has raised a most important aspect, namely, the co-operation between the police and Crisis Care. The police are not prepared to refer cases to all agencies. They prefer to refer cases to an agency such as Crisis Care which is part of a Government department and which they know is disciplined and subject to the rules of a Government department. The police have learnt from experience to trust Crisis Care. There has been a very good rapport between the police and Crisis Care. That is why I believe it would be undesirable to expect other agencies, perhaps voluntary agencies, to carry out the kind of work that Crisis Care carries out. That is why it is necessary to maintain the kind of budget for Crisis Care that is being maintained.

Dr BILLARD: Obviously, from what the Minister and the Deputy Director-General have said, there are trends that are increasing the work load, even though the number of contacts is declining. The figures that have just been given show a 6 per cent decline in the number of attendances and a decline of 2 000 phone calls, from 38 000 to 36 000. If the work load is increasing, this suggests that perhaps some particularly difficult types of problem in the community are hidden within those increasing figures. Can the Minister give details of any particular types of problem which are seen to be increasing and which are particularly difficult to deal with.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am sure that the honourable member has correctly stated the case. It is obvious from the figures that, whereas the work load is increasing, the number of contacts has decreased. I am sure that the honourable member is right in saying that there is an increase in the number of problems that cannot be dealt with in a short time. I will ask the Deputy Director-General to try to quantify that point. I very much doubt that he can do that in the short term. It may not even be possible, by looking through the files, to quantify that point or to indicate the nature of the more serious problems that involve an increase in the work load without an increase in the number of contacts. I will ask the Deputy Director-General to try to satisfy the honourable member. If we are unable to indicate fully, we will look at the records and contact the officers at Crisis Care to see whether we can prepare data in suitable form for inclusion in *Hansard* and we will see that it gets back to the Committee. I am not sure that it will be possible to do that, but we will try.

Mr Harris: I cannot quantify the time spent in each case, but I can give some indication of the nature of follow-ups. Of the 2 105 face-to-face contacts, 664 related to violence or domestic discord, 521 to child-related problems, and 235 to other traumatic experiences, usually sexual assault referrals, and that kind of thing, because the unit works closely with the Rape Crisis Centre at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There were 365 involving personal problems, 200 involving accommodation problems, and other problems, 120. That is the total of face-to-face contacts. We do have and I think we can give records of the nature of the referring problems for most of the telephone contacts, but I do not have that detail with me.

Dr BILLARD: That sort of broad category is really what I was looking at. If it is possible, I would appreciate it if there could be some comparison with previous years; if there is an increase in one area, say. I think it would be useful to know.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: If I could just expand on that: the figures in the Budget Estimates papers referred to by the honourable member were estimates. The figures which have just been given are the hard figures. If it would help the honourable member for us to see whether we can make comparisons with previous years, we will endeavour to do that and get it to the Committee in proper form so that it can be incorporated.

Mr Harris: The statistical form which is used for Crisis Care has been changed marginally to make certain information more readily available. From memory, I think there has been an increase in the domestic violence category, but it may be difficult to compare one set of figures completely with another because there have been minor changes in category. But within those limits we will get back to you on it.

Dr BILLARD: My final question on this area: I note under 'Issues/trends' the following comment:

Considerable interest, both interstate and overseas, has been expressed in the activities of the service. This has resulted in many requests for the supervisor to attend briefing sessions and planning groups interstate.

How much of the Budget has been devoted to this area, to interstate and overseas trips?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Director-General to reply to this in detail. I think the short answer is that not a very great part of the Budget would have been devoted to that purpose. Not a great deal of the time of the supervisor would have been taken up in this. The only items of expenditure, of course, in addition to his salary would have been air fares and overnight accommodation, but I will ask the Director-General to elucidate this as much as he can.

Mr Cox: The whole question of the expertise of the supervisor has been a real problem to the department, because each State has been wanting to copy what we are doing in Crisis Care. There have been demands from every State for him to go and speak to staff. Therefore, we have been fairly stringent that they should pay the expenses. That does not overcome completely the loss of his time from us. Because he is the supervisor it is necessary to make arrangements at that time to cover that need.

It has been interesting to see the Western Australian initiatives that have come out of his visit, the Queensland initiatives that have come out of his visit, and the work he has done in New South Wales. We have attempted to make sure that this State does not bear the cost, although I suggest that at certain times we have borrowed the expertise of other States and not borne the cost, because they have things we like to see and copy. We do have a mutual arrangement about these things, but in most cases Mr Patterson has had his expenses paid.

Mr PLUNKETT: I would like to ask the Minister what action he has instructed the department to take concerning glue sniffing. I am looking at a cutting from the *News* of a report by Dr Clarkson. Briefly, he states that there is a need for an investigation into glue sniffing, and claims that permanent kidney damage could result from that practice. He has written, with four other doctors, a report in the *Australian Medical Journal* which states that 'Dr Clarkson records for the first time a case of a person whose kidneys became irreversibly damaged from this practice.' I have another clipping concerning Aboriginal children, who apparently have become addicted to petrol sniffing. I consider that this matter would come under the child protection area of welfare, but I would like to know what investigations the Minister has instructed his department to undertake in this area.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I thank the honourable member for his question, because the matter of glue sniffing and petrol sniffing is a very serious one. It is a very difficult one to address, because of course it is not illegal to buy petrol. It is not even illegal to buy glue. Some investigations have indicated that, while some of the forms in which glue is sold, with a bag intact for proper purposes, are very much suited for glue sniffing, it would be difficult to prohibit that because it does have a legitimate purpose. The question of glue sniffing and petrol sniffing has been a concern to me. It is one I have taken up with the department from time to time.

A former regional director, Mr Brenton Wright, who has now left the department, was most interested in this area, and I had several discussions with him. He has done a great deal of work on it. I set up a working party, together with the Education Department in the western region, of which that officer was Regional Director while he was with the department. The working party has not really come to any final satisfactory conclusion, and I am not sure there is much satisfactory conclusion to this serious problem. I have discussed the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Health, and studies have been made, although I am not sure on what basis, and whether they were called working parties or whatever else. There have been discussions in the Health Commission on this same question. A number of studies have been made and reports have been written, some on a national basis.

The responsibility for the area, of course, is inter-departmental: as it does concern young people, it concerns my department; as it affects health, it concerns the Health Commission; as commonly glue sniffing is in connection with schools, it affects the Education Department. All three departments and their Ministers have been concerned about the matter and have done something to try to resolve it,

without any working parties or reports having come up with any definitive answer. Indeed, I doubt whether there is one. I thank the honourable member for his question. I have told him what has been done, and I assure him that it is a matter of continuing interest with which the department will continue to concern itself.

Mr PLUNKETT: I thank the Minister, but I would like to follow that line in another area: smoking. I have clippings from the *News* of 8 January 1981, quoting a report from a doctor concerning inaction on smoking. This doctor points out that the carbon monoxide in cigarettes is particularly dangerous, especially to pregnant women. There is also a report of a campaign to discourage children from smoking. I think that the Minister, and his department would accept that, even though some older people have given up smoking, more schoolchildren smoke now than was previously the case. Has any action been taken about smoking by children? Some tobacco companies now advertise cigarettes with jigsaw puzzles and photographs of various sporting identities, to attract children to certain brands of cigarettes.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: In the Community Welfare Act (I think in section 80, before it was recently amended) there was a prohibition with a modest fine for anyone who sold tobacco products to persons under 16 years of age. The department has never had the ability to enforce that. It was a matter for police enforcement, and in the past it was generally ignored. I have been pleased to see recently signs in shops advising customers that it is an offence to sell tobacco products to children under the age of 16 years. Also, I was pleased to see during the school holidays, when I had a week's holiday, a person, obviously under the age of 16 years, who asked for a number of packets of cigarettes in a shop in the North of the State being informed by the shopkeeper that it was illegal to supply them. I congratulated the shopkeeper on doing that. Whilst the smoking question is most important, it is in the health area, as the honourable member acknowledged. It is not only children who smoke. I mentioned earlier the degree of co-operation between education, health and welfare, which is necessarily great. I do not want to pass the buck, but the effects of smoking on health are very much in the health area.

I believe that my colleague, the Minister of Health, intends to introduce a controlled substances Bill for a controlled substances Act, which will include tobacco. That is the best area in which to address the subject. My department is not making any inquiries about this at present. Because this does not relate only to young people but also to adults, it is more effectively left to the Health Commission. We all know that we have a Minister of Health who is dedicated to controlling or even eliminating smoking.

Mr PLUNKETT: In my electorate on the western side of Adelaide, there is a great demand for emergency housing for pensioners, unmarried mothers and the unemployed. Does the department intend to make further moneys available for people in desperate need of accommodation? In most cases these people are unable to pay the rent, but as soon as they receive an offer of a flat or a house, they are approached by Sagasco or ETSA to pay a \$35 security deposit. If they are single and unemployed, as the Minister would well know, that would leave \$1 on which to live out of their first cheque. That \$35 does not cover gas or electricity used; it is a security in case they have not paid their debts when they leave.

Endless inquiries have been made to the Department for Community Welfare in my electorate about financially helping these people. Also, I have directly approached ETSA and Sagasco management, and in most cases I have been successful because the \$35 demanded has been waived. However, many people who have not come directly to me have been without electricity or gas, unable to cook

meals for two or three weeks, but on reconnection of supply they have been asked to pay an extra \$10 reconnection fee. Does the department intend to help these people who are unable to pay the \$35? Is more money to be made available for this purpose? I am sure that the Minister would have been told by the department that there is a great demand for this type of assistance, not only in my electorate, but all over Adelaide.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The department is not a housing authority, as the honourable member knows; he did not suggest that it was.

Mr PLUNKETT: What about welfare housing?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We are still not a housing authority, and there is no provision in our Budget, nor has there ever been in previous Governments' Budgets, out of which we can provide for housing. The Housing Trust is the authority in this regard. We can make available emergency financial assistance for persons who find themselves in a dire emergency. We have found that 8.5 per cent of applications for emergency financial assistance has been in respect of shelter. There is no intention of making any more money available, because the social indicators have not suggested that should be the case. The level of applications for emergency financial assistance has remained fairly constant, and the increase provided this year appears to the Government to be sufficient to meet the need. Certainly, we could not fund payment of gas or electricity bills on a continuing basis, as we are not in the housing business, neither are we in the income maintenance business. That is a Federal responsibility.

I have been critical of the Federal Government about this on several occasions. The only thing we can do, and the only thing that this department has ever been able to do, is to provide moneys to meet a particular financial emergency. We believe that the amount of money we have provided in this budget will be adequate. We have no reason to suppose it is not going to be adequate and the comparisons with the previous year indicate that it will be adequate. As I have said, 8.5 per cent of the total applications made are in respect of shelter and probably I am sure others have been in respect of electricity and gas bills. The facility which there has always been to provide for emergency financial assistance will still be there.

Mr PLUNKETT: I appreciate the Minister's answer and I accept that the Housing Trust does not come under welfare, but I do think that welfare is responsible for people who are in dire need, and they are the people I am speaking about. I mentioned housing as an example of the plight of these people who are in dire need of assistance. Unless I have the wrong meaning of welfare, the people I am thinking about are people who are right at the end of their tether, and they come to their member of Parliament for some financial help. I direct them to welfare, and in some cases they have been helped.

I bring the \$35 to the attention of the Minister because I have been able to get the welfare department to assist in paying this \$35 in some cases, and in other cases I have been able to get the companies to withdraw the demand. I was pointing out that if a single unemployed person has to pay \$35 for something that he does not owe (it is only a security, like a bond for a flat) he is left with only one dollar to live on. That is utterly ridiculous. If a person is starving, he will not pay a security bond of \$35, so he lives in a place where he cannot prepare a meal for himself, with no gas or electricity.

That was my line of questioning on welfare services. I consider that to come under Programme Estimates (Book 11) at page 36. I wanted to point out to the Minister that I mentioned housing first, because a person would not need

to pay for gas or electricity if he did not have accommodation.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I pointed out earlier that there is provision in our budget, and there has always been, for emergency financial assistance, and I think that would cover what the honourable member was referring to when he talked about people in dire need. That is exactly what emergency financial assistance is all about. I do not know whether the honourable member, in his advice to his constituents, is aware of the Emergency Housing Office. The Emergency Housing Office, which is undertaken by the Housing Trust, is the agency which is particularly appropriate and which is concerned—

Mr PLUNKETT: For the Minister's information, they have none available. I have tried on thousands of occasions.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: All right. That is the agency which is set up for that purpose. There is no ability within the Department for Community Welfare, which is not concerned with housing, which is not a housing authority, to provide money for housing, which is a capital matter anyway.

In regard to people who are in dire need, there is a provision for emergency financial assistance. It has always been there and it will always be there, and people should apply. There are guidelines which set out for district officers and the persons administering emergency financial assistance how that money should be made available.

Mr ABBOTT: In answer to my earlier question on family impact statements, the Minister indicated that the scheme was operating well and that family impact statements are carried out by a designated departmental senior officer in all Government departments. That being so, I wonder why no other Government department has mentioned this as an activity in the detailed programme information in the Estimates. Is there no cost involved, or is it just not being done by the other departments? If the Minister believes that the series of tests which senior officers are required to conduct on major proposals will be effective in influencing decisions on whether proposals go ahead or are modified, why has there been no reduction in the negative effect of new policies and practices of this Government? What built-in compensatory factors for families can the Minister show? Why have family living standards fallen?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: As I indicated previously, the object of family impact statements was to be an awareness arousing exercise, so that the Cabinet would be aware of this aspect, the aspect of impact on families, together with all sorts of other things in the mix and the balance which Cabinet takes into account in making its decision, and this is being done. The question is why other departments have not mentioned it in the programme performance budget papers. I suggest it is because it is part of the total administrative cost, and obviously would not be accounted for separately. The honourable member spoke about the negative impact of the policies of this Government on family life. I deny that there is any. Aspects which have made—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Are you saying you can speak for the whole Government? How can you know that?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I deny that there is any and the honourable member for Mitchell has interjected and asked how can I speak for the whole Government. I would inquire, then, how the member for Spence can speak for the whole Government of which he is not even a member, when he says that there are negative impacts through the actions of this Government. I am as entitled to express my opinion as is the member for Spence, and I deny that there are any negative aspects through the actions of this Government. We all know that there have been economic factors throughout the whole of the country and throughout the whole of the world which are not brought about through the action

of this Government, the Commonwealth Government or the Government of New South Wales in that State, the Government of Tasmania in that State, or the Government of Victoria in that State, and in other countries. Because of economic conditions there have been influences which have been adverse to the family and adverse to the individual, but they are not necessarily brought about by the Government. I would deny that there has been any action of this Government that has been specifically adverse to the family. There may have been actions that it has had to take because of the economic climate which may have had that effect, but I certainly deny that there are negative aspects.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: They may have done—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The family impact statements are carried out; they are done. I have observed them myself, quite apart from the inquiries which have been made by the Family Research Unit in the department. I have had my personal assistant from time to time look at the matter to examine to what extent family impact statements are carried out and how effective and informative they appear to be. I am satisfied that they are informative, that they do do what they are intended to do, namely, to arouse the awareness of the Cabinet.

In the net result, it would be impossible to assess. I am quite certain that, because they are always there, that because there always is a family impact statement on any submission made to Cabinet which may reasonably have some impact on the family, they do have an effect.

When Cabinet reaches a consensus on a particular submission, different members of Cabinet may have been motivated by different reasons. It is not possible to assess in detail in any statistical way what effect these statements have had; but they have been made, they are there, they have been faithfully carried out and they have been referred to very much in debates in Cabinet. It is my submission that they have done exactly what they were intended to do, namely, to ensure that decisions are not made without some reference to the effect on the family.

Mr ABBOTT: How many family impact statements has the family research unit prepared since its inception? For which projects were those statements prepared? How many of those statements have been modified by Cabinet? Can the Minister say in how many instances the results of statements were such that details of projects were changed significantly? Have there been any projects cancelled as a result of adverse family impact statements and, if so, can he name those projects?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I thought I had already made this quite clear. First, the family research unit does not prepare family impact statements. I made that clear and referred to it earlier. Family impact statements are prepared by a senior officer in each department—the department concerned in preparing the Cabinet submission. The family research unit conducts seminars to instruct and assist officers of various departments to prepare those statements. It is available for advice and assistance, if needed. I know that that assistance is often called upon. The other question asked by the honourable member, which I thought I had made clear earlier cannot be answered in detail, is what projects have been rejected or modified.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In your knowledge, you don't have to know about all of them.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I indicated earlier that it would not be possible to indicate which projects have been modified, rejected, or otherwise changed because everyone who has been in Cabinet, including the honourable member who asked the question and the honourable member who interjected, knows perfectly well that a Cabinet submission is put up, discussed in Cabinet and various other factors taken into account. If a consensus is reached on a particular

subject mix, different members of Cabinet have arrived at that conclusion for different reasons. One does not always know what those reasons are—they may not have said so. The best and proper answer, and I make no apology for this, is that of course I cannot quantify, and of course there is no way of knowing in detail or number which projects have been affected by those statements and which have not. I can say, as I have said before, that the family impact statements are there, are continued with, are in general agreed to by the departments and, certainly on many occasions, I have heard family impact statements referred to in debates in Cabinet.

Mr ABBOTT: I note from page 93 of the Estimates of Payments under the heading 'General' that the amount allocated for overseas study and development has been cut by more than \$30 000. Can the Minister say on what kind of project last year's allocation was spent and why this year's allocation is so much less?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask Mr Beatty, Director, Resources Division, to answer that question. However, the main reason for the differentiation is that last year there was a Ministerial trip by the Minister, his wife, press secretary and Regional Director mainly directed at the Third International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect in Amsterdam. The delegation also looked at welfare services in various other parts of the world. That cost about the order of \$40 000, which will not be spent next year. That is the main reason for the difference. Mr Beatty can tell the honourable member about the trips contemplated during the coming year. I think that one of them is to be undertaken by Mary Corich, the Women's Adviser, but Mr Beatty will give the details.

Mr Beattie: The only trip contemplated and approved by Cabinet for this year is for Mary Corich, the adviser on women and welfare, who is going to the United States and Canada to look at a treatment programme for adolescent girls and their families. Miss Corich will be paying her own fare and taking leave while she is there. The department will be subsidising her expenses while she is actually doing her study.

Mr ABBOTT: I turn now to welfare services for intellectually handicapped persons. Is the Minister aware of the Proposal for Alternative Accommodation for Intellectually Disabled Incorporated, a paper prepared and submitted by the Alternative Housing Committee? The philosophy espoused in that paper is the establishment of a lifestyle for intellectually disabled persons which enables them to live with dignity, security and independence, from young adult to old age, to foster social awareness on the part of the disabled person and to encourage acceptance of intellectually disabled persons by the community; also, to develop a network of support where necessary within the local community. Those proposals are to offer an alternative to institutional care for mildly intellectually disabled adults. The paper goes on to espouse basic principles such as the assessment of property, staff and other matters in relation to the proposal.

I believe that that proposal fits in perfectly with the issues and trends spelt out in the detailed programme information for the Minister of Community Welfare which talks of increased emphasis being placed on support for intellectually handicapped young people and their families, either to avoid the need for residential care or after these people have left the centre. The 1981-82 specific targets relate to more services being provided for intellectually handicapped people. Has the department looked at this submission, and has anything been planned along those lines?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The question of care of the handicapped and responsibility for that, it has been generally accepted, is the responsibility of the Health Commis-

sion. It is one of those areas that overlap. The areas from our programme performance budgets—our objectives, and so on, from which the honourable member has quoted—mainly related to Lochiel Park where we look after some intellectually handicapped young people. Because generally it has been accepted that the care of the handicapped is a health responsibility and not one for this department, we do not have any proposal to expand our activities in that area.

Mr ABBOTT: How can the Minister say that, when issues, trends and specific targets for community welfare are set out in the Estimates programme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Of course I can say that, because this is a welfare department. We are concerned with the welfare of all people in South Australia, whether they are handicapped or not, whether they are Aborigines, people of ethnic communities, or other people. In regard to welfare and in regard to the handicapped, we recognise that there are specific needs for those people, and that is what the allocations referred to are all about. The general care of handicapped people, as has been well recognised for some time, rests with the Health Commission. I think that Mr Cox can expand on this issue to some extent, and I would ask him to do so.

Mr Cox: The paper which has been discussed is the one in which we have taken some action in relation to mildly retarded adolescents, in terms of Lochiel Park. The department, since the 1972 Act, has had a policy of lessening the effect of institutions on young people wherever we can. We also have a policy of trying to separate retarded young people, who are most likely to have offended, from the most sophisticated offenders, and we have used Lochiel Park to do this. With a lot of experience now and more wisdom, we believe that some of these people do not need residential care, and we are able to use some of our staff to help them out in the community. Sometimes we bring young people into Lochiel Park for help, and we have been able to close a unit there to allow this sort of work to be done. We have not taken on the responsibility for the wide needs of the mildly-intellectually retarded people throughout the community, but we are certainly looking at those who are intellectually retarded and offending and attempting to provide support systems.

Mr ABBOTT: Further, on this matter, I refer mainly to social welfare activities of parents who have intellectually disabled children. I received a letter from one of my constituents and I would like to read that out. The husband and wife concerned said that they would like a centre or some building to be made available for these people to meet for social activities and get together and mix with others who cannot have the pleasures of normal people, particularly when they reach the 16 years and over age group. The people involved have a Downes syndrome son who is 20 years old in December 1981, and the woman states:

It seems a considerable amount is put into institutions, but there doesn't seem to be too much for those able and capable of living at home, which saves or must save the Government by parents or guardians able to do this. These people are in need of activity centres or the like for their leisure time, also for parents just to have a break from consistently needing to supervise their child.

The letter concludes by saying, 'After all, it is the Year of the Handicapped'. Recent reports have found that in spite of the fact that maintenance of home care promotes self-sufficiency and better integration into the community and that institutional care is more expensive than home care, resources have been and still are concentrated on institutional care. I believe that the Bright Committee rightly pointed out that the real challenge in caring for handicapped persons is not between community care and institutional care, but is in the provision of an optional care

system to meet individual needs at different points of time. Is the Government taking the soft option of institutional care rather than providing real alternatives? I am concerned about providing some kind of welfare facility for those parents who for many years have been tied to the care of their handicapped children.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: As the Director-General said just now, the only concern of this department in regard to the handicapped is about those handicapped people who are offenders or who are likely to be offenders. We do not have any other direct responsibility. The matter to which the honourable member referred of providing a building in which handicapped persons could receive some help (and it would be only young handicapped persons who would be our responsibility) and training and where their parents could have some recreation, was the first time that he has raised this matter. An inter-departmental committee has been set up to look at the concerns of the handicapped, and of course the Attorney-General is the Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person.

My department is concerned and responsible for young handicapped persons who are offenders or who are likely to be offenders. There is no suggestion, of course, of the Government's saying that it prefers the so-called soft option of institutional care; the Government has never said or demonstrated that, and I am not sure that it is a soft option, either, because institutional care is very much more expensive, apart from anything else, than home care. I am sure that the Government and its various agencies responsible for the handicapped are most concerned about being able to keep the handicapped living in their own homes. I am sure that that is a concern of the inter-departmental committee on which my department is represented.

Mr GLAZBROOK: On page 11 (2) of the Programme Estimates under the heading 'Specific targets/objectives', there is a statement concerning the disbursement of \$430 000, which was received from the Childhood Services Council, to 13 organisations participating in the family support services pilot scheme. Can the Minister expand on what that means?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes. I would ask the Deputy Director-General, Mr Mac Harris, who specialises somewhat in this field, to answer that question.

Mr Harris: The family support services scheme for the past three years has been a pilot scheme that has been financed entirely by the Commonwealth office of child care, part of the Commonwealth Department for Social Security. For these three years the State has been provided with funding of \$1 200 000, and there has been a committee comprising representatives of local government, SACOSS, the Department for Community Welfare, and other organisations, including the Commonwealth Government, which on the guidelines established initially between the Commonwealth and the State distributed the funding for that scheme. Many of the projects of the scheme, because some of them were fairly developmental, started at different times, but the majority concluded in about July this year, and others will conclude at the end of the year. The Commonwealth Government has now indicated that a further sum of \$1 300 000 will be made available for the next three-year period, and there will be some minor amounts of carry-over funding between now and January 1982 when the new funding sequence will commence.

The organisations that have been funded comprise a wide range of voluntary organisations including a fairly large family homemaker scheme operating to service a number of voluntary organisations and the people who come to them for help, a family support service scheme at Salisbury, a family project at Port Adelaide Central Mission and a family care resource team run by the Catholic Family

Agency. An Aboriginal child placement agency was originally funded under the scheme but that subsequently became separately funded. Also funded by this scheme were family welfare projects of varying kinds directed to different segments of the community, including some ethnic groups throughout the State and including some Aboriginal homemaker schemes at Oodnadatta and at Coober Pedy.

The scheme has operated within the guidelines established between the Commonwealth and the State originally to assist and support these groups, some of which were established organisations and some of which involved established particular projects within the scheme, to get the project going and to maintain it over that period. As the Minister stated earlier, provision was made within that first three-year sequence of funding for an evaluator to be appointed on a contract basis. All of the projects have been evaluated. It is likely that most of the projects that are currently running will continue in the next three years.

The intent of the scheme originally was, where possible, to increase the degree of self-support that the host agency could provide, either through its own support or through community support. That has occurred in many cases. In some cases, the scheme was directed at a particular ethnic community, helping it to make better use of the resources available (such as the Spanish community in Whyalla) and getting the group more attuned to using the existing resources, but giving it specialised help initially. Because some of the programmes were directed at a specialised section of the community, they have subsequently dropped out. Generally, there are a number of projects still going, and these will continue within the next sequence of funding.

Mr GLAZBROOK: How many properties does the Department for Community Welfare own, and what is the maintenance factor in regard to those properties?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It would be difficult to answer that question at short notice, but I expect that we will be able to provide information about the total number of properties. Whether we can provide specific answers in regard to the maintenance of those properties I do not know. We may be able to do that in overall terms, but I do not know whether that is all that the honourable member wanted.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I imagine that there would be a fairly substantial cost involved to the department in regard to these properties. Does the department have to pay council rates on those properties as well as maintenance costs?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The department has to pay rates. The management of the properties is conducted by the Public Buildings Department. The matter was raised earlier as to whether questions relating to the properties should be answered by the Minister or by the Public Buildings Department. The cost of Public Buildings Department for 1980-81 was \$1 828 186. I also have a list of the properties. I doubt that the honourable member would want me to read it out and I am sure other members would not want me to read it. I could supply the honourable member with the list, or it could be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I so seek leave.
Leave granted.

PROPERTY DETAILS

NORTHERN COUNTRY REGION

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Northern Country Regional Office				
26 Mildred Street, Port Augusta West	O	Regional Office	Regional Office	Regional Office
Staff Houses				
94 Memorial Avenue, Alice Springs	O	Staff House	Staff House	Continued use as Staff Houses
27 Roberts Crescent, Alice Springs	O	Staff House	Staff House	
5 Oleander Crescent, Alice Springs	O	Staff House	Staff House	
4 Coolibah Crescent, Alice Springs	O	Staff House	Staff House	
1 Adey Street, Ceduna	O	Staff House	Staff House	
4 Adey Street, Ceduna	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Mudge Street, Ceduna	O	Staff House	Staff House	
17 Mudge Street, Ceduna	O	Staff House	Staff House	
5 Tonkin Street, Ceduna	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 221, Coober Pedy	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 310, Coober Pedy	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 338, Coober Pedy (Dug Out)	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 26, Kutaya Terrace, Flats 1 and 2, Oodnadatta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 94, Kutaya Terrace, Oodnadatta	L	Staff House	Staff House	
Lot 103, Orabee Avenue, Oodnadatta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
26 Cummins Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
31 Cummins Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
34 Cummins Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Edwards Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
16 Edwards Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Francis Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
20 Hannagan Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
25 Harris Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
1 King Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
2 Lancaster Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
36 Larkin Crescent, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
9 Leslie Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Naisbitt Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Parham Crescent, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
111 Wauchope Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Flat 11, Withers Street, Port Augusta	L	Staff House	Staff House	
30 Eric Avenue, Port Lincoln	O	Staff House	Staff House	
7 Heather Road, Port Lincoln	O	Staff House	Staff House	
24 Martindale Crescent, Port Lincoln	O	Staff House	Staff House	
103 Oxford Terrace, Port Lincoln	O	Staff House	Staff House	

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
37 Ferme Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
41 Ferme Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
68 Ferme Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
18 Hannan Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
51 Hannan Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
26 Kingston Street, Port Pirie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
39 Gowrie Street, Whyalla	O	Staff House	Staff House	
315 Jenkins Avenue, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
29 McGee Street, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
212 Nicholson Avenue, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
5 Ralph Street, Whyalla Playford	O	Staff House	Staff House	
5 Ramsey Street, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
86 Stirling Drive, Whyalla Stuart		Transferred to Correctional Services		
20 Currajong Crescent, Leigh Creek	O	Staff House	Staff House	
59 Edinburgh Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	
38 Stirling Drive, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
80 Stirling Drive, Whyalla Stuart	O	Staff House	Staff House	
8 Wallace Street, Whyalla Playford	O	Staff House	Staff House	
3 Hall Street, Flat 3, Whyalla	L	Staff House	Staff House	
51 Flinders Avenue, Whyalla (Flat 6)	L	Staff House	Staff House	
30 McGee Street, Whyalla (Flat 8)		Handed back to S.A.H.T.		
57 Menard Street, Whyalla (Flat 7)	L	Staff House	Staff House	
84 Stirling Drive, Whyalla	M	Transferred from Correctional Services		
3 Sanderson Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	Staff House
103 Tassie Street, Port Augusta	O	Staff House	Staff House	Staff House
Cooper Pedy District Office	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
Shopping Plaza, Main Street, Cooper Pedy				
Leigh Creek District Office	O	District Office	District Office	May not be relocated at Copley
First Street, Leigh Creek				
Oodnadatta Branch Office	O	Branch Office		
North Terrace West, Oodnadatta				
Peterborough Branch Office	O	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
84 Kitchener Street, Peterborough				
Port Augusta C.W.C.	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
5 El Alamein Road, Port Augusta				
Port Lincoln District Office	O	District Office	District Office	District Office
21 Oxford Terrace, Port Lincoln				
Port Pirie District Office	L	District Office	District Office	To be relocated with new C.W.C.
1 Alexander Street, Port Pirie				C.W.C.
Whyalla C.W.C.	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
143 Nicolson Avenue, Whyalla Norrie				
Ceduna Terrace, Ceduna	O	Amenities Centre		
6 Morrison Terrace, Ceduna	O	Family Home		
Alice Springs District Office	L	District Office	District Office	Possible move
Elders Street, Alice Springs				
Ceduna District Office	O	District Office	District Office	District Office
Eyre Highway, Ceduna				
Kutaya Terrace, Oodnadatta	O	Hostel	Save The Children Fund	
West Terrace, Oodnadatta	O	Pensioner Units	Pensioner Units	To be transferred to Oodnadatta Housing Society
West Terrace, Oodnadatta	O	Ablution and Change Rooms	Ablution and Change Rooms	Change rooms for Pensioner Units
47 Dartmouth Street, Port Augusta	O	Dartmouth Family Home	Dartmouth Family Home	Dartmouth Family Home
84 Pybus Street, Port Augusta	O	Pybus Family Home	Pybus Family Home	Pybus Home
54 London Street, Port Lincoln	O	Port Lincoln Family Home	Port Lincoln Family Home	Port Lincoln Family Home
4 Third Avenue, Port Lincoln	O	From D.A.A.	Loaned to Save The Children Fund. With D.N.C.R. awaiting Advice	
23 Butterick Street, Port Pirie	O	Port Pirie Family Home	Staff House	Staff House
Gertrude Street, Port Pirie	O	New Port Pirie C.W.C.	Construction Site	C.W.C.
9-11 Baldwinson Street, Whyalla	L	Whyalla Family Home	Whyalla Family Home	Whyalla Family Home

PROPERTY DETAILS

SOUTHERN COUNTRY REGION

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Southern Country Regional Office				
40 Bridge Street, Murray Bridge	L	Regional Office	Regional Office	Regional Office
9 Collin Street, Barmera	O	Staff House	Staff House	
4 Loader Street, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Loader Street, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
5 Phillips Road, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
39 Zante Road, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
13 Roberts Street, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Flat 2, Merritt Avenue, Berri	L	Staff Flat	Staff Flat	
8 Merritt Avenue, Berri	O	Staff House	Staff House	
62 Tiddy Avenue, Maitland	O	Staff House	Staff House	
28 Walter Street, Maitland	O	Staff House	Staff House	
1 English Drive, Millicent	O	Staff House	Staff House	

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
4 Ireland Street, Millicent	O	Staff House	Staff House	Continued use as Staff Houses
9 Mayall Street, Millicent	O	Staff House	Staff House	
21 Mount Burr Road, Millicent	O	Staff House	Staff House	
7 Brolga Street, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
72 Crouch Street, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
10 Derrington Street, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Dove Place, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
9 Gladigau Road, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Gladigau Road, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
4 Illawong Drive, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
9 Laird Street, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
90 Lake Terrace, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
120 Lake Terrace, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
128 Lake Terrace, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
30 Shelton Street, Mount Gambier		Transferred to Woods and Forests Department		
3 Willawa Street, Mount Gambier	O	Staff House	Staff House	
16 Elm Avenue, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
32 Gail Crescent, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
45 Gail Crescent, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Murray Bridge Community House	
62 Gail Crescent, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
17 Garden Crescent, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Hawke Road, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
12 Homburg Drive, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
36 Joyce Street, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Margaret Street, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
178 Swanport Road, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
6 Tapp Terrace, Murray Bridge	O	Staff House	Staff House	
185 Swanport Road, Murray Bridge	L	Staff House	Staff House	
43 Memorial Drive, Naracoorte	O	Staff House	Staff House	
19 Myall Street, Renmark	O	Staff House	Staff House	
23 Kirby Street, Waikerie	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Office Accommodation etc.				
Berri District Office	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
5 Wilson Street, Berri				
Millicent Branch Office	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
57 George Street, Millicent				
Mount Gambier District Office	L	Meeting Room		
22 Elizabeth Street, Mount Gambier				
Murray Bridge District Office	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
Sixth Street, Murray Bridge				
Naracoorte Branch Office	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
163 Smith Street, Naracoorte				
Renmark Branch Office	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
M.C.G.C.A. Building, Renmark Avenue, Renmark				
Waikerie Branch Office	L	V.O.	V.O.	V.O.
4 Peake Terrace, Waikerie				
William Street, Berri	O	District Office	Y.P.C.	Y.P.C.
Acacia Street, Mount Gambier	O	Family Group Home	Women's Shelter	Unknown
9-11 Elizabeth Street, Mount Gambier	O	Mount Gambier C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
48 Twelfth Street, Renmark	O	Renmark Family Home	Renmark Family Home	Renmark Family Home

PROPERTY DETAILS

CENTRAL NORTHERN REGION

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Central Northern Regional Office				
84 John Street, Salisbury	L	Regional Office	Regional Office	Regional Office
Staff Houses				Continued use as Staff Houses
1 James Street, Campbelltown	O	Staff House	Staff House	
2 James Street, Campbelltown	O	Staff House	Staff House	
3 James Street, Campbelltown	O	Staff House	Staff House	
15 Kelly Street, Clare	O	Staff House	Staff House	
3 Mannanarie Road, Jamestown	O	Staff House	Staff House	
11 Hill Street, Kadina	O	Staff House	Staff House	
31 Digby Street, Kadina	O	Staff House	Staff House	
10 Moonta Road, Kadina	O	Staff House	Staff House	
3 Below Street, Nuriootpa	O	Staff House	Staff House	
7 Below Street, Nuriootpa	O	Staff House	Staff House	
41 Schaedel Street, Nuriootpa	O	Staff House	Staff House	
Office Accommodation, etc.				
Elizabeth C.W.C.	L	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
1 Windsor Square, Elizabeth				
Old Vaughan House	O	Residential Care		Y.S.U. Y.P.C.
Enfield C.W.C.	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
Main North Road, Enfield				

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Salisbury C.W.C. 9 John Street, Salisbury	O	District Office	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
Clare Branch Office 221 Main Street, Clare	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Kadina District Office 10 Digby Street, Kadina	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
Maitland Branch Office 28 Elizabeth Street, Maitland	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Salisbury North V.O. c/o Council, Hissar Avenue, Salisbury	L	V.O.	V.O.	Only partially limited use—could be surplus
403 The Parade, Kensington Gardens	O	Spence Cottage	Central Northern Admission Unit	
34 Marlecombe Road, Elizabeth Vale	O	Elizabeth Family Home	Elizabeth Family Home (S.A.Y.R.A.C.)	
44 Harewood Avenue, Enfield	L	Gilles Plains Hostel	Gilles Plains Community Unit	
643 North East Road, Gilles Plains	L	Branch Office	District Office	District Office
Gawler Branch Office 21 Adelaide Road, Gawler	O	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Hillcrest Branch Office 515 North East Road, Gilles Plains	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Ingle Farm Information and Resource Centre Ingle Farm Shopping Centre, Walkleys Road, Ingle Farm	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Modbury District Office 1269A North East Road, Ridgehaven	L	District Office	District Office	Possible surplus pending Tea Tree Gully C.W.C.
Nuriootpa District Office 33 Murray Street, Nuriootpa	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
29 Second Avenue, Klemzig	O	Klemzig Family Home	Klemzig Hostel	Hostel
North East Road, Modbury	O	Block of land C.W.C.	C.W.C. site for Tea Tree Gully	
999 North East Road, Modbury	L	C.R.C. Toy Library	Toy Library	Possible surplus if T.T.G. is built
56 Second Avenue, St Peters	O	Stirling Cottage	Vacant	To be transferred to S.A.H.T.
101 Beovich Road, Ingle Farm	O	C.N. Admission Unit	Vacant	Undefined
Petherton Road, Penfield	L	Elizabeth Y.P.C.	Elizabeth Y.P.C.	Elizabeth Y.P.C.

PROPERTY DETAILS

CENTRAL SOUTHERN REGION

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Central Southern Regional Office 1 Malwa Street, Glandore	O	Regional Office	Regional Office	Regional Office
Office Accommodation, etc. Noarlunga C.W.C. Noarlunga House, Noarlunga Centre	L	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
Marion C.W.C. 316 Diagonal Road, Sturt	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
Mitcham District Office Shop 56, 2 Princess Road, Torrens Park	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
Victor Harbor Branch Office 5 Crozier Road, Victor Harbor	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Crisis Care 57 Greenhill Road, Wayville	L	Office and Control Base	Office and Control Base	Office and Control Base
34 Beach Road, Christies Beach	O		Various Community Groups	Various Community Groups
28 Williams Street, Clarence Park	O	Clark Cottage	Central Southern Regional Admission Unit	
Naldera Street, Glandore	O	Naldera Family Home	I.C. Rugby Association Leased	Not known
25a Naldera Street, Glandore	O	Slade Cottage	Education Department	South-East Area School
52 Pleasant Avenue, Glandore	O	Windana Matron's Flat	Vacant	Not known
58 Pleasant Avenue, Glandore	O	Pleasant Avenue Cottage	Let to students doing a study	Temporary location for C.S.G.H.
24 Lyndhurst Road, Seaford	O	Family Home	Youth Support Unit	To be transferred to S.A.H.T.
20 Tarlton Road, Somerton Park	O	Seaforth Home	Community Centre	Slade Kandarik Glenelg District Office Little Patch
318 Diagonal Road, Sturt	O	Marion Youth Units	Marion Youth Units	
Lyndsay Street, Sturt	O	Site for Marion C.W.C.	Vineyards and tomatoes	?
36 Gordon Street, Glenelg	O	Merrilama	Catholic Services Girls House	
320 Diagonal Road, Sturt	O	Staff House	Office and part Marion Units	Office and part Marion Units
235 Sturt Road, Sturt	O	Youth Project Service	Youth Project Service	Youth Project Service

PROPERTY DETAILS				
CENTRAL EASTERN REGION				
	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Staff Houses				
17 Glen Stuart Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	Continued Staff Houses
19 Glen Stuart Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	
21 Glen Stuart Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	
1 Private Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	
2 Private Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	
3 Private Road, Magill	O	Staff House	Staff House	
42 Church Street, Magill	O	Staff House	Vacant	
Centres				
Homes Avenue, Magill	O	Youth Project Centre		
Glen Stuart Road, Magill	O	(S.A.Y.T.C.)		
Hill Street, Campbelltown	O	Lochiel Park Training Centre		
155 Cross Road, Westbourne Park	O	Kali Cottage Leased to Aboriginal Hostels	D.N.C.R. to advise	
James Street, Campbelltown	O	Brookway Park		Proposal to use as Horticultural Centre D.C.W.
72 Cheltenham Street, Malvern	O	Malvern Cottage	Southern Areas Mothering Unit	
Homes Avenue, Magill	O	Staff Development Branch	Staff Development Branch	
G.R.E. East Wing	L	Central Office		
Central Eastern Regional Office, 4-8 Angus Street, Kent Town	L	Regional Office	Regional Office	R/O
Office Accommodation etc.				
Adelaide C.W.C., 34 Waymouth Street, Adelaide	L	District Office	C.W.C.	C.W.C. to be relocated?
Adelaide Hills District Office, Merriion Terrace, Stirling	L	District Office	District Office	District Office to be relocated to Mount Barker C.W.C.
Campbelltown C.W.C. 163 Montacute Road, Newton	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	
Norwood District Office 81 Osmond Terrace, Norwood	O	Residential Care	District Office	District Office
Unley Branch Office, 301 Unley Road, Malvern	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
Woodside Visiting Office Main Street, Council Chambers, Woodside	L	V.O.	V.O.	V.O.
12 Gulfview Road, Blackwood	O	Family Home	Vacant	To be transferred to S.A.H.T.
Conigrave Lane, Norwood	O	Norwood Youth Activities Centre		
59 Ethel Street, Stirling	O	Woorabinda Campsite	Woorabinda	Camp site
59 Ethel Street, Stirling	O	Family Home	Caretaker's Residence	Caretaker's Residence
13 Churcher Street, Thorngate	O	Colton Cottage	Colton Cottage	Colton Cottage
Church Street, Magill	O	Magill Home	Magill Home	Magill Home
400 Fullarton Road, Myrtle Bank	O	Fullarton Cottage	Vacant	To be transferred to S.A.H.T.

PROPERTY DETAILS				
CENTRAL WESTERN REGION				
	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
Northern Country Regional Office				
Central Western Regional Office and Hindmarsh Branch Office, Port Road, Hindmarsh	L	Branch Office and Regional Office	Branch Office and Regional Office	Possible only Branch Office. Regional Office to Port Adelaide
25 Flinders Avenue, Kingscote	O	Staff House	Staff House	Staff House
19 Goodall Avenue, Kilkenny	O	C.W. Project Team	C.W. Project Team	C.W. Project Team
17 Goodall Avenue, Kilkenny	L	C.W. Youth Project Service	C.W. Youth Project Service	C.W. Youth Project Service
Kangaroo Island Branch Office, Town Hall, Kingscote	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Branch Office
The Parks C.W.C. Trafford Street, Angle Park	O	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
Port Adelaide District Office S.G.I.C Building, 64 Dale Street, Port Adelaide	L	District Office	District Office	District Office
80-84 East Street, Thebarton	L	T.P.C.C.C.	T.P.C.C.C	T.P.C.C.C. Now Incorporated
Thebarton C.W.C. 101 Henley Beach Road, Mile End	L	C.W.C.	C.W.C.	C.W.C.
West Torrens Branch Office, 209 Anzac Highway, Plympton	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	Moving from 209 to 403 in near future

	Owned Leased	Original Use	Current Use	Future Use
403 Marion Road, Plympton	L	Branch Office	Branch Office	
Woodville District Office, 33 Woodville Road, Woodville	O	District Office	District Office	C.W.C. to be established
24 Railway Terrace, Largs Bay Selling	O	Largs Bay Family Home		To be transferred to S.A.H.T.
1 Rowells Road, Lockleys	O	Hay Cottage	Central West Admission Unit	Central West Admission Unit
18 Lurline Street, Mile End	L	Hay Community Unit	Hay Community Unit	Community Unit
206 Childers Street, North Adelaide	O	Kumanka Boys Boys Home	Vacant	To be transferred to S.A.H.T.
52 Hill Street, North Adelaide	O	Stuart House Hostel	Stuart House Hostel	Stuart House Hostel
8 Beulah Road, Norwood	L	Neighbourhood Project Centre	Neighbourhood Project Centre	Neighbourhood Project Centre

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What is the basis of the allocation of \$935 000 on page 47 of the Programme Estimates under the heading '1980-81 outcome'? The sub-programme is 'Community Welfare Grants Scheme'. Does that involve the grants scheme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask Mr Beatty, the Director, Resource Services Division, to say how the figure was arrived at.

Mr Beattie: Expenditure for welfare grants was reduced in 1980-81 by \$93 000, because welfare grants are made on a calendar year basis. The full allocation of the funds provided in 1980-81 would have created problems in funding of all of the projects for a full year in 1980-81. For that reason, the department had about \$80 000 held over in Treasury in trust for 1981-82. That accounts for the \$93 000. The additional \$194 000 is a 4 per cent increase in allocation in line with normal contingency increases.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The figure given in the Auditor-General's Report for the same period for which we have been supplied with figures for the department is \$890 000, yet the figure before the Committee is \$935 000. Does the Minister say that this is because there is a difference in the accounting years; that is, there is a calendar year base for the community welfare grants funding whereas the Auditor-General uses the financial year with which Parliament is more familiar? Is that why there is a discrepancy in the two funds?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I expect that that is why there is a discrepancy between the Auditor-General's figures and those in the Budget. For many years the Community Welfare Grants Fund has been paid out and operated on a calendar basis from 1 January to 31 December, whereas the Budget documents are prepared on a financial year basis. There has been a substantial increase for 1981-82 in the Community Welfare Grants Fund. The figures continue to be distorted because of the difference between the financial year used for Government purposes and the calendar year used for the purposes of actual disbursement of the fund and the fact that it is necessary to ensure that the client organisations, that is, the voluntary agencies, receive their on-going funding on that basis.

Mr Beattie: Because there was a large increase in funding in 1980-81, when a large number of new projects was approved, the funding had to be carried over from one calendar year to the next and from one financial year to the next. The figures are distorted because of the progress of some of those projects.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Director-General will give the exact reconciliation of those figures.

Mr Cox: Fees for members are shown in the Programme Estimates at \$5 700. This includes some of the terminal

leave, workers compensation and salaries payouts that are not included in the other report. Therefore, there is a difference in the figures. One set of figures refers to the grants figure and the other refers to the grants programme. The exact figures are as follows: fees, Community Welfare Grants Committee, \$4 985; fees, Community Welfare Advisory Committee, \$8 130; welfare grants, \$889 823; terminal leave payments, \$498; workers compensation, \$119; salaries, \$31 611, making a total of \$935 166.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am relieved to find that we can get an accurate answer, and we ought to be able to, because the Auditor-General does not invent the figures that he puts in the report. They are supplied by the department. The reason for my question is now obvious: I just wanted to make sure I got the detail of the other matters with which we were concerned. I believe I heard the Minister say this morning that there had been a 40 per cent increase in community welfare grants funding from last year to this year.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No. What I said was that last year, as against the year before, there was that increase.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If one peruses the Auditor-General's Report, one cannot find that 40 per cent increase that has been mentioned. I am referring to the figure given for 1979-80. If one does the necessary mathematics, which I have done, we find that there was a 20 per cent increase on the actual funds. As the Director-General has just pointed out, the figure that appears in the Auditor-General's Report is the exact amount which is disbursed from the grants fund, without the addition of certain charges and so on, that may be apportioned to it. The figures on page 53 of the Auditor-General's Report indicate that there has been only a 20 per cent increase for the last two years. I do not want to make an issue of it, but perhaps the Minister has some additional information that I do not have.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think the Director-General can give the answer for this, but the figures were actually paid and actually allocated.

Mr Cox: In 1979-80, \$697 000; in 1980-81, \$980 000.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: \$890 000?

Mr Cox: No, \$980 000. They were the exact figures.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The allocated figure was \$980 000.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is naughty, because it does not agree with the Auditor-General's Report, and that is going to require some further questioning. The Auditor-General's Report says, 'Grants for welfare activities, sundry grants as recommended by the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee: 1980, \$697 000; 1981, \$890 000,' not \$980 000. Somebody is wrong, and it is usually not the Auditor-General. Perhaps we need to have another look at our figures.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: In 1979-80 expenditure was \$697 000 in the community welfare grants fund; in 1980-81 the allocation was \$980 000, which was the 40 per cent increase that I mentioned. In fact, \$80 000 of that was not spent; this was in relation to ongoing funding being on a financial year basis, and that \$80 000 has been kept in trust by Treasury. This morning, when you were not here, Mr Chairman, a question regarding sick leave was asked by the member for Spence. We have an answer to that. Also, a question was asked by the member for Brighton about information services, and we have an answer to that. Perhaps I could ask the Director-General, with your leave, to give those two answers.

Mr Cox: The question about sick leave was a comparison between this year and last. We have figures for August 1980 and August 1981, but we have not had time to take them out for a full year. In August 1980, 380 officers took 985 days sick leave, and in August 1981, 367 officers took 912 days sick leave. The information services question related to \$84 600 made available for that purpose, and how much was for salaries. In fact, \$59 100 was for salaries and \$25 500 was for contingencies. Those contingencies include amounts spent on pamphlets, children's week publicity, the annual report, and such documents.

Mr ABBOTT: Why did the department back down on its decision to close the welfare office at Oodnadatta? I understand that two Aboriginal welfare workers have volunteered to go there, in the interests of that community, to open a welfare office in that town. To whom will those two persons be responsible? Does the State Government pay their salary or is it paid by the Commonwealth?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There was no question of backing down. Earlier this year two D.C.W. officers and two community welfare workers were in Oodnadatta. Even then, a remarkably small population was being served. No population in South Australia as small had been served by two community welfare workers. We do recognise, of course, that most of the population was Aboriginal. Many people have forgotten, and it should be said, that I think it was in 1972, after the Federal referendum, that the decision was made to hand over the responsibility for the Aboriginal people to the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Department for Aboriginal Affairs. Prior to that, the Department for Community Welfare in South Australia had also been specifically responsible for Aboriginal affairs. During the period following 1972, that was phased out fairly rapidly and I believe that the final date for change was 30 June 1979.

Since that time the Department for Community Welfare has had no responsibility whatever for Aboriginal affairs as such. I know it has been difficult for many people in the area and others to accept and understand that previously we had been responsible, and we had had officers who were still officers of the department who had been in charge of some of the missions, such as Amata, and so on, who are still working for us, but they are working for us simply as community welfare officers. What I think has not been appreciated by all people is that that change did happen as a result of the Federal referendum, that it is a change in responsibility for the Aboriginal people as such and their development (and this is the most important thing and one with which I very much agree), and the change of responsibility was made to the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Department for Aboriginal Affairs.

The responsibility of my department is for the delivery of welfare services, and the delivery of welfare services is to all of the people in the State. This is certainly an area of responsibility which I will not abdicate. People in some regional areas, including some of the Aboriginal people, asked us to give them the money so that they could look

after themselves. That is a sort of apartheid situation which I will not tolerate. I am responsible to the Parliament and, through the Parliament, to the people of South Australia for the delivery of welfare services to all of the people in this State, whether they are Aboriginal people, whether they are native-born South Australian people of other origin, whether they are ethnic people, or whatever, whether they are in Ceduna, Oodnadatta, Coober Pedy, Mount Gambier, or Adelaide.

I acknowledge that the Aboriginal people have their own special needs, and this has been very much addressed by the department, and that the ethnic people and various other groups have their own special needs. However, the situation in Oodnadatta was that there was no way of justifying keeping the two D.C.W. officers, two community welfare workers, in Oodnadatta even earlier this year with such a small population.

The population did decrease with the railway situation, and so on. It was mainly the white population that left. There was no way of justifying keeping that office open. The department decided to close the office, as such, and to run it as a branch office from Coober Pedy. Previously, the main way in which the department serviced the north-west reserve was from Alice Springs. We have decided that a more efficient way of servicing the whole of that northern and north-western area was to progressively close the Alice Springs office, which we intend to do; to strengthen the Coober Pedy Office; to close the Oodnadatta office; and to service the various people, white and Aboriginal (and most of them are Aboriginal in that area) from the Coober Pedy office. In future, the north-west reserve will be serviced from the Coober Pedy office, and the Oodnadatta office will be serviced from the Coober Pedy office. We do recognise the need to provide a high level of services at Oodnadatta, with an experienced welfare officer.

Officers who had been resident there previously had been relatively junior. The promise that I gave to the people of Oodnadatta is that they will be serviced from Coober Pedy by an experienced welfare officer, one who will have a knowledge of the needs of the Aboriginal people. In about the middle of this year, and in the presence of yourself, Mr Chairman, I went to Oodnadatta, very shortly after the announcement was made about the closure of the office, and had a meeting with the Aboriginal people there. No real objections were raised. Questions were asked about how the community could be serviced. Certainly, some of the Aboriginal people had difficulty in expressing themselves at that meeting. I offered to meet them afterwards, which I did. To the best of my knowledge and ability, I tried to do that and it was accepted. I think that my assessment of the meeting would be that there were regrets expressed, as there are always regrets expressed when some service is closed, but it was acknowledged that the disabilities that they were worried about were going to be met.

There are, I think, six half-time Aboriginal community welfare aides (I am not sure what the term used is) available from Commonwealth funding in South Australia. Two of them had been made available in Oodnadatta. The question addressed by the member for Spence can be answered by saying that there are federally funded persons available to help the Aboriginal people, and they are Aboriginal people themselves, in Oodnadatta. The Deputy Director-General, Mr Harris, can give more detail about that.

Mr Harris: In addition to the two liaison officers federally funded whom the Minister has mentioned, there is an additional homemaker who is funded through the family support services programme, making, in all, three workers funded through funds available to our department in addition to those funded directly through the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs. We have given a clear under-

taking, as the Minister mentioned, to provide a regular service from Coober Pedy, and the undertaking is that this should be on a not less than fortnightly basis.

Additional to that, the member for Spence mentioned that two officers from within the department had, because of their association with the area, offered to go up and serve in that area for a time—not as departmental representatives, but to work directly with the community, to help the community understand referral procedures, how to use the resources available to them, and how to make contact with the various departments and organisations that they need to contact. Those representatives would be going up there in a capacity working directly to the Aboriginal community and arranging and helping that community to understand the supporting services and resources that can be made available to them. A visiting service from Coober Pedy will continue, nonetheless. It is likely that those two officers will be funded from Commonwealth funds for the time that they are there, because they are working directly to that community and are not working for the department in providing services. Our main welfare services will continue to be provided through Coober Pedy.

Mr ABBOTT: Will those two Aboriginal welfare workers be replaced within the Department for Community Welfare? How many Aboriginal welfare workers employed in the department are Commonwealth funded and how many are State funded? Why is Mr Rathman (and I am not sure what position he holds within the department, but I think he is the Chief Adviser on Aboriginal matters) being transferred to the Department of Further Education next Monday? Is that because he has been too outspoken on Aboriginal matters? Why are his services no longer required by the department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Director-General to answer those questions, because they are in detail relating to the staff of the department.

Mr Cox: In terms of the Aboriginal community workers on the staff there are 25.5 (which means they include a part-timer), of which 16.5 are permanent and nine are temporary. Their salaries are paid by the Commonwealth. There are Aboriginal workers who have become community welfare workers in the department. I do not have a figure for that, but I can get it for the Committee. Mr Rathman was approached by the Director-General of Further Education to take over an education component of Aboriginal education in the Department of Further Education. It was an approach that we did not know of. We left it to Mr Rathman to resolve whether or not he wished to take that position. My information only two days ago was that he was not going to take it. He told me that he wished to stay with us, and I agreed to that. It is a promotion position, and gives him the opportunity of being head of a big branch in the Department of Further Education, so it is a promotion. Mr Rathman is a competent operator. The present position is for three months and is temporary. We are reluctant to lose him, because of his competence, but I believe that for the Aboriginal people to get opportunities for senior positions is really tremendous so far as the Public Service is concerned.

Mr ABBOTT: Was he a member of the task force committee?

Mr Cox: He is a member of the task force committee.

Mr ABBOTT: Into the future of Aboriginal welfare.

Mr Cox: Into Aboriginal welfare services in the department, where we are planning for the next period of time. You seem more up to date than I in relation to his going. We have not been finally told that he is starting there, or when he is starting. It is obvious that he has made you aware that he is going. We then have to consider who

should replace him on the task force for that period of time.

Mr ABBOTT: I turn now to the youth work caravan. Will the Minister explain the success or otherwise of the social workers' plan to work with young people in Hindley Street from a caravan. I understand that some problems arose in relation to the parking of the caravan, but social workers were expected to continue their work without a base. Has the scheme been successful? Has it got off the ground, and how many social workers are employed on that scheme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The scheme has long since ceased to operate from a caravan. It has operated for some time from an office in Hindley Street. There has been a neighbourhood youth worker employed there for quite some time, I think for more than 12 months, and we have also been able to obtain assistance elsewhere in this scheme to give support to young people who frequent Hindley Street during the day and at night-time. We had very considerable financial support from the Adelaide City Council, for which I am very appreciative, and also other general support. I have met the neighbourhood youth worker on many occasions and I am most impressed with him. I have been with him in Hindley Street looking at the work he is doing and the work he has been able to set up through this other organisation which has been formed and which the City Council is involved in. He has been able to set up an office and he has voluntary and paid assistance there, and from the office he is able to give support to the young people who frequent Hindley Street. The amusement parlours or the pinball parlours that operate in Hindley Street are obviously a concern and something that must be looked at. Generally speaking the feedback that I have received is that they have not been observed to be harmful.

However, some time ago I set up an inter-departmental working party between the Department of Community Welfare, my other department of Public and Consumer Affairs (because that department licenses places of public entertainment which includes amusement centres), the police, and observers from the City Council. That working party has been working very hard, but has not finally reported. The main thing is that the operation in Hindley Street, which has long since ceased to function from a caravan, but which functions from an office, is alive and well and working very successfully. I ask Mr Cox whether he can report further on that in detail.

Mr Cox: The Hindley Street project has been an outstanding success in terms of the contact it is making with young people, and we are doing a thorough evaluation of it because it is one of those projects that, whilst it can count the heads that are going to the drop-in centre, one must then start to see what is really happening to the people coming in with problems. There has been a significant number of referrals to the district offices and other welfare agencies, and there are reports about its first year of operation. It was decided to fully support it for a second year because of its success, and I would think that if a report was required there are statistics that might interest the member for Spence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Dr Billard): I would indicate to the member for Spence that in his last question he branched into a new subject. As there are other members waiting to ask questions after the next question from the member for Spence I will call another member.

Mr ABBOTT: I want to refer to another area, so I will not ask a question at this stage.

Mr RANDALL: I am faced also with a difficulty as a new addition to the Committee, as I do not know whether questions that I intend to ask have already been asked; however, I am sure my attention will be drawn to the fact

if I do. I refer to page 60 in book 11 of the Programme Estimates concerning the area of pre-school and associated services. I also refer to the large book, volume 2 of the Programme Estimates at page 338. What is the definition of 'pre-school'; are we talking about two, three, four, or five year olds?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes.

Mr RANDALL: We are talking about two year olds to five year olds?

Mr Cox: There is an addition when there are after-school activities, when we are then talking about young people who are at primary school who need after-school hours care; there are two groups.

Mr RANDALL: I refer to page 60 and to the community-based play groups mentioned there. I assume that they are play groups which cater for pre-school children, that is, two year olds or three year olds. What is the definition there?

Mr Cox: There are pre-school and associated activities. At Norwood and Mansfield Park there are other school activities for primary school children and some children under the age of five. Therefore, there is a mixture of child care programmes in that line. Play groups and child care centres are usually at an integrated centre, funded by the Childhood Services Council, and the Department for Community Welfare is the vehicle for ensuring their management.

Mr RANDALL: So, the programme shows that under the Minister's care and control is a sum allocated from elsewhere, from the Childhood Services Council?

Mr Cox: Yes.

Mr RANDALL: Which is federally funded?

Mr Cox: Partly Federal and partly State.

Mr RANDALL: How could one find out how much the State puts in?

Mr Cox: That information is contained in the Education Department's line in its Budget estimates.

Mr RANDALL: I noticed that the member for Spence made quite good gains in this area; having questioned the Minister of Education yesterday, he was able to question the Minister of Community Welfare on a similar matter today and get an interesting answer. The difficulty arises when one asks the Minister one day for directions and then follows it through on the next day's activities as far as funding is concerned. The problem that members face is co-ordinating and getting programmes together between Ministries.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I shall just comment on those remarks. The Childhood Services Council which has been in existence for some time involves the three Ministries of Education, Health, and Welfare together with a separate organisation. It is partly State funded and partly Commonwealth funded, and the whole question does arise whether there ought to be a separate organisation such as that or whether the three Ministries concerned could handle the matter themselves. I believe that the member for Henley Beach has raised a legitimate question in regard to the whole matter of the Childhood Services Council.

Mr RANDALL: I understand that the Childhood Services Council is under the control of three Ministries; however, I gained the impression that only the Minister of Education provides the State funding for the council. Is that a correct impression?

Mr Cox: The funding goes straight from Treasury to the Childhood Services Council, which is an integrated body of senior officers who make recommendations about how it is to be spent. The approvals go to the Minister of Education, unless they cross Ministerial boundaries. We apply to the Childhood Services Council for funds for some of the projects we are involved in. The department is the chief provider of family day care services in the State. That scheme is

funded directly and the Commonwealth funds us 100 per cent for that. There are preschool and associated services, which appear on the list. Some State money and some Commonwealth money is involved in each of those programmes, but I cannot give the exact proportions. We attempted to establish integrated programmes, because both health and education was involved. I hope that that clarifies the situation.

Mr PLUNKETT: What expansion has occurred in the number and role of day care centres under the department's responsibility? The Minister would be aware that this was one of the election promises.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask Mr Cox to answer that question.

Mr Cox: We have two responsibilities in relation to the day care centres that we are involved in. First, the department is the licensing authority for private child care centres. That is our first responsibility. All private child care centres are licensed by the department in conjunction with other professions in the area. Secondly, we are involved with day care centres where there has been an integrated programme, and the list in this regard is provided on page 60 of the Programme Estimates. The honourable member will see that they are associated with resource centres and inter-departmental co-operation. We are involved in day care centres only when there is a health and education integrated centre. Our third function is where subsidised care is needed, where people cannot afford to place children in day care without a subsidy to help them. The subsidy is worked out on a needs basis.

Mr PLUNKETT: Has the Minister had any consultation with the Council on the Ageing, the trade unions, employers, or educational institutions to ensure the provision of comprehensive counselling services in relation to preparation for retirement? How many voluntary agencies have been established to provide those services? This was also an election promise.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I believe that most of that consultation has been undertaken through the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. There has been consultation in that area to ascertain whether trade unions are prepared to take part in providing counselling for people who are to retire. My department has a continuing interest in this matter, but I believe that it has been mainly through the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment that those consultations have been held.

Mr ABBOTT: I have received a number of approaches about the future of the infirmary for the aged at the Magill Home for the elderly. I appreciate that this home comes under the Health Commission. However, promises were made to upgrade those premises. There are strong rumours that this centre will be transferred to Windana. The claim is that the Government is not honouring the commitment that it made. I understand that some of the wards, for example the Atkinson ward, are empty at present. The infirmary is the Queen Mary Ward. The facilities are not good. Has the department any plans to complete the undertaking that was given?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: In the first place, I made no promise about the Magill Home. Secondly, it should be understood that the previous Government conducted a study in relation to the upgrading of Magill Home. This study commenced in 1972, and the previous Government did not do a great deal about the situation. At present, the department is fully aware of the need to resolve the critical accommodation problems at Magill Home. The Minister of Health and I have discussed the issues and discussions have also taken place between senior executive staff of the Health Commission and of my department. There have also been discussions with the Commonwealth Department for

Health. My department is attempting to ensure that the best possible infirmary care (and this is the important point) is developed for Magill Home residents as soon as possible.

To ensure that this occurs, a full investigation of alternative forms of care must be considered before any commitment is made to rebuild on the property. This matter is particularly important in times of financial constraint. The important thing is that people at the Magill Home are in hostel care or in infirmary care, which is really hospital care. The really important thing is to ensure that people who need infirmary care at the Magill Home can get it. Nothing else is really important.

The original building programme for Magill Home placed emphasis on hostel accommodation. From the time the plan was developed to the present time it was considered that there were sufficient infirmary beds in South Australia. The new demand at Magill Home for infirmary beds requires a major change to the building programme. Funds were not allocated for this purpose when the Public Works Standing Committee approved the master plan in 1977 and, in fact, requirements of the plan have undergone major changes. This requires further approval and consideration, and, because of the considerable expense involved, alternatives must be considered fully. My departments is investigating alternatives to building additional infirmary wards at the Magill Home.

Two of the wards require redevelopment to provide an adequate physical and social environment for residents and to meet the standards of the Commonwealth Department for Health. One of these wards will need to be demolished and a new ward will have to be built. The other ward requires major redevelopment. It has been estimated that, by the time this work is completed, almost \$2 000 000 will be required.

Taking into account redesigning and rebuilding, the project is likely to take up to at least two years to complete, if approval is given by the Public Works Standing Committee for its construction. The estimate for the construction of two infirmary wards was about \$1 200 000. The Public Buildings Department estimated that the cost for Atkinson Ward alone would be \$600 000, as at September 1980, and that minor alterations to Jellicoe Ward would cost about \$100 000.

The minor alterations to Jellicoe Ward are unlikely to have met the required standards, and it is thought that this will require a complete rebuilding task. The \$2 000 000 estimate is increased by the rate of 1 per cent inflation per month, and the amount includes site works and demolition to other wards. There was no provision for an administrative block or respite beds in this proposal. The actual cost of the hostel recently completed was \$444 000, and an infirmary ward would be far more complicated and complex in the equipment and facilities necessary and, therefore, more costly.

A further alternative which has been considered is the development of a completely new building with sufficient infirmary beds, and the demolition of Atkinson and Jellicoe Wards. Possibly, this would be cheaper than the renovation of the two existing wards and would be considered as an option. It should be noted that all costs given are estimates—some from the Public Buildings Department, some departmental—and they are not firm quotes. The latter could only be provided when the matters have reached a final drafting stage and are available for quotation when more accurate figures could be provided.

In the light of the likely cost of the alterations or of the rebuilding programme, it seems unreasonable to continue the development of these proposals at a considerable cost to the State while other alternative infirmary accommodation is available. The alternative accommodation has been

upgraded and is likely to meet Commonwealth Health Department requirements with minimal additional costs. What is needed is infirmary care for the residents at Magill Home who have been in hostel care and need infirmary care. Where that is provided is not really important: the important thing is that they get the infirmary care that they need. I do accept that the Government has that responsibility. The Government clearly has a responsibility to house the indigent aged who have nowhere else to go. They are being cared for in hostel care at Magill Home. When they need to transfer to infirmary care it is important that they can get that care, but where it happens, I suggest, is not important. I am, as I have said, undertaking consultations with my colleague the Minister of Health at the present time as to how that infirmary care can be provided. One possibility is Windana. Another possibility which is being investigated—

Mr ABBOTT: I raise a point of order. I move that the Ministerial statement be inserted in *Hansard* without the Minister's reading it.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am not reading it.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not sustained.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I was not in any event reading it, so there is no way it can be inserted. The important thing is that infirmary care should be available to the indigent aged who are housed at the Magill Home. One possibility would be Windana. Another possibility would be one which, as I was just saying before I was so rudely interrupted, I have been discussing with the Minister of Health, that is, that residents at Magill who need infirmary care could be assessed by the Royal Adelaide Hospital with a view to a guarantee being given to me—which I would require—that they could be housed in appropriate infirmary care, and that is virtually hospital care.

The honourable member for Spencer referred earlier to the parts of Magill Home which are vacant. The parts which are not used are empty rooms. They are not hospitals, and they are not infirmaries, so that the alternatives for the Government are a very substantial upgrading of the infirmary accommodation at Magill Home or to provide for the residents of Magill who need infirmary care elsewhere. It does not seem to me to matter very much where they are cared for as long as they are properly cared for. I give the undertaking that they will be properly cared for, and the we will not renege from that obligation.

When some preliminary sort of arrangement has been arrived at between myself and the Minister of Health, when we have some idea where we are going—which we do not have at present—I also undertake to consult with the relevant parties. I think they mainly are the residents—they are the people who are most concerned. I would also at that time consult with the unions, although as long as the residents are going to be cared for properly I do not think it is so much their concern. While I do not know—and this is the case at present—what all the alternatives are, and therefore what alternatives can be looked at, there is no way that I can consult.

Mr ABBOTT: I thank the Minister for that long and detailed answer. It is our wish that we conclude the community welfare lines by 6 p.m. However, that is entirely in the Minister's hands. It depends on how long he takes to reply to our questions. I would like now to turn to the question of homeless young people. I understand that in the Government's plan to assist homeless young people five houses it owns will be sold, or hopefully will be sold, so that the money can be spent on 12 smaller homes for use by homeless young people. Two of those homes are Kumanka and a double-storey house at Fullarton (I understand that is the Fullarton cottages). Which of the other three are being sold, and are they also being used by

squatters at this time? What role will the Department of Community Welfare play in this programme, and how many staff are presently being trained for agencies willing to run accommodation for homeless people.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The member for Spencer suggested the five D.C.W. properties would be sold. I suppose in a sense that is accurate, except that we do not own the properties any more.

Mr ABBOTT: You made the statement.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I made the statement, but the statement that I made was that the properties had been transferred to the Housing Trust, so they are not any longer D.C.W. properties. I made the statement and made a clear statement on what the situation was. There are five properties. The two major ones were Kumanka and Fullarton. I will ask the Director-General to refer to the others in a moment. First, Kumanka, which possibly has been one of the most controversial of them, had been to provide hostel accommodation for young adolescent boys with problems, and quite some time ago it ceased to become appropriate to use it for that purpose.

We first sought to use the property for another purpose, namely, as a western regional office, for which consent was refused by the City Council. Secondly, we sought to use it for the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, which falls within my responsibility, but consent for that land use was rejected by the City Council. Further, we sought to use it for Red Cross independent living, which was also rejected. It was indicated to me and also by letter from the City Council that no change of land use would be consented to, apart from the purpose of a private residence. So, there was no way that we could use it usefully.

It is well known that squatters, as mentioned by the member for Spence, moved into the property some time ago. It is clear that the Naomi Shelter has been using Kumanka without the department's consent as an annexe to its own shelter. In fact, invitations were issued to members of Parliament, probably including the member for Spence and myself, to attend a tea party there, which clearly indicated that that was the purpose for which they were using it.

We did not plan to use Kumanka as a women's shelter. When we made inquiries there were vacancies in other women's shelters, but, had we sought approval, I am certain that it would have been denied, because it was made quite clear by the City Council that the only changed land use to which it would agree would be as a private residence. We had these five properties (Kumanka, the one in Fullarton, and the other three to which the Director-General will refer shortly), which we could not use for suitable departmental purposes. The sensible thing to do seemed to be what we did some month or so ago: transfer the properties to the Housing Trust, which will sell them and use the proceeds to provide 12 homes in which homeless youth can be accommodated.

We will ask private agencies to supervise the homes in which homeless youth will be accommodated. We will provide them with funds to enable them to supervise those homes. It is intended, and I think all members would agree that it is desirable, that homeless youth should be accommodated, so far as is possible, in minimally supervised accommodation of this category. The arrangement is that in each home two university students will be invited to supervise the houses and live there rent free in return for carrying out that service, and four homeless youths will have to pay a minimum amount, of perhaps \$5 a week, for electricity and various outgoings.

So, the total scheme was to take five properties that we could not use for any legal purpose, be it women's shelters or anything else, in accordance with our charter as a depart-

ment, and while we are not a housing authority, we could usefully make these premises available so that homes could be purchased to accommodate homeless youth. It is anticipated that, from the proceeds of these properties when they are sold by the Housing Trust, 12 properties will be available. The Housing Trust has been most generous and will not wait until the properties have been sold and funds are received before it makes the 12 properties available. In fact, eight properties will be made available shortly. We have made arrangements to have them supervised by a voluntary agency and to make appropriate arrangements to fund that agency. That is the general nature of the scheme. I call on the Director-General, Mr Cox, to refer to the other properties.

Mr Cox: Other properties outside Kumanka and Fullarton were an admission unit at St Peters, which we have stopped using, and the Seaford unit, at Seaford. There is also a property about which there is some hitch in title in terms of transfer; that is the ex-superintendent's home at Magill which is outside the property there, and which is no longer needed. A road closure is involved there. The move from the larger established properties was because of emphasis on young offenders, the inception of the Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme. The other emphasis has been on emergency foster care, run by Seventh Day Adventists. A multiplicity of reasons has caused these properties to become available, and the possibility of using that money for housing young people is one of our targets.

Mr ABBOTT: I understand that emergency accommodation will be offered for up to three months. What will happen after that when young homeless people have no permanent accommodation to move into? The 12 new houses to be administered by the Port Adelaide Central Mission on behalf of the Government will be in the western suburbs. What financial assistance, if any, will be made available to the mission for this purpose, and will any extra staff be required by the mission to conduct that programme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Three months was suggested because, as I said, D.C.W. is not a housing authority; we are not obliged, nor is it any part of our function, to provide permanent housing. We indicate by the three months period that we expect homeless youths in that time to find somewhere else to go. The Housing Trust certainly will help them, as we will, as much as we can. The member for Spence correctly said that the homes would be in the western suburbs. Initially, there will be eight out of the 12, and it is only those eight in which we have involved the Port Adelaide Mission. We are keeping the other four up our sleeves, as it were, to consider where they should best go. We will fund the Port Adelaide Mission to the extent of \$10 000 for supervision and \$10 000 for provision of furniture.

Mr CRAFTER: I seek information from the Minister about the department's policies regarding housing. The Minister said earlier today that the Department for Community Welfare was not a housing authority, but he would be well aware of the many statements emanating from the Housing Trust stating that it is not a welfare department. That is a continual reply that I receive from the Housing Trust. In fact, the Annual Report of the Housing Trust devotes quite a bit of time to talking about welfare related matters, and in the section of the report that refers to responses to a changing social market, the report states:

The trust is increasingly aware of the changing housing needs of various disadvantaged groups in the community, such as the aged, lone-parents, the handicapped, homeless youth and other low-income households. Large tract developments of new rental housing on low-cost land in the metropolitan fringes are not the most appropriate way to meet the housing needs of many who seek public housing assistance. The house may satisfy the urgent need

of shelter but, in certain cases, can involve the tenant in financial and social costs in terms of distance from family, employment, public transport, health care, etc.

The report goes on to talk about some of those needs, in particular, the priority housing assistance and the Emergency Housing Office, which is involved very much in welfare areas of counselling in the Emergency Housing Office, of financial assistance, and in the priority housing area, where in fact there is reference made to the role of social workers in reaching those decisions by the trust. I would be interested to know from the Minister whether there are any plans or formal liaison with the Housing Trust or other housing authorities, bearing in mind that the Budget Advice Service, as has been referred to in the reports of the Department for Community Welfare, has a lot of its work involved in housing related matters, and whether there is some liaison about the problems associated with shelter in the community.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The member for Norwood has correctly stated that I said earlier that we are not a housing authority, and neither we are. There is close co-operation between the Department of Housing, the Minister of Housing and me. The Emergency Housing Office has already been mentioned. The relationship between the district offices and the Housing Trust and the Emergency Housing Office initiated from our department. There is indeed a close co-operation, and I referred earlier to the co-operation that is needed in the area of human services which I specify as being mainly education, health and welfare, but certainly in areas of housing, and I mentioned that there were other areas when I spoke.

In the matter of welfare housing, there is indeed a need for co-operation between my department, the Housing Trust, and the Minister of housing, and that has been happening very much indeed and very successfully. I think probably one of the most successful areas has been in regard to housing co-operatives and the Minister of Housing announced publicly some time ago a policy of housing co-operatives, as they have operated in Victoria and in some parts of the United States, and the one which has been mentioned mainly, and which is in operation at the present time, is one being run in conjunction with the Women's Shelters Association. There is another under way in regard to homeless youths. We have acknowledged very much indeed the area of co-operation there. I have had, in regard to those matters and others, a number of conversations with the Minister of Housing, and we seem to have been closely together in these matters recently.

In regard to the matters raised by the member for Norwood in relation to housing co-operatives, questions such as this have arisen. He referred to social worker assistance in those places, and in the conversations the Minister of Housing brought to my notice that, with housing co-operatives, often the rent collector for the Housing Trust is landed with all the welfare problems. The tenants will not come to us, and when the rent collector calls at the house he is saddled with all the problems. The resident will not go to the nearest district office, and certainly not to the central office. We have talked about that, and we have addressed it and we are working out a way of overcoming it, and that is by presenting a staff training programme for the rent collectors involved in that area in the Housing Trust.

We do recognise the matters raised by the member for Norwood. First, I must reiterate that we are not a housing agency and we cannot provide houses, but I also acknowledge that in the welfare housing area there is necessarily an area of co-operation between housing and ourselves, and it is no good just putting people in welfare housing; their welfare problems will continue. As just one way of overcoming that, we are working on a training programme for

the Housing Trust officers who are to be involved with the people in the housing co-operatives. Mr Cox may wish to expand on this.

Mr CRAFTER: I asked whether there are any formal relationships between departments providing services to those in need of shelter, and the Minister has explained that there is at Ministerial level some consultation. It seems evident that in the last two years there has been a devolution of responsibility from the Department for Community Welfare to the Minister of Industrial Relations with respect to the youth housing inquiry and the follow-up from that, and the Department for Community Welfare housing stock for the Housing Trust and youth housing programme, with the Emergency Housing Office going under the umbrella of the Housing Trust and the rent collectors becoming the social workers, and so on. It seems that in the problem of welfare housing, housing is the minor factor and welfare is most important, and the Housing Trust report states that welfare problems are not solved simply by providing housing; the Housing Trust seems to be saying that loudly and clearly.

I have an example in my own district where, as the Minister knows from correspondence, I have written asking for financial assistance so that the Lutheran City Mission, which provides emergency family accommodation, can stay open. Initially it applied for funds under the Community Welfare Grants Committee. It asked whether help would be available from that source and was told that it would not be eligible. The mission representatives saw the Minister, who encouraged them to apply; they did and were refused. I am not sure whether that was because of criteria or no money. Now they have reapplied this year under encouragement from us both. The Lutheran Church is about to close down its hostel. It has been close to closing down previously. It has received no financial assistance from any public authority; it has tried to get Commonwealth assistance, but that has not been forthcoming. Last year it housed 500 people, the great majority of whom were referred by the Department for Community Welfare.

Once again, it seems that there is no response forthcoming by way of support to that institution which is providing housing. It is my concern that the welfare department is moving further away from facing up to the housing crisis that is very much a part of the decline of living standards of people in the community, for those reasons I have referred to earlier.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think, with respect, that the member for Norwood is quite wrong in saying that there has been any devolution or that the Department for Community Welfare has resiled from any activity that it had before. He referred to the emergency Housing Office. That never was in the D.C.W. at any time; it was always with the Housing Trust. He referred to the Youth Bureau: that never was with the Department for Community Welfare; it was with the Department for Community Development. The main thing to say is that I have acknowledged (and I have acknowledged this all day and will continue to do so until 6 o'clock, I suppose) that there does need to be co-operation between education, health and welfare, in part housing in part industrial affairs and other departments that are providing some form of human service.

I have indicated, as the honourable member acknowledged in regard to housing co-operatives, that there is such co-operation and that it is going on. Regarding the project run by the Lutheran Church which the honourable member mentioned, that involved the Community Welfare Grants Funds. I do not know about the matter in detail, but I do know that they were out of time with their application. If their application is properly made in time in the current financial year, it will doubtless be considered.

Mr RANDALL: I refer to the community childhood services group. Will the Minister refer to his Director the question of duplication of services, because, when one looks at the figures, as the Director pointed out earlier, for after school and pre-school programmes, one sees similar sorts of programmes being budgeted for and being programmed in the Education Department under the same programme sector of early childhood? Where do communication and assessment of duplication take place?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Director-General can certainly reply to that in a moment. I would like to refer back to an answer I gave to the member for Henley Beach, that possibly there is some unnecessary duplication in the Childhood Services Council and that perhaps that could be avoided through taking some other way of carrying out the services which it provides. I ask the Director-General to give the detailed answer.

Mr Cox: I think that there may be some misunderstanding. There are joint projects where the Department of Community Welfare, Education Department, and Health Commission are doing a project together, so in those cases there is no duplication. As I understand it, the Childhood Services Council has a project committee which studies the indicators of various districts, the services available, and then makes a decision whether or not to support a programme. That has been going on ever since the Childhood Services Council was established. There are some areas where the population has changed during that period and there could be some excess services in those situations, but they would be the only duplications because the Commonwealth, which is funding it, is very careful about the criteria of where funds go and the sorts of indicator from the community as to its needs. Therefore, the possibility of duplication may be with private care centres going the same as State ones, but even those are few and far between.

Mr RANDALL: It was indicated earlier that we have this programme sector called 'Early Childhood' for which I think the Director said that funding came from Treasury. Turning to its books and programmes, where does one see that sort of programme funding? Surely there must be some programmes funded out and clearly shown. The yellow book indicates that there is a programme called 'Early Childhood', but the amount of money put into 'early childhood services' is difficult to find.

Mr Cox: I am not in Treasury, so I cannot find out which line it is in, but I would expect that the Childhood Services Council programmes would identify the information that the honourable member wants. I have not checked that, but that is where I think it will be. I will get it checked for the Committee.

Mr MATHWIN: I turn to Programme Estimates, book 11, at page 11, and the reference to residential care. This deals with the provision of secure residential care. There is also mention of care and sustenance of the child, and the education and trade workshop. I presume that means that there is a section that educates and deals with people from the Education Department. Do all inmates get educational instruction? How are the records and statistics maintained by that department kept? Are those statistics a complete record of a young person, showing medical problems, the way in which treatment has been given and his general record?

There is also a reference to post-release supervision, where contact is maintained with the child. What is the case load of the people performing that duty? When young people are being assessed to go out into the Intensive Neighbourhood Care schemes, which are mentioned on page 12, it is stated that the offenders are placed with families who have to be recruited and trained. Who assesses whom in that case?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Deputy Director-General, Mr Harris, in whose special field of expertise this matter falls, to answer that question. It may be that he has missed some parts of the question, because it was fairly lengthy. If he does so, perhaps the honourable member can repeat those questions he has missed.

Mr Harris: In relation to educational programmes at SATAC at Magill, they have a wide range of youths, including older ones, not all of whom would be involved necessarily in educational programmes; it would depend on their interest and willingness. However, if they are under 15 years of age they would be required to attend educational programmes for part of the day and workshop or work skill activities for another part of the day.

At SAYRAC at Enfield there is a remand and assessment centre. The children who go there tend to be there for a shorter time, and an education project centre there provides educational assessment and support to the young people. Here again, the majority would attend school at some stage during the day, but they do not all attend the full school day, and the time that they are in SAYRAC varies considerably from short-term remand to some who are there on detention and who would be more involved in school programmes.

Assessment does not always involve a medical assessment unless that is thought absolutely necessary. However, where issues are either brought up in assessment prior to a court order for detention, or where it is subsequently noticed that there is a need for medical attention or medical follow-up, such issues are followed up within the detention centres or, alternatively, if a child is placed in the community, the issues are followed up by district office staff within the community.

With regard to the INC scheme, the supervision and support of INC parents in the community is the responsibility of the supervisors of young offenders, and there is one of those in almost all regions—not all regions, because the central/eastern region has a smaller number and is dealt with by other regions. Generally INC parents are selected by a group comprising staff from the district office to supervise young offenders and other people from the general psychological and consultative sections of the department. The support continues on a local basis through the local district office.

The case load of those people varies, because there are about 80 INC parents in the community and, as the Minister mentioned, the number with any one family would be relatively small, and the number in any one programme operated by a district office would tend to be small. In some country districts, of course, it would be a very small number, so the case load generally would be small, but it varies from time to time. In some locations, perhaps in the central/northern region, they have to deal with more offenders, and the central/western region, for example, would have higher numbers requiring general community support.

Mr MATHWIN: With regard to the training of families and to the question of placement with a family, who assesses that situation?

Mr Cox: The assessment is usually done at or about the time of the court appearance. Some offenders would be placed with INC parents for a remand period, usually as part of a court order or with the knowledge of the court. Others may be placed with a family subsequently, and that would be part of the recommendation made to the court and on the basis of assessment by the assessment officers and other staff working within the regional structures.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to page 12 of the Programme Estimates: under 'Treatment of the child' the comment is made 'To review the treatment, progress, suitability of

placement.' What alternatives do we have to choose from? The explanation of the procedure is that the child or the youth is interviewed; then there is liaison with and guidance of parents, and support families are mentioned, and so on. Does the victim ever come into the situation, being given some help and advice by the department, or is the victim entirely left out?

Most successful schemes I have seen operating involving the placing of young people in the community to their advantage have always included the victim. There is a two-way benefit: there is benefit for the young offender in many ways, and it has a certain distinctive benefit for the victim. Does the department include the victim in any of these situations?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I refer that question to the Deputy Director-General.

Mr Cox: The Victims of Crime Committee reported on a number of these issued, and one concerned restitution or making good to victims. It was thought that restitution was only desirable where the victim was willing to become involved with the offender, or offenders, as the case may be. We have had cases where an attempt has been made by a panel, or sometimes by the court, to suggest restitution but where this has not been wanted by the victim. However, where it is wanted, and where the victim is willing for this to happen, it does occur. The assessment of a youth placed under supervision is the responsibility of the district officer and of the senior staff, as well as the supervising officer. There is a monitoring programme both in detention centres and outside, because the position regarding each youth on a bond must be reviewed by a review board (or a review panel as the new term will be under the amendment legislation) at least once every six months. The terms of supervision that need to apply to those who are under supervision or who are under detention orders are usually determined by the training centre review board, which operates under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, and this relates to both training centres.

Mr MATHWIN: Who makes the decision whether to include the victim? Is it the department's officers, the court, or both?

Mr Cox: It can be part of a court order if the court chooses to make that type of order. It usually would be done with some knowledge of what the victim wishes in relation to the child. If the decision was made by a panel, it would only be by consultation with the victim, with the victim's full agreement that a restitution attempt would be made.

Mr MATHWIN: I was not dealing with restitution: I was referring more to the inclusion of the victim in some of the areas in which the offender is involved in repaying his debt to society, whether it is gardening or whatever it is that he is doing. I was not referring to restitution which may be a nasty word to some people, although not to me. I would not like to try to push the restitution question too far.

Mr Cox: If the victim approaches us for help, we will give him all the help that we can. If it is a question of the offender working with the victim subsequently, that should be done only with the full consent of the victim.

Mr ABBOTT: I understand that two or three years ago the department was attempting to find a formula for the allocation of emergency financial assistance. Can the Minister advise the Committee whether such a scheme has been devised and, if so, can he give us details? On my calculations the amount proposed for emergency financial assistance represents a cut in real terms on the amount actually paid in 1980-81 for this purpose. Since the employment situation in this State is still very grave and not expected to improve, this will mean that an increasing number of people can be expected to require emergency financial assistance. In view

of that, does the Minister believe that the sum proposed for this year is reasonable and realistic, and can he say whether further funds will be made available during the year if the demand makes this necessary?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am not quite sure whether this was what the honourable member alluded to, but guidelines for applications for financial assistance have been in force for some time. We are still using the same guidelines. At present, we are considering the feasibility of varying those guidelines to make them more specific, to take away what is, I suppose, bureaucratic discretion, and to make it more cut and dried where people are entitled to financial assistance.

The sum proposed provides for a 4 per cent increase in the sum actually spent last year, and that is a standard 4 per cent increase for contingencies. Last year, the sum allocated was \$420 000 and during the year a further sum of \$80 000 was provided. However, only \$57 000 of that sum was spent. Regarding the amount actually spent, the amount this financial year, \$497 200, amounts to an increase.

The figure used was the 4 per cent contingency allowance, and we expect that that will be sufficient because, if one considers the last c.p.i. figure, one sees that the increase for all groups was 5.2 per cent. However, the increase for food was considerably less, namely, 4.3 per cent. In fact, about 75 per cent of emergency financial assistance is provided for food. Therefore, there is every reason to suppose that the sum voted will be adequate.

The allocation of the total sum between regions has been determined according to the social indicators. Last year, the figure was based on the previous year's figure. There was a specific agreement that Treasury would provide further funds if it became necessary. I made that undertaking at that time, and that action was taken. A further \$80 000 was provided, as the demand appeared to be there, but, in fact, only \$57 000 of that sum was spent.

This year, a specific attempt has been made to identify and quantify the need. This was discussed with the Budget Review Committee. I, the Government, and the Budget Review Committee believe that the sum provided will meet the need. If it does not, and if it transpires that we are wrong and that we have not taken into account the right factors, I would certainly be prepared to make a further application. I believe that the Director-General can add to the remarks I have made.

Mr Cox: I was not quite sure that the matter of the social indicators that we used to allocate the sum to various districts was understood. It seems that the member for Spence wants more information about that. Last year, we looked at the total allocation of emergency financial assistance and tried to find a way to use our social indicators for a good distribution so that it was fair throughout the State.

In terms of emergency financial assistance, we took the people who received Commonwealth benefits in proportion to the way in which they are disbursed over the districts, because they are the people most in need. We have been able to distribute emergency financial assistance by that method. Some district offices would receive complaints that the assistance has reduced a little, and that is because we are using an allocated model rather than the method that was used last year. I hope that information is of assistance if members are approached.

Mr ABBOTT: The Premier is to make a speech tonight to the Financial Executive Institute of Australia. He will say that there will be further pruning of the Public Service. Will the Minister's portfolio be one of the areas to suffer and, if so, where? No doubt this matter was discussed in Cabinet and, as the Minister is a member of that Cabinet,

I ask whether any further cuts will occur in the Department of Community Welfare and what areas will suffer.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would like to spend some time in answering that question, to spin time out, but the answer is 'No'.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Regarding the allocation for young offenders and children at risk (page 11 of the Programme Estimates), will the Minister explain what is involved and what details are recorded? At the bottom of the page, above the tabulated columns, there is reference to the activities that take place in relation to secure type care, and one is 'Oversight and administration of the centre's operation records.' What kind of records are kept? I am thinking in terms of inmates. How useful are the records?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am sure that the Deputy Director-General can answer that question in detail, because the records that are kept are very important. They are kept up to date and they are kept confidential.

Mr Harris: The basic type of records that are kept at the centres relate initially to the court orders that have brought the child to the centre in detention. They relate to any assessment panel reports that have been prepared and any additional reports that might have been done by medical, psychological or psychiatric professionals. They would also indicate the general programme after initial further limited assessment within the centre to see what direction and what sort of programmes are best suited to the youth that can be applied within the centre to which he has gone.

Records are kept to report before review boards. These usually contain information about the child's family and the desirability or otherwise of the child returning to the family or to other community placements. Generally, there is a basic record of the child, the orders made to get the child into the centre, the types of assessment made in relation to the child, and the on-going progress reports that are prepared within the centre.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister say whether the content of those records is available to the child or to the parents?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Deputy Director-General will answer that question.

Mr Harris: That information is not necessarily made available, but parents or other relatives, when approached, are invited to attend the review board discussions and participate in the discussions about the child's returning to the community and the appropriate time for that. There are some details in the record that may be regarded as confidential to the child in some cases. The total record would not necessarily be accessible to parents.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: For how long are those records kept? Are they destroyed after a given period?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Deputy Director-General will answer that question.

Mr Harris: The records tend to be retained for a period after the youth turns 18 years of age by requirement of the archives. We keep a certain percentage of the records, and the rest are destroyed after the specified period, but I cannot remember precisely whether that period is five years or seven years.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: How long are the records retained, and what actually happens to them in specific detail?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: As the honourable member requires precise and further detail, and as the Deputy Director-General, who is the person most *au fait* with this aspect of our activities, does not have the exact detail, I am quite prepared to see that that is provided in appropriate form for insertion in *Hansard*.

Mr CRAFTER: Do the three regional youth workers positions which have been cut from the department refer to the Neighbourhood Youth Work Scheme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Director-General, Mr Cox, to answer that question. It is mainly a difference in name between the various officers, a question of consultants, on the one hand, or neighbourhood youth workers who have been retained.

Mr Cox: The decision that the three regional youth workers should not be continued was made to keep a State youth worker who will act as the policy person for our department in liaison with the Youth Bureau and other organisations in the State. In many areas we suggested at certain stages when the programmes were initiated that some of the consultants might not be necessary once we got the programmes under way. The Neighbourhood Youth Network has got something like 12 people working straight to district officers, and there is no need now for some of the types of work done by regional youth workers. The regional youth workers have performed a first-class task in creative work over a period, but it seemed that in priority order to give service we should not keep the consultant role, particularly if we could keep the field staff.

Mr CRAFTER: Perhaps so that the Opposition could make an assessment on the worth of these people's work, although I do not expect the Minister to give this information now, could the Minister ascertain who were the officers who were not being replaced? What were their duties? What regions were they working in, and why were they placed in those particular regions? What contact did they have with volunteers and community groups?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I doubt whether the names would be relevant, but the other answers I am prepared to provide in the proper form.

Mr ABBOTT: Under 'Centralised facilities and services', I note that the amount allocated for Crisis Care this year will be about the same as the amount spent last year. In view of the rising rate of unemployment, associated problems of family break-down, domestic disputes and the rising incidence of crime, does the Minister believe this to be a reasonable and realistic allocation for the Crisis Care service? I would also like to know how many calls Crisis Centre received last year? How did that compare with the year before? Has there been any change in the number of staff providing that service?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think the member for Newland asked a similar question earlier.

Mr ABBOTT: It was similar, but it was not exactly the same.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It was not precisely the same, but it related to the number of calls and the number of direct contacts. I think what the member for Newland was indicating was that there had been less. It seems to me that the member for Spence is suggesting that the total calls on Crisis Care would be greater. Our assessment has been that which we have given to it in the Budget. I do not think that the calls on it will be less. You cannot just take the figures of telephone contacts, and you cannot just take the figures of direct contacts. I indicated before that you can have quite a short contact with a client who rings Crisis Centre or a very long contact. It does not seem to me that the problems associated with unemployment and the social problems generally are increasing. I think, perhaps, this has been a mistake that has been made. The problems have been fairly steady for the last two or three years. I do not mean the figures necessarily, but the problems have been fairly steady for the last two or three years. I do not see the problems which Crisis Care deals with as increasing. Certainly, this Budget intends to maintain their staff.

I have made the comment before that their staff is intended to be topped up from other areas of the department where any of that staff is on long service leave or anything of that kind. We do not see the need as increasing. We see it as one which is to be maintained. That is exactly what we aim to do. I think that the Director-General can add somewhat to that answer.

Mr Cox: The situation is that the vote was \$300 000, and the actual expenditure was \$396 000. Included in that \$396 000 is the replacement we have made right throughout the year for sick leave, extended leave and all those sorts of things that have happened in that area. In actual fact, we transferred staff into Crisis Care so that we do not leave them at all under their 19 staff. It is one of those areas that we want to keep fully staffed. The proposed budget of \$400 000 this year is \$100 000 up on what was voted last year, and we would be continuing the practice of making sure it is fully staffed this year. So, there is a possibility that the actual would be higher at the end of this year, and the department has to cope with that. The increase is \$100 000 this year on last year, and we hope it will incorporate some of the sick leave and extended leave that has happened in the past.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In Parliamentary Paper 9 (page 95), the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme is listed under 'Centralised Facilities and Services'. I do not really quarrel with that, except to say that it would seem to me that it might more properly have appeared under 'Miscellaneous'. It is a scheme that certainly does not belong exclusively to South Australia: it is a world-wide scheme. In effect, it would surely fall outside what normally might be grouped as a centralised service available through the departmental structure, as it were. Was any thought given to that?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would have thought that the honourable member would be aware of the funding arrangements for the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme which have applied for some time. It has been Government-funded for a long time, probably since it was initiated in Australia. I think it was originally funded through the National Fitness Scheme. When that no longer was appropriate it was decided that it should still be funded. The previous Government decided, quite properly I think, that as appropriate a department as any through which to fund it was the Department of Community Welfare. That applied to the previous Government, and it applies now. I might say that I am very happy that this has applied, because I think the scheme is a very good one, and I have enjoyed working with the staff of the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme. But the previous Government undertook to go on funding the scheme. I think, it is correctly accounted for in central funds rather than regional funds, because you cannot assess how it will happen across the regions.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Committee that Mr Randall has been replaced by Mr Mathwin. Are there any questions?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think the Minister was in the process of responding to a question I had raised with him.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I had completed the answer. It was in relation to the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and as to whether it was placed in the main line or the Miscellaneous line. The Director-General, Mr Cox, has the exact answer to that.

Mr Cox: The situation is that it is a function of the department and not a function of grants; therefore, it has to be in the centralised line in the recurrent expenditure. It has salaries and contingencies, the same as other items, whereas the Miscellaneous lines are money that is given out to community groups.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As ever, on the ball and accurate.

Mr BECKER: I refer to page 28 of book 2 in relation to issues and trends, the increased formalisation of adoption of children from overseas countries; the increases in the number of handicapped babies and older children for adoption; and the increase in requests from people involved in past adoptions for contact and information about their children or the parents. How is the activity in relation to adoption of children from overseas countries progressing and are there any problems? Also, has there been any success with the programme for the increase in the number of handicapped babies and older children for adoption?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The figures in regard to the countries from which children have been adopted are as follows: from India, a total of five in the last 12 months; Indonesia, 17; Korea, 9; Malaysia, 1; Nepal, 2; Sri Lanka, 15; Taiwan, 4; and Thailand, 1; a total of 54. This has been a very delicate area, because the guidelines for inter-country adoption are easier than are those for intra-country adoption, in particular those for adoption of South Australian children. The guidelines in regard to the number of children, the age of the parents, and those kinds of thing are less stringent.

Many people have wanted inter-country adoption, and this involves problems with the other countries concerned. A country from which we are trying to obtain children for inter-country adoption can readily see it as child stealing. We have to make quite sure that we have the approval of the countries concerned. We have to make sure that the agencies we use are accredited and proper agencies. There have been some countries, including at least one of those from which we have received children, where there have been established cases of buying children, not into Australia, but into European countries, so this is an area where we have to be very careful. We have to operate very carefully with the other States, and I think South Australia has perhaps again been a leader in setting up the proper guidelines. Our department has been consulted for help by other States in setting up the proper guidelines.

I have certainly been very satisfied with the progress of inter-country adoptions. Some of the visits I have made, even into country areas, have revealed that there are areas, the Riverland being one, where there has been quite a large number of inter-country adoptions and the parents and the children saw me. They seem to be very happy with what is happening. This is a delicate area and one which needs careful attention, but I think it is proceeding very well at the present time. I would ask the Director-General, Mr Cox, if he would like to comment further on that and also on the other question raised by the honourable member, particularly in regard to the handicapped children.

Mr Cox: The inter-country adoption process has always been very complicated. We have been seeking agreements with other countries in relation to it. Two months ago there was an international conference where South Australia led the way in relation to what was being attempted in Australia. In South Australia we had Mr Peter Fopp, who was our Director of Special Services. He designed the agreements and how to go about it in every State in Australia, and he led the way. Our method of doing this has given some of the Governments in other countries some security to know that we are not just taking their babies without due regard to their systems.

South Australia is known throughout Australia as being an area where we have offered reasonable treatment in relation to this. There are sometimes delays in assessments, about which adoptive families are not very happy, because of the priority, I suppose, they would like us to give it, but in general the system works well.

The evidence of people who have adopted is that they are very successful in handling the cultural problems, of which there are many for children of this nature. The children tend to get a lot of attention from the community, as well as from the parents, and this has its own set of problems in relation to the child's growing up. The inter-country situation is one which has been handled carefully. We still have much to do. The bureaucracies, if you like, in some other countries are very difficult. We have just had a visitor who has been to India. The files for the children are handled in the street, with people sitting on forms. They take the top file, so the problem is to make sure that your file is always near the top. There is a real problem in becoming an adoptive parent. The problems are great. It is related: we feel the pressure we put on them when we try to press for more adoptions and at a faster rate, because of the problems they have.

In the handicapped area a report has just been released from our department in which we have given special attention to handicapped children being adopted in the last 12 months, and it has been quite successful. I have not got those figures, but there has been a real effort to ensure that handicapped and older children are adopted. We have been identifying children who have been in foster care for quite a period of time. We have reviewed the cases and tried to ensure that they have some basis for support that is secure. That has been something we have done in the last 12 months. I have not got the figures here. The Minister has not yet seen the report, but I would be quite willing for the Minister to decide whether he would hand that on.

Mr BECKER: I would appreciate at some time in the future receiving that, because I would be interested to see how that programme is working. I think it is very important that we look at all children available for adoption, irrespective of their disability. It is certainly a worthwhile programme if we can have them placed in homes with parents who are prepared to give them the care and attention they deserve.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I refer to programme performance documents, page 21, the programme title being 'Services for women (N.E.C.)', which I presume is 'not elsewhere counted'. I doubt whether the ladies would be very happy about those brackets, but I understand the reason for it. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that in the employment levels specified for the coming financial year, as occurred in the previous year, two persons are specified. As the sub-programme titles are 'Equal opportunity for Women Clients' and, 'Equal opportunity for Women's Staff', are those two employment levels of average full-time equivalents of two persons females?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The answer to the question is 'Yes'. I think the more general question to which the Minister referred is that I have been most concerned, as I am sure previous Ministers have, at the small number of women in the department who reach executive level or decision-making level. I think that about 58 per cent of our field staff, our operative social workers, are women, but very few are on the executive. I think there are three at present and (one of those is in an acting capacity), in an executive of about 16 or 17. The difficulty has been that it has often been hard to motivate women to seek the necessary qualifications or experience, first of all to go through to apply for the position of district officer.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Who wrote that last sentence—a man?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No, I said that it has been difficult. Nobody can dispute that because we have tried very hard indeed to motivate women to apply for the position of district officer, or some other position which would get them to a position where they could operate at the

executive level. It has been terribly difficult. The main thing has been that they do not want to, and there is nothing from a man's point of view about this; it is a plain matter of fact. Many of them no doubt are married, with families and with husbands whom they regard as being the main bread-winners, and they are happy to operate as a social worker at a base grade level, or something a little above that. We have had great difficulty in motivating them to apply for the position, to even ask to be district officers or somewhere else where they could operate at executive level. We have found it difficult to motivate them in the past to obtain the necessary qualifications and experience.

The honourable member may recall that earlier this year I called, on a national basis, a women and welfare conference in South Australia, a large part of which was devoted towards this very question. We have read the report of the conference and are acting on it as well as we may. I am pleased to say that there has been a staff survey conducted recently within the department trying to motivate women to gain the qualifications and experience that will enable them to become district officers or otherwise to get to a decision-making level. This appears to be most successful. It does appear that we will be able to encourage more women to reach decision-making levels.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I notice also on the same page under the programme title 'Services for Women', the activity lines towards the bottom, extension of links with the office of Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and the collection of data on the nature and extent of complaints. This is in reference to the advocacy services for women staff, and I wonder whether the Minister could amplify a little on those two brief statements in the activity area.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There has been that opportunity extended that members may have links with the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. Of course, her role is related to complaints and, unless people complain to her that they have not received equal opportunity in some way or another, there is nothing she can do about it.

I would mention that since I became Minister—this was in train previously—we have appointed a Women's Adviser and there has been communication between her and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. I would ask the Director-General, Mr Cox, if he can expand on what I have said.

Mr Cox: This programme relates a great deal to the activities of the Women's Adviser. She is on the executive because of the nature of the position and has been able to add an incredible dimension in relation to the women's problems as far as welfare is concerned. In terms of advocacy she does have access to very senior people in the department (she is a very senior person herself), but because she is available, the women do talk about issues that relate to them personally, some of their fears in relation to the work they do with clients, some of the ways in which they feel that they may not be getting a fair go in terms of interviews, reviews, and those sorts of aspects of the department, and she has initiated many programmes. One of the programmes at the moment is that all our staff will be interviewed to find out just the sort of things they wish to do and their ambitions, and so on, and that includes every woman, and they have been part of designing the questionnaire. We have given a focus on this because of the nature of our clients, having so many single parents who need support, and we need to have a better understanding of them, and because of the nature of our staffing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Glazbrook): There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister for Community Welfare, Miscellaneous,
\$17 864 000

Acting Chairman:
Mr R. E. Glazbrook

Members:
Mr R. K. Abbott
Mr H. Becker
Dr B. Billard
Mr G. J. Crafter
Mr J. Mathwin
The Hon. R. G. Payne
Mr K. H. Plunkett

Witness:
The Hon. J. C. Burdett, Minister of Community Welfare
and Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:
Mr I. S. Cox, Director-General, Department for Community Welfare.

Mr W. H. Beattie, Director, Resource Services Division,
Department for Community Welfare.

Mr G. R. Billett, Senior Finance Office, Department for
Community Welfare.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed
expenditure open for examination.

Mr ABBOTT: Under the heading 'Miscellaneous' there
is provision for a \$759 000 grant to women's shelters. This
is approximately 10 per cent more than the amount of
actual payments for this purpose last year, and is consistent
with the Government's promise to maintain last year's levels
of spending, plus 10 per cent. However, it is not clear from
the Budget papers whether this includes the extra funding
which the State Government has had to provide this year
since the Federal Government abrogated its responsibility
in this area. Can the Minister say whether provision for this
extra funding is included in the proposed spending for this
year?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes, the arrangement which
previously applied with the Commonwealth was that, in
regard to on-going funding, the Commonwealth supplied 75
per cent and the State Government 25 per cent. In regard
to capital expenditure, it was 50/50. The Commonwealth
announced that, with the changed method of funding, the
amount of money which it had included in the total reim-
bursement from tax moneys to the State, and not as a tied
grant, was the amount which it had provided previously,
plus 10 per cent.

The State really has no way of checking that. We have
accepted the fact that that was included. We have matched
the figure so that the total amount includes the State
matching figure with the amount that the Commonwealth
Government says that it has included in the total amount
paid to the State. The net result is that the total amount
available to women's shelters is what was available last year
plus 10 per cent. This is pleasing, because it is an area of
need, and the addition of 10 per cent is greater than appears
in other places in the Budget. I think that that is desirable.

Mr ABBOTT: In reply to a question asked recently in
the Legislative Council, the Minister said that the allocation
of funds for women's shelters would be decided by the
department on the basis of the claims made by the shelters
and after discussion with the Women's Shelters Advisory
Committee. He went on to say that some shelters may
receive the same sum as last year, or more, and some may

receive less. Will the Minister say what factors will deter-
mine the level of funding for each shelter and whether
those allocations have now been determined; and, if so, will
he give details?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The allocations have not yet been
determined. They will be determined on the same basis as
they have been in previous years. There is a finite amount
to be divided between the various shelters. I think, broadly
speaking, that it would be true to say that it will be a
question of need between the shelters, a question of what
the shelters are doing to support themselves, and things of
that kind. There is one cake, the total amount of which
appears in the Budget papers, and that has, as in the past,
to be divided between the various shelters.

Mr ABBOTT: The other matter I wish to refer to under
the 'Miscellaneous' line is citizens centres. It is noted that
this does not include senior citizens' centres but merely
states 'citizens centres'. The proposed allocation is \$529 000.
This was previously shown in the Minister of Health's
miscellaneous special grants area, but, nowhere can I find
the actual payment for 1980-81. Can the Minister provide
that information?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That is the amount of payments
to senior citizens centres in 1980-81. That had previously
been dealt with under health and has been excised from
the health line. Initially Treasury failed to give it to us, but
we now have established that that oversight has been rec-
tified and that we will receive (and this does not appear in
the Budget documents before us) the necessary additional
sum. Possibly, the Director-General can elaborate on that.

Mr Cox: The agreement for us to take over the senior
citizens club area relates to the work that we do in the
community with the aged and not necessarily institutions.
We made that first move, because we have community
welfare centres in the local community that can support
them. Secondly, the funding is on a triennium basis from
the Commonwealth, and we are in the middle of a triennium
where there has been agreement for a certain amount of
money to be spent each year. The \$529 000 shown here is
Commonwealth money. There is about \$37 000 of State
money not appearing on the Budget line but which will now
be added to that sum. There have been numerous approvals
given for welfare officers to work with senior citizens' clubs
which we are going to follow up this year. We are preparing
for the new triennium, so that the exact amount spent last
year is similar to what is being spent this year, and the
State matches it for certain parts of the programme.

Mr ABBOTT: It seems from those answers that senior
citizens are going to be much better off in South Australia.
What extensions have been made by the Department of
Community Welfare to existing schemes initiated by senior
citizens to provide educational and recreational facilities
for themselves? This was one of the Minister's election
promises, and I would like to know whether it has been
fulfilled at this stage.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It has not been fulfilled at this
stage, partly because we have not hitherto had the funding.
It is part of our election promise to be fulfilled during our
term of office, and that we certainly intend to do.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You've got about eight months
to go, from what I hear—May next year.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable
member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: I notice that the Budget allocation of
\$653 000 for women's shelters was exceeded last year by
\$37 000. Can the Minister inform the Committee why it
was exceeded by that amount and who received the addi-
tional money?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: At this stage, I do not think I
can inform the honourable member of that. If I can obtain

the figures on that matter for him and provide them in suitable form so that they may be incorporated, I will do so.

Mr BECKER: I know that there have been suggestions of problems in the past with the handling of finances by some of the women's shelters. I would not put them all in that category because I know that there are one or two excellent ones; certainly, the Para Women's Shelter, I think it is called, is a first-class shelter. What progress has been made in assisting the people who run the shelters to supervise their activities to ensure that they are run on a sound financial management footing?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The services of the department, particularly through the Women's Adviser Mary Corich, who is the main point of contact with the women's shelters, are always available to the shelters if they wish to use them. As suggested by the member for Hanson, some women's shelters are very co-operative and do avail themselves of that service. There are others which take an independent stance (that is their right as long as they comply with our requirements) and which are not amenable to suggestions to help them with regard to their management problems. I think the answer is that with regard to our funding we do expect and insist upon (and do eventually receive) proper accounting from all of the shelters.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Quarterly or half-yearly?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Quarterly, I think. There are some problems. Not only the member for Mitchell but the member for Hanson also has correctly assessed that there are some problems. There are some shelters with which we have difficulty in extracting proper accounting, and we acknowledge that. All of the shelters fulfil a need. We do the best that we can to insist on a proper accounting and we do not make the next payment until we get it.

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister tell the Committee how many women's shelters there now are in South Australia and give us the general locations, although I realise that for certain reasons certain locations are kept confidential. Has there been an increase in the number of women's shelters, and can the Minister comment on the problem that has been highlighted in the press recently concerning squatters at North Adelaide?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There are 11 women's shelters, three of which are in the country at Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Mount Gambier, and the rest are in the metropolitan area. The premises at Mount Gambier unfortunately were burnt down about a month or so ago, and the department has been able to relocate the shelter. The honourable member referred to the matter of Kumanka to which I referred earlier today, perhaps when the honourable member was out of the room. What happened there (and this has been in the press several times) was that a number of women squatted in the premises which at that time belonged to the department and, as I mentioned earlier, the premises had been previously used as hostel accommodation for youths with problems. It became unsuitable to continue that operation. The department had several difficulties in obtaining consent from the City Council for change of land use.

We applied to use the property as the central western regional office, for the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, and for the Red Cross Independent Living Scheme. They were all rejected, and it was made very clear to us by the council (in fact, there was a letter that categorically stated this) that the only form of land use that would be approved would be personal residential use. At the time when those women squatted at Kumanka, the department made inquiries and found that there were vacancies in some women's shelters. A women's shelter was not a purpose that the Government wanted to use the property for, anyway, but it is quite clear from correspondence and other contacts

that we have had with the City Council that had we applied for that land use the request would not have been acceded to. So, there was no legal way that it could have been used as a women's shelter, in any event. Initially, the Naomi Women's Shelter denied any sort of part in the squatting, but later it became very clear that Kumanka was being used as an annexe to the Naomi Women's Shelter.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think it was very highly supported.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It was very clear that it was an annexe, because of course the Naomi Women's Shelter issued a formal invitation to some members of Parliament and to other people to attend a garden party, and they made quite clear that they were responsible for it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You were there helping women—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am just trying to answer the question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that both interjections and the answering of interjections are out of order. The Minister is replying to the member for Hanson.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That is just what I was endeavouring to do. I have outlined before what has happened in regard to Kumanka: because we could not get consent to land use for any suitable purpose of the department in regard to both that property and other properties, we transferred those properties, and Kumanka no longer belongs to us. We transferred those properties to the Housing Trust (which I announced at the time) on the swap and sell scheme, as we called it. Those properties will be sold by the Housing Trust and the funds used to provide 12 homes for homeless youths under a scheme which I outlined earlier today, which I think I need not outline again.

Mr ABBOTT: I have a further question before I conclude my questioning on senior citizens issues. An electoral promise was also made by the Minister that programmes designed to maintain senior citizens independent of institutions would also be extended. I ask the Minister, what development has occurred in that particular area?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do not think any further development has occurred in this area, but as I said before election promises are to be carried out during the term of office of a Government and that matter is certainly being looked at.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to the line 'Capital subsidies to non-government children's homes' for which a contingent amount of \$30 000 has been provided. Can the Minister tell me what this subsidy is and which homes are included in this scheme?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: First, the grant is an increase of approximately 4 per cent, which has been the general contingencies increase. The grants are made on the advice of an advisory committee which administers this fund to various children's homes, including shelters, the Adelaide Youth Shelter, the Norwood Youth Shelter, the St Joseph Refuge, and quite a number of other similar homes run by independent organisations. I do not have the complete list of homes which are funded.

Mr MATHWIN: I will place that question on notice.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The honourable member has been kind enough to place the question on notice, so we will deal with it in that way.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to the line 'Grants to non-government children's and youth homes', the expenditure on which amounts to over \$1 000 000. Could I have some further information on that line? I was wondering whether the Government is taking into consideration the advantages of housing offenders, in particular in institutions that are non-profit making. As the Minister would be well aware,

this is happening in a number of other countries, particularly in the United States, in Massachusetts, and in Provinces of Canada, where the cost of housing these young people is very small. Indeed, in Winnipeg, young people are housed in secure institutions at \$50 a head per week, which is not bad when one realises what we are paying. In Boston, Massachusetts, it was about \$100 a head when I was there about 18 months ago. I was wondering whether the Government was extending its operations in this area into selected non-profit making organisations.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: So far, in regard to young offender (if that is what the honourable member is talking about, and I think he is), we have not proceeded beyond the two secure care centres, SATAC and SAYRAC. There is a special mental health scheme and there are other ways of looking after young offenders. We had looked, and still are looking, very carefully, at the member's report of his study tour, both in this regard and in other respects. We are examining the feasibility of his suggestion. I am not entirely sure that it would be satisfactory in the present set-up in South Australia to invite non-profit-making organisations to undertake the secure care of young offenders, but the member's report in this regard and all other respects certainly was very worth-while and gave us a lot to think about. We are examining it.

Mr CRAFTER: Regarding rates and taxes concessions for pensioners and other people on low incomes, particularly local government rate subsidies, the concession is based on a percentage of the total rates levied against the property owned by the pensioner. However, there is a cut-off level at \$150, which is the maximum amount which can be paid. It is my experience that that cut-off point unduly harms many people. I realise that there must be a cut-off level at some stage, but that level of \$150 has not increased since the inception of the scheme. Rates have increased quite considerably.

In my district there have been recent revaluations of properties, and rates have increased by up to \$90 for a family home. There is no incentive for people to remain in their own homes as long as they possibly can. This cut-off point of \$150 leaves a large gap of perhaps one-quarter or one-third of the total amount payable. Is the Government considering this matter, and does it propose to index that sum of \$150?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Government is always looking at the appropriate sum. As the member acknowledged, there must be a cut-off point. I will ask the Director-General to expand on this point.

Mr Cox: This matter has been considered again this year. In affluent areas, 60 per cent of rates would exceed \$150; however, in most areas of need up until last year, it was still below the maximum of \$150. The commonwealth scheme has been under review for the past two or three years and we have been considering which way it should go, but no decisions have been taken. Very few people were receiving the top rebate in the past couple of years.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I understand that the transport concession card or certificate for the unemployed applies for three months. Supposedly, if a person finds employment at the beginning of a month, for instance, the concession card can still be used for the remaining period. Is this the case?

The HON. R. G. PAYNE: If you look at the back of the card, you will find that they are trying to cut that down.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I am just asking the question. What action is the department taking to check that, and to see that there is less abuse of the system?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It will be 'death or such other punishment', which should agree with your feelings in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections and cross talk across the Chamber are of no benefit to the committee.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I ask the Director-General to answer that question.

Mr Cox: We have considered this matter as to the number of people who obtain the passes, for how long the passes apply, the most appropriate duration, and how to reduce the amount of bookwork that has to be dealt with in issuing about 100 000 concession cards in any year. We must balance those factors. The length of unemployment might be of exceptional extended duration. I am sure that people use the concession card for the first few weeks of unemployment in getting a job. People usually expect that the period of unemployment will not continue.

We have tried to balance the factors in the light of the immense amount of clerical work that is related to the issuing of the cards. The issuing of cards on a monthly basis was beyond the capacity of the officers. That is where the situation stands. We are constantly reviewing the matter, because we are aware that some people use the cards for longer than they should. We have some idea of these things, and how to prevent them is a different matter.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Is there any possibility of the department working in conjunction with the State Transport Authority? I ask this question because many of the driver-operators, from the Oaklands station particularly, have told me that they have noticed a number of people using those passes at 6 a.m. or 6.30 a.m., obviously, on their way to work. The operators are quite upset about that kind of abuse of the system, yet they feel that they do not have the authority to take action.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I take the member's point, but I believe it is fairly obvious that the authority could not be given to a bus driver to inquire in that regard. A problem we have found in regard to these concessions is that, while I do not believe that the total number of unemployed people has increased very much, a greater percentage of people are experiencing long-term unemployment than was the case previously.

When people are first unemployed, they do not apply for a card. They do not want to do that. They do not want to use such a card, and they hope they will gain employment. When they do not gain employment, they have to apply for a concession card. In 1979-1980, 57 867 travel concession cards were issued; in 1980-1981, 109 271 were issued. That is the effect of long-term unemployment. I take the member's point, and I believe that this matter was alluded to by way of interjection by the member for Mitchell about the fact that abuses can occur. We are aware of that.

However, the important thing is to ensure that unemployed people or those who are otherwise entitled to travel concessions cards are supplied with them. It is more important to see that those people obtain the cards than to prevent abuses. We should do what we can to prevent abuses, but with respect to the member for Brighton, I believe that to enable a bus driver to set himself up as an arbiter of the question of whether or not a person is entitled to a concession card is not really practical.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: They had their go in September 1979. They are not getting another. The Minister will understand what I mean.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes. I do.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that interjection has any relevance to the matter before the committee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In 1980-1981, \$10 000 was allocated for research grants and \$10 000 was actually spent. One is almost tempted to say, 'What marvellous accounting!' An amount of \$10 000 is provided in the contingency line for 1981-1982. On what research project was

the \$10 000 expended in the previous year, and on what is it likely to be expended this year?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The \$10 000 so accurately allowed for in the previous financial year and accurately spent was spent on the research conducted by the Mann inquiry, which I commissioned, into the delivery of welfare services, with particular reference to obtaining the opinions of the clients, the receivers of those services. The expenditure on the Mann Committee itself, its sitting fees, is provided for elsewhere.

Professor Mann approached me at the time and said that he found it necessary to his inquiry to engage contract employees to conduct the surveys, people with suitable qualifications, and because it was an inquiry into the delivery of services by the department with reference to the clients, he felt he would not be satisfied with departmental officers carrying out that research. The only way that I could meet his request (and he had requested more money than this) was in that area, the \$10 000 for research. I gave him the whole lot. That is why there was \$10 000 allocated and \$10 000 spent. I allocated the whole of that amount to that particular inquiry.

Regarding the \$10 000 estimated in this year, I think all members of the House of Assembly in areas where we are conducting surveys have received letters. We have undertaken surveys in a number of different district offices, to examine various aspects where we think further research ought to be undertaken. Most of this \$10 000, which is our estimate, will be absorbed in those areas.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am sure the Minister would not expect me to accept that surveys are being conducted in various areas where it is felt that research ought to be undertaken. I am sure that he would realise that I am at least going to press for a little more information as to which topics are involved.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There are nine small survey projects to be undertaken by district offices and co-ordinated by the Family Research Unit. They concern budget advice, family maintenance, children in foster care, crisis points for social security recipients (two studies into that), refugee families, unattached refugee youth, children's aid panels, and mobile toy libraries. That is set out in the Budget papers, of course.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My final question is directed to you, Sir, as Chairman. Before we depart from the 'Miscellaneous' lines, I seek from you a ruling on capital expenditure in relation to the department we are now considering. Such capital activity that is occurring in relation to this department does not appear under a line in the Estimates papers as such. That is under Community Welfare. It appears under 'Other Government buildings', which, of course, come under another category, but it does have the sub-heading, on page 133, 'Other Government buildings—Community Welfare Department'. I wonder whether we may be permitted to explore, with some reasonable licence, that particular area, and no other, of course, on that particular page.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, the Chair is not responsible for the manner in which these documents are drawn up. Strictly in accordance with the proceedings, the question should have been directed to the Minister of Public Works. However, in view of the fact that we are not actually considering the capital funds in this vote, I am prepared to allow the honourable member to make very brief comments in relation to these matters so that he may seek information about the uses to which the department may be putting certain buildings. I hope the member will be brief and link up his remarks.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I take it that it will be after 'Miscellaneous'.

The CHAIRMAN: No. I will have to allow it during 'Miscellaneous'.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is on page 133. As usual, Sir, you have exemplified the reasons why you are Chairman of one of these Committees, and I am pleased to record that fact. 'Community Welfare—Works in Progress' are stated to be 'the South Australian Youth Training Centre, Magill, upgrading'. There is a further \$311 000 proposed this year. The only question I wish to ask in relation to that is somewhat historical in nature. In my time (and I think I deserve some credit for that, because that is the first time I have said during the whole procedure of the Committee: history is what my previous service was in that area) there were certain proposals for the upgrading of what the member for Glenelg used to call McNally. It is now called the South Australia Youth Training Centre. Have there been any changes in the concept of that time to improve the dormitory accommodation and certain other facilities there in relation to the funding proposed?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The funding proposed for 1981-1982 for the upgrading is \$46 000. I ask the Director-General to comment on that figure and what is being done in the upgrading.

Mr Cox: The figure is \$311 000. The total cost is \$440 000. Money has been spent on the security section. The start of the programme was related to the maximum security section, in which there was a real problem of heat in the cells that were down in that section. Regarding the money that has been spent at the moment, there has been repainting of some of the sections by professional painters. The intention is to develop some of the dormitories into single-bed accommodation, to improve the quality of the toilets and shower recesses, and to upgrade again some of the sorts of community living facilities there. So those are the sorts of programmes for this year.

Mr MATHWIN: That being the case, on the same line I would ask whether there is going to be any upgrading of the educational facilities, where we recently had absconding, which is noted throughout the department as being one of the areas where there is a problem with security. Is it the intention, with some of this \$311 000 to be expended, that the upgrading of security in that particular section is going to be undertaken?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think the question of the educational facilities and security does not relate to the 'Miscellaneous' lines and does not relate to this line. The absconding record from SAYTAC in recent times has been very good indeed, and very much better than it had been in the past. In fact, it has improved enormously.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Solely due to the change of Government, no doubt?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think interjections will assist. The Committee has a considerable amount of work to do.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There was the absconding from the trade school, which I think the member for Glenelg was referring to. That matter has been reported upon to me. I think that some minor changes in procedures are adequate to prevent that from happening again, and that has been implemented.

Mr MATHWIN: Further to that, just let me say that the reason I mentioned the area was to indicate what I was talking about. It was not for any other reason. If that area is to be used, and it would appear to me that that has to be used by the Education Department, because it is ideally—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we should start discussing the Education Department. The Chair has tried to be very tolerant and to allow these particular matters. I do not think I can allow the discussion to broadly go dealing

with matters which are under the control of the Education Department.

Mr MATHWIN: We are going to spend \$311 000 on the line 'Other', which I suppose could be anything; 'Other' is another \$74 000. I would ask the Minister whether any of that money is to be used to upgrade the security in the classrooms in order that those facilities may be used. I am sure the Minister would agree that if we are going to tighten up the security, that is the area where we must do it. Is there any money allocated in those two lines, one of \$311 000 and the other \$74 000, for security in that excellent area, which is hardly being used now at all because of the problem of security?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Part of that \$74 000 would be available for the purpose of upgrading the security, if that were deemed to be necessary, but the question of the abscondings has been looked at. I have received a report. I feel satisfied that different procedures can overcome the problems. I would suggest that, whilst absconding is always a problem, and that, to me, people who are there ought to be remain there, the problem has been minimised in recent years. I can assure the honourable member that, if it is indicated any capital money ought to be spent in the security are at SATAC, then certainly that can be done. The money is available and it can be looked at.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Public and Consumer Affairs, \$8 030 000

Chairman:

Mr G. M. Gunn

Members:

Mr R. K. Abbott
Mr H. Becker
Dr B. Billard
Mr G. J. Crafter
Mr R. E. Glazbrook
Mr J. Mathwin
The Hon. R. G. Payne
Mr K. H. Plunkett

Witness:

The Hon. J. C. Burdett, Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. A. Noblet, Director-General, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

Mr P. F. Young, Deputy Director-General, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

Mr D. Ryan, Acting Chief Management Services Officer, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

Mr P. J. Maynard, Acting Senior Management Services Officer, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

Mr P. W. Kay, Executive Officer, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

Mr CRAFTER: By way of introduction to the questioning on these lines, the Opposition wishes to express its great disappointment that there has been a substantial reduction in expenditure in this area of government activity in this Budget. Our estimates of that reduction in the Consumer Affairs Division is a reduction in real terms of some 3.7 per cent and, as can be seen clearly from the lines, there are quite substantial reductions in not only the consumer

affairs role of the department, but in the work of the Prices Division, and in such other minor but important areas as the work of the Salt Damp Committee, which touches on some 200 000 odd residences in this State.

It is one of the essential functions of government to bring about fair play in the community. Its whole legislative function is to be an arbiter, and it is no more needed than in the market place itself. One of the great advances that was made in this State in the 1970s, one of the things which brought about a change in the quality of life in this State, and it was recognised around this country, was our consumer protection laws and, whilst those laws remain intact, if they are not to be administered at the same level as they were previously, and if there is to be a reduction in funds for that administration, then that lowers the very quality of life that we have in this State.

We know that right throughout the legislative programme of the previous Government the then Opposition hotly contested every piece of consumer legislation brought into this House and, more particularly, in the other place, where quite often it was emasculated. Obviously, the ability of an incoming Liberal Government was an ability to change consumer protection laws. That was clearly evident in so many of the statements made by the then Opposition that it would get out of the way of business; it would let business have a free hand in this State. It is quite alarming to read in the annual report for the year ended 31 December 1980 of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs these words:

Many traders have adopted a deliberately unco-operative stance in relation to investigations by the branch, in some cases to the point of open defiance of legislative requirements. Judging from some of the comments made by such traders it seems that this attitude stems to some extent from the change in Government in this State in September 1979 and the resulting expectation on the part of some traders that this would mean an end to consumer protection of all kinds.

We view with great alarm the difficulties that the Consumer Affairs Division in particular was put in as a result of traders in this State obviously being led to some extent to the point where they really did believe that there would be a dismantling of the consumer protection legislation that was established in this State over the last decade.

This Budget, I suggest to the Committee, begins the slow dismantling of many of those very valuable tools in the hands of the consumers and, indeed, recognised by legitimate business operators in their own interests in the market place. That is expressed in the Commissioner's report when the Commissioner quotes the words of the Federal Treasurer, who states:

It is increasingly accepted as such by responsible business organisations and is an integral part of the present Government's approach to surveillance of market place behaviour.

One would have hoped that this would have been an area of Government activity that would have not been so dastardly hacked by the razor gang. On the other hand, we find that the Public and Consumer Affairs Department is increasing in its function as a revenue earner for the Government. This year it earns an extra \$800 000 in revenue and so, not only is it a Government of user pays, but also of consumer pays, and there is indeed in that function an inherent conflict building up between its function as a revenue earner and that of providing assistance to consumers.

I ask the Minister whether indeed he is satisfied with the total expenditure that he was allocated this year for the activities of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, and if he was not, what actions he took to try to improve that situation.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I am satisfied. I am rather surprised at the line the member for Norwood has taken. He has mentioned the reduction he has calculated at 3.7

per cent in real terms, which is a fairly small reduction. I revert to what I said earlier in regard to the Department for Community Welfare, when the member for Mitchell commented on a cake to be cut, that there is a given amount to go round, which Government has. Both of my departments, I said then and I say again, in my view have borne no more than their share of the reduction. This is not a large reduction, and it does not prevent the department from doing what it ought to do. I was rather surprised to find that the two areas to which the honourable member referred where he said there had been reductions were prices and the Salt Damp Committee.

Mr CRAFTER: And consumer affairs, as well.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I missed the consumer affairs. Consumer affairs is a reduction and that is certainly an important area. In regard to prices, it has been acknowledged as the philosophy of this Government that the Government believes that, wherever possible, prices ought to be fixed in the market place; it is only where market forces are not operating correctly to fix prices that prices do have to be controlled.

With this philosophy, which is the philosophy of the Government which was elected and was part of the policy of the Government at that time, it is not surprising that, in the prices area, there should be a reduction. I have noticed from the United Kingdom that when the Thatcher Government abolished price control, both the Office of Fair Trading and the Consumers Association in the United Kingdom said that they think prices are lower in fact because price control was abolished, because if there is a mechanism for increasing prices there is a temptation to use it, and that has been done, whereas, if there is no mechanism to increase prices, prices should find their own level.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Beer went up twice a year under price control.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: If the honourable member would not mind keeping quiet, I can go on with what I am saying.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Of course, you don't want to hear—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! No further interjections will be tolerated.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do acknowledge that the economy is not the same in the United Kingdom as it is here, that it is a larger economy where there are less monopolies and cartels and other things which prevent the market forces from operating correctly in the market place. Therefore, this Government has made clear that it has no intention of abolishing price control at this time. It is not surprising that we have reduced that area as a Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. The Salt Damp Committee is one of the very minor activities of the department; it is only a committee that has been tucked under the wing of the department. It has done very well and will doubtless continue to do well in the future. Mainly, it has achieved its purpose in educating the home builder and the home owner. Its research has largely been completed. The area in which that has been cut by way of funding has been in the research area. All that we are saying is that we are not funding any more research in that area for the time being.

I think, if I heard him correctly, the honourable member referred to fair trading and then referred to the former Government's policy of consumer protection. We have made very clear, and I think to some extent the honourable member referred to this, that we think that the conception of consumer protection as such is a paternalistic conception, a conception of the Government's holding the consumer's hand, which is not in keeping with the way in which Australians usually want to operate. We prefer to adopt a concept of fair trading—that we try to help the achieving of fairness between the consumer and the supplier.

The honourable member quoted the Commissioner's report, and the Director-General is, in fact, also the Commissioner. He quoted it out of context in some respects, I think. He referred to parts of the report where he talked about occasions where business people are acting improperly, as at times they do. I think that some of the parts of the report which must also be taken into account appear on page 9 under the heading 'The Role of the Commissioner', as follows:

2.1 In recent times it has become apparent that some serious misconceptions have developed regarding the role of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. The expectations of some consumers indicate that he is often seen as a sort of bureaucratic fairy godmother who should be able to solve consumer problems simply by waving a magic wand called 'consumer protection'. Others seem to see the Commissioner more as a charging white knight, who goes about righting wrongs by beating traders into submission; here 'consumer protection' is seen as a flashing sword rather than a magic wand. Still others seem to regard 'consumer protection' as a type of shield that the Commissioner uses to wrap around consumers to protect them from the harsh realities of the modern commercial world.

He goes on to say in paragraph 2.2:

Obviously all these images present a completely wrong picture of the role of the Commissioner and the functions he is required to carry out.

I entirely support the sentiments and philosophies contained in that report if it is read in context. I am satisfied that this is an allocation from a restricted Budget. I have made this clear before and say again that there is no point in the Opposition trying to pretend that it is not a restricted Budget. The Government has made perfectly clear that there is not as much money to go around as it would wish to go around. No department can do everything that it would like to do. But, in the context of that restricted Budget, I am certainly quite satisfied that the amount which has been allocated to this department is fair.

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister, as he did this morning with the cuts in staff in the Community Welfare Department, provide the Committee with a list of the staff cuts in the public and consumer affairs area, which I think the Committee will find helpful when looking at this matter? Will he explain to the Committee where, in fact, those staff reductions are to be made that are referred to on page 72? Some 10.5 positions associated with a reduction in expenditure of about \$55 000 are affected. Will this affect the delivery of services previously supplied by that department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Naturally, I do have a common and frank approach of being prepared to say where the reductions in staff will be made. As with the Department for Community Welfare, so in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs; salaries are a large part of the total departmental budget, and reductions in staff are necessary if an effective reduction in the budget is to be made. The reduction in staff is 15 in this department. It consists of, in the consumer area, five; price control, two; standards maintenance, four; Public Trustee, two; and support services, two. Regarding the consumer area, we are satisfied that with a slightly reduced number of complaints we can cope with that. In the prices area, in view of what I said earlier, I think it is obvious that we can cope with a reduction of two. In standards maintenance there is a reduction of four people: I think that the Standards Branch can still carry out the job which it has to do. The Public Trustee area and support services will not be adversely affected in the delivery to the public of the services they provide.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I wish to ask the Minister a question about policy on deregulation. It has been said, of course, that within the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs there is a great number of regulations, particularly relative to small businesses. What initiatives have been taken or are planned within that department regarding deregulation.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We have taken a great number of initiatives in that area. So far the Appraisers Act and Auctioneers Act have been repealed, although the repeal has not yet come into force for administrative or technical reasons. The Residential Tenancies Act has been completely reviewed and most of the amendments have come into force, and many of them are of a deregulatory nature to strike a fairer balance between the interests of landlords and tenants. The Trading Stamp Act was repealed and replaced by a new Act allowing a much wider range of promotional ventures by businesses. That Act came into operation on 1 July 1981. In fact, the new Act repealed the whole of the Trading Stamp Act except those provisions relating to third party trading stamps.

With regard to the Consumer Credit Act and the Consumer Transactions Act, a provision was inserted giving the credit tribunal power to grant relief from penalties for contravention of or non-compliance with the Acts, and to fix lesser penalties having regard to all relevant circumstances. That is very clear measure of deregulation, because previously the civil penalty was the whole of the payments outstanding, the whole of the credit charges.

By way of regulation and proclamations, under the Consumer Credit Act there has been a substantial increase in title insurance premiums permitted to be passed on to consumers, so that is a matter of deregulation, mainly, that a greater amount was allowed to be passed on to consumers to ensure that this form of insurance continues to be viable to protect credit providers' interests. There was a revision of stipulations relating to advertising of credit and revocation of the prohibition on the use of some expressions in advertising. There was the exemption of American International Incorporated, that is, American Express, from requirements of the Act to ensure that credit facilities of this company continue to be available to card holders in this State to the same extent as in other States. Also, there was a clarification of exemption from definition of 'credit provider' under the Act by removing reference to interest rates on loans advanced.

With regard to the Prices Act, there was substantial revision of price control, including removal of most items from formal price control and establishment of new justification and monitoring procedures. With regard to the Credit Unions Act, there was exemption under section 12 to ensure that all credit unions registered outside the State are able to operate in South Australia without being registered in South Australia. Under the Licensing Act, hotel brokers regulations were revised to facilitate applications for hotel brokers licences.

Under the Consumer Transactions Act, there was an exemption from section 48 and 20 (2) of the Act for businesses when they enter into consumer contracts with other businesses, so that they are dealing with consumers, and a revocation of regulation that from 1 January 1981 would have required travel agents' contracts to comply with section 48 of the Act. Under the Residential Tenancies Act, the period in which security bonds from outside the Adelaide metropolitan area must be lodged with the tribunal was extended to 1 January 1982, and that has been further extended. Under the Builders Licensing Act, power was given to the board to refund part of the licence fee where the licensee dies or ceases business, which power did not apply before. Under the Prices Act, there was a reduction of categories of goods that must be price marked.

Since these amendments further changes have been made or proposed. One is in regard to the Licensing Act concerning the licensing of cinematograph operators. First, that was changed to deregulate these operators in regard to 16 mm operators, but since then 35 mm operators will no longer be required to be licensed, either, and that will get

rid of a further statutory authority, namely, the Licensing Board. The list that I have given did not include several major projects, involving extensive industry consultations that are nearing completion. For example, there is a complete review of the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act which has involved a lot of consultation with industry, and that is nearing completion. There has been a major review of the Land and Business Agents Act. All of these are major initiatives in the area of deregulation.

Mr GLAZBROOK: It has been put to me that there is some concern about the question of accuracy of some of the electronic check-outs in supermarkets and stores which deal with a large volume of goods, where the check-out operators speed through the process of pricing articles. Has the department received any complaints about this, and are safeguards proposed by the Minister's department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do not think the department has received complaints, but certainly we have addressed ourselves to the matter. At the meeting of the Standing Committee of Consumer Affairs Ministers in November 1979, I raised the matter, and a working party was set up. Because I raised the matter, the convenor of the working party was South Australia, and the Victorian and New South Wales Governments, the Standards Association, the Commonwealth Business and Consumer Affairs Department and the National Standards Commission were involved. The problems that arise are these: first, if a proper list—a completely itemised list—is provided for the shopper, the shopper will get more information than he or she gets now, because at present the consumer in a supermarket simply gets a list of figures; there is nothing else; there is no indication of what was purchased.

However, with an electronic check-out system it can be programmed, and in my view ought to be programmed, so that one does get a list which shows things such as a packet of Weeties costing so much and 4 kg of potatoes costing so much. Consumers get much more in the way of information than they get at present. One of the vital things is that if there is only shelf pricing, and not item pricing, there is no guarantee that the price on the shelf is that which in fact comes out through the electronic system. On the other hand, evidence has been given suggesting that the cost of making the computer include item pricing in electronic check-outs is enormous. One major chain in New South Wales estimated that it would cost \$1 000 000 per annum to provide for itemising instead of just shelf pricing. This position has come up quite frequently in the United States. Some States in the U.S. require by law that the supermarket provides, free of charge to the shopper, marking pencils so that they themselves can mark on the items that they have purchased the price that appears on the shelf and they can check later with the list as to whether that was correct.

The American experience was that quite often that system was used in the initial stages by shoppers, but after a few months they did not use it any more. I inquired in the United Kingdom of the consumers association about whether it was concerned about the electronic checkout system, and members of that association indicated that they were not concerned. They said, 'We don't want the Government to do anything about it. The consumers will sort it out for themselves.' In the large economy of the United Kingdom, some stores would use the system and some would not, and consumers could decide which of the two systems they would use.

It is essential to provide that prices at the checkout point cannot be changed while the system is in operation, because that is a quite frightening facility. Until recently, only one system has been in operation in the Adelaide metropolitan area. So far, that system has not used the full bar-coding system. It uses a manual system of punching the code. I

observed how easy it was to change the price whilst the system was in operation. Since then an electronic checkout system has been introduced in Clare, and I believe that a system is also underway in Gawler. The working party has been set up—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the Minister temper his answer a little.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That is exactly what I am doing. The working party has recommended that the Australian Retailers Association be requested to develop, implement and enforce a code of practice in relation to the use of electronic checkout systems. Very briefly, without going into too much detail, I point out that the matters to which I have referred are to be included in the code of conduct. The working party that was set up by the Standing Committee of Consumer Affairs Ministers has reported initially and it is to report again when it has received that code of conduct from the operators.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the member for Norwood, who seemed to express some displeasure at the Chair, I point out that prior to the dinner adjournment the Opposition members asked 59 questions and Government members asked 27 questions. The Chair has attempted at all times to assist the proceedings of the Committee by allowing Standing Orders and sessional orders to be interpreted in a fashion that would not stifle debate. It is entirely within the province of the Chair as to how many questions any honourable member may ask. The Chair has assisted by allowing honourable members to ask three questions at a time. As time is running out, it was the view of the Chair that the questions could be spread across the Chamber.

Mr CRAFTER: A point of clarification, Mr Chairman. Had I asked two questions?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will allow the honourable member to ask a question, and if there are no questions from the other side, he can ask as many questions as he likes.

Mr CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Regarding occupational licensing, the Minister spoke at some length about the Government's wish to deregulate in the area of business activity in the community. I notice that that is one of the few areas where there has been an increase in manpower and expenditure. Will the Minister explain how in that area of licensing and/or regulation there have been increases?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Occupational licensing is an area in which we hope to achieve some savings in the future. We are certainly thinking about the possibility of setting up the commercial tribunal to try to bring all or some of the areas of occupational licensing together, instead of having separate administrations. This will be a further area of deregulation.

We are also looking at negative licensing, where appropriate, where there would be no licensing but a code that was set up by industry. The code is given the force of law and a tribunal can prevent an operator against whom claims are established from operating or it can allow him to operate under certain conditions. However, I will ask Mr David Ryan to say why there is an increase in this area of occupational licensing.

Mr Ryan: The major increases in the programme line 'Industry occupation regulation and/or licensing' occur in the areas of licensed premises, liquor licensing, and residential tenancies. Both organisations have recently been reorganised, with an increase in the computerisation service to the community. The major increases in cost have been in regard to staffing the organisations that fit the programme lines and the objectives of a programme.

The total expenditure increase from \$1 548 000 to \$1 824 000 comes about essentially because of the staffing

arrangements in those areas. The bulk of the increase is \$100 000 for new organisation that has been approved for those two areas. A number of other areas relate to the refund of licensing fees in the licensed premises area and the reprinting of booklets on the Residential Tenancies Act for education of both landlords and tenants. Costs have also been incurred in that area.

Mr CRAFTER: Regarding fair trading and price control, (page 82 of the Programme Estimates), this is where there has been the most dramatic cut, in my assessment, in this whole department. I refer to the three tiers of interference in the market. The first is price fixation, and I assume that this is the area to which petrol relates. Beer comes under the category of price justification. In the third area, last year there was an allocation of \$45 000 for goods and services that are subject to price monitoring, and there were 2.5 staff in that area. There is a proposal to have no expenditure and no staff in that area. Why has it been decided not to police that area and to abandon that area of price regulation? What goods were previously monitored under sections of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The goods that were monitored previously will continue to be monitored. We made information available publicly when we adopted the change of decontrolling some areas that were previously subject to formal price control and using the system of justification and monitoring. Those areas will continue to be monitored by officers of the Prices Division, as they were monitored previously. The complete list can be made available, but it is not available at present. The monitoring will continue.

Although no provision has been made in the 1981-82 Budget for staff to carry out price monitoring, this function may be carried out on an *ad hoc* basis. An example of this occurred recently when the Federal Government announced a sales tax rise. Staff in the Prices Division and staff with experience in prices from the Consumer Services Division were utilised to carry out a programme of price monitoring aimed at preventing profiteering from increases. In that way, by using the staff of the Prices Division whose time will be devoted mainly in other areas of formally fixed prices and price justification, and perhaps using staff from policy research, or from outside where necessary, adequate monitoring can be maintained.

In regard, for example, to the sales tax rises, that exercise to which I referred, two officers who had had that necessary experience were brought back from the country. That is the way in which the monitoring will be maintained. As to the list, I can provide it for the honourable member either personally or by posting it to him, or if he wants it included in *Hansard*—

Mr CRAFTER: Incorporate it.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Right. We will have it inserted in *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I think it is normal to seek leave of the Committee. I am not being critical, but I think, Sir, you would rather have it that way in the record.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Dr Billard): Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

Mr ABBOTT: How many dangerous goods, including toys, have been prohibited from manufacture following the proclamation of the Trade Standards Act, and is the Minister aware of any dangerous goods being dumped in South Australia that cannot be sold elsewhere since that proclamation? This is a curly one.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I think the prohibition is from sale rather than from manufacture. There have been several prohibitions made since that time. One of the conditions laid down in the Act is that the prohibition cannot be made if the matter can be rectified by a trade standard. In some

cases, for example, folding tables, the matter has been able to be rectified by a trade standard. We are keenly aware of the need to avoid the dumping of dangerous goods, and some prohibitions have been made. Perhaps the Director-General can give some further information. I cannot remember the numbers that have been banned at the present time.

Mr Noblet: I cannot give details of the actual numbers. I am sure they could be supplied at a later stage. South Australia was the last State in Australia to have the power to ban or otherwise regulate the sale of dangerous consumer goods. For that reason, when the Trade Standards Act first came in there was a large number of standards and banning orders from other jurisdictions in Australia that had to be examined to see if they should be taken up in South Australia. It was found in many cases that the fact that goods had been banned from sale or been regulated by product safety standards in other States was sufficient to take them off the market altogether.

In some cases, the Federal Government had taken the necessary action under the Trade Practices Act, which has fairly universal application, except that standards and banning orders under the Trade Practices Act do not apply to non-corporate businesses operating solely within the boundaries of the State. In the area of manufacture we are talking about, there are relatively few manufacturers who are not bodies corporate, so it was found in many cases that the standards already taken up by the Federal Government under the Trade Practices Act were effective.

There have been comparatively few cases where action has had to be taken under the Trade Standards Act, but priority has been given to cases where we had reason to believe that goods were being dumped in South Australia. One recent example was balloon blowing kits that had been banned in other States some years ago. Action had not been taken in South Australia because we believed that they were no longer available, no longer on the market. They suddenly reappeared, I think as a prize at a sideshow at the Royal Show, and action was taken quickly to deal with them.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will see that the actual figures are supplied and provided in proper form to be inserted in *Hansard*.

Mr ABBOTT: I understand that only a part of the Trade Standards Act was proclaimed, because of certain cost factors. I ask the Minister, regarding the advisory council set up to advise on the needs and priorities on the further proclamation and provisions of that Act, whether the proclamations have yet been made and, if not, when they can be expected to be proclaimed.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The whole of the Act has been proclaimed, except a section that repeals a number of existing Acts. That section will not be proclaimed until regulations can be made which, in effect, more effectively will replace the existing Acts. That is being examined. It is a matter of some complexity, and I cannot say when that is likely to happen.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I would like to ask a question of the Minister relative to the boards and committees in the commercial division, particularly with reference to the Builders Licensing Board. There is considerable criticism made relative to the effectiveness of the board and its membership, perhaps because of the Act. I therefore ask how often the board meets, what are the fees paid, how many members are there on the board, and is the criticism of the Act valid with reference to the overall situation of the Builders Licensing Board.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will call on the Director-General to answer the detailed questions as to how often the board sits, who is on the board, and so on. The board has a difficult job to do. Certainly, complaints are received about

its operation. It is outside my control, of course. It is an independent tribunal. The honourable member has asked a general question and I think I can reply to it in only a general way. I do not think that the majority of the complaints are valid, but I ask Mr Noblet to give the other detailed answers.

Mr Noblet: The Builders Licensing Board comprises five members, namely, a legal practitioner as Chairman (or, at present, Acting Chairman), two members representing the building industry (one nominated by the Master Builders Association and one by the Housing Industry Association), and two members representing persons on whose behalf building work is carried out. The idea is that the board should be a balanced board of industry and consumer representatives, with a legal practitioner as Chairman.

The board presently meets at least once a week, every Friday afternoon, to deal with the several functions it has, the principal one being the issue of licences to carry on building work either generally or in specified trades, the second function being continued supervision of those persons licensed, and lodging complaints with the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal in cases where it thinks that the builders should no longer hold such a licence.

Thirdly, there is the three-yearly renewal of those licenses and, fourthly, dealing with complaints against builders that work has been carried out in an unsatisfactory manner. There was for some time a confusing division of responsibility for investigation of building complaints between the Builders Licensing Board, on the one hand, and the Consumer Services Branch, on the other. The board can deal only with complaints about faulty workmanship. This is sometimes not appreciated by people who make complaints, who do not realise that they cannot necessarily have all their complaints dealt with in the one quarter.

The board cannot deal with complaints by people about over-charging; about whether work should have been done as part of the contract price, or whether it was proper to charge extra for particular work. They are matters over which the board has no jurisdiction. The board also, until recently, had no jurisdiction at all in cases where the person was not required to be licensed, such as for small jobs where a licence is not required, and there are some areas of the State where the Building Act does not apply, for example, Naracoorte, and there is a provision in the Builders Licensing Act, the effect of which is that the Builders Licensing Act does not apply in areas where the Building Act does not apply.

So, for some time there was a great deal of confusion in the minds of both builders and consumers as to whether a complaint should be investigated by the Consumer Services Branch or the Builders Licensing Board. It also appeared at the time that it was conceptually undesirable for one body to be the licensing authority, the disciplinary authority, the investigating authority and the adjudication authority in respect of complaints about building work. It was decided that the Builders Licensing Board should be a licensing authority and an adjudication authority, but should perhaps take one step back from the investigation process and adjudicate on complaints that are properly brought before it after conciliation has failed to resolve them.

For that reason all but two of the inspectors attached to the board were transferred to the Consumer Services Branch. The two who remained there remained to assist the board in dealing with applications for licences and with disciplinary matters, but they do not investigate complaints about faulty building work. We now have the situation where all aspects of all complaints about faulty building work, whether they relate to price, workmanship, contract or any other aspect, are dealt with by the Consumer Serv-

ices Branch. An attempt was made to resolve the dispute by conciliation, and the only cases now that need to be referred to the Builders Licensing Board are those that require an order to be made against the builder, because conciliation has failed to resolve the dispute. It will be necessary at some future time to amend the Builders Licensing Act to give full effect to this policy, but in the meantime efforts are being made to implement that policy by administrative action.

Mr GLAZBROOK: To what extent can the board force errant builders to rectify work and perform remedial treatment when an order has been made?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would ask Mr Noblet if he would answer that question.

Mr Noblet: If the board has made an order against a builder that he carry out remedial work and the order is not complied with, there are two consequences for which the Act provides. One is that the failure to comply is in itself an offence, which could be prosecuted through the courts of summary jurisdiction. The second is that the failure to comply could be grounds for disciplinary action to be taken by the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal, on the complaint of the Builders Licensing Board. To that extent, the orders are enforceable. However, evidently there is some unrest on the part of some people, who, when told that, get the impression that the board is not in a position to enforce its orders. That applies to any order of any court.

Apart from criminal orders which can be enforced by putting somebody in gaol, if a court orders someone to pay money, or to act in a certain way and that order is not complied with, there is very seldom any way in which a person can physically be forced to comply with the order. To the extent that an offence is committed and disciplinary action can be taken against a builder who fails to comply, the orders are enforceable, but that does not always help the person for whose benefit the original order was made.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would like to raise a matter which gets a mention on page 74 of the performance budgeting documents. There is a reference there to the fact that an increased demand for rental accommodation is likely to result in increased pressure on the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. If we search Parliamentary Paper No. 9, under 'Commercial Division' on page 98, we find a reference to the Chairman of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, the Registrar, investigation officers, and clerical staff. A sum is recorded there as having been voted last year, an increased sum expended, and a further increased sum is proposed for the consideration of the Committee.

The matter I wish to raise is probably best referred to in the Auditor-General's Report, relating to this section of the Minister's responsibilities, at page 148. The heading is, 'Residential Tenancies Fund Financial statement for the year ended 30 June 1981'. If we peruse the figures that appear below we find that the balance of funds held at 30 June was \$3 546 222 and those funds are mainly those that are lodged respondent with the tribunal on the basis of security bonds. In what way are those funds invested, and how is the interest being earned from those invested funds being applied?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Deputy Director-General, who is responsible for this area, to give some more details in a moment as to how the money is invested, but securities, generally speaking, have been invested with the State Bank, on the short-term money market, and so on. Until the Act was amended (the amendment was introduced by me earlier this year) the only way in which the interest could be applied was in the way of payments to landlords or tenants and the provision which applied in the previous Act in regard to the administration of the Act was ambig-

uous. That was cleared up in the amendment introduced earlier this year, which was passed, so that now that money may be applied towards the administration of the Act, but I ask either the Director-General or Deputy Director-General to give more information as to the actual investment of the moneys.

Mr Young: I regret that I have not got a list of the investment of the fund with me at the moment, but I undertake to supply a complete list. I can say that the fund is invested pursuant to section 86 of the Residential Tenancies Act, in what could normally be called trustee investments. The Minister, in approving investments pursuant to section 86, has tended to ensure that investment of money available for investment is applied for the benefit of South Australia, and accordingly the Electricity Trust, the State Bank and like organisations figure prominently in the investment portfolio.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I accept the fact that that information may not be at hand and I am perfectly willing to receive that later. I ask that in that information the relevant interest rates which apply to the particular separate investment portfolios concerned be included. I thought section 86 of the Act was referred to. My understanding was that there was an amendment to that area also. Could the Minister enlighten me?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That was the section I referred to earlier, that now it is possible and quite clear—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is that the only amendment? I thought there were some others.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That is the only one.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I could not remember all the details of that amendment. I wondered whether there was some other provision, such as 'must be approved by the Treasurer', or some other provision.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I approve the investment. There is no provision that that shall be approved by the Treasurer.

Mr CRAFTER: Does the Minister agree that it would be desirable to establish a specialised branch within the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs to deal with complaints against professional people, such branch to have access to persons with professional qualifications?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I do not agree with that. It is a matter that has been the subject of discussion for some time. The power already clearly exists in the Prices Act, without any further amendment, to investigate complaints against professional people. There have been a number of such complaints but they have been relatively few in number. It could be argued that they have been few in number because, generally speaking, the attitude of the department has been to refer the complaints to the appropriate professional body. The only real way that they could be investigated within the department would be if the department had available to it (and it would have to pay for of course) professional expertise to investigate those complaints.

The number has not been sufficient to justify that and, of the number of so-called complaints that have been made, many have been inquiries rather than complaints. Because the matter had been raised from time to time, I did, I think last year, specify a period of two months during which time the department instead of simply referring matters to professional bodies was to take details of the complaints made. That was done for a period of two months. I was not satisfied that the results of that indicated that a special branch or section in the department ought to be set up.

I commissioned a working party to investigate the matter of the professional complaints. That working party has reported to me, and copies of the report have been sent on a confidential basis to various bodies, principally Pronag, (Professional Negligence Action Group) and also the Council for the Professions. I have received comment from one,

but not the other. I certainly have no present intention of setting up such a section. I will at some time consider, when I have received appropriate comments, whether or not to release the report.

Mr CRAFTER: Was the Minister, as Minister of Public and Consumer Affairs, consulted prior to the decision being taken by the Government to remove from the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee their reference on white collar and corporate crime and, if he was consulted, what was his submission on that letter?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I was not consulted. I would not really expect to be consulted. I would have thought that that was more a matter for the Department of Corporate Affairs.

Mr GLAZBROOK: If I might return to the line of questioning I was following before relative to the Builders Licensing Board: how many cases have reached the stage where orders have been ignored and where the board and tribunal have been unable to do more? Also, has anyone been prosecuted for ignoring the orders?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It may be very difficult to obtain all of that information; for example, information on where an order had been made and it was not possible to do any more. I am not sure that the Builders Licensing Board would necessarily have those records, because there would not have been feedback in all cases. I will obtain such information as is available and make it available for incorporation.

Mr GLAZBROOK: What action can be taken by the department to protect owners whose vehicles are stolen and subsequently sold by another party?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I would ask the Director-General to answer that.

Mr Noblet: If a person's vehicle is stolen and sold to another party, the person who buys it doesn't get good title to it, and the person from whom it was stolen is entitled to get the vehicle back by legal measures. The question may be directed at a particular case of which I am aware where this happened to a consumer in the north of the State who had his car stolen, according to him, while he was overseas. When he came back he found that the vehicle had passed through at least two hands and found its way into the hands of a person who apparently bought it innocently, not realising that it was not the property of the person from whom he bought it. He went to the police asking for assistance to recover his vehicle. There is some discrepancy here in the story, but according to one version the police told this person that there was a new law that prevented him from recovering his vehicle. If that was so, I think that maybe there was some confusion with the law relating to the sale of goods that are subject to security interests or are encumbered in some way, because there has not been any amendment to the law in relation to stolen vehicles. The difficulty was that the police had to advise this person that they were not in a position to act as arbitrator to determine who was the true owner of the vehicle. The vehicle had passed through several hands; people had acted in good faith in acquiring it, and the police said, in my view quite properly, 'It is the function of the courts to decide who the rightful owner of this vehicle is; we can't usurp the function of the courts and go in and seize the vehicle on your behalf.' So, the consumer was advised by several authorities that unfortunately, although this would mean delays and expense that would have to be incurred by this person, if he felt that he had a case and he could establish the vehicle as being his he would have to take action to enforce his rights over that vehicle through the courts.

Mr CRAFTER: I refer to the Government's promise made prior to the last election in respect of insurance policies and the inequitable provisions in those policies. I

ask the Minister what is proposed in this regard. As I understood it the policy was as follows:

We would legislate to protect persons who take out insurance policies from any inequitable provisions which may be written into the policies. In particular, we will provide that a policy may not be voided by reason of a mis-statement in a proposal which is not material to the acceptance of the proposal, which is the case at present. We will also provide that the policy may not be voided merely because the property in question was not insured for its full insurable value.

Is it the intention of the Government to legislate to fulfil that promise?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The promise will certainly be carried out during the lifetime of the Government. I have had some discussions about the matter with appropriate parties. We have been hoping for the final report of the Australian Law Reform Commission on this matter. That has not yet come to hand and it may be that we may have to take action without the benefit of that report, but certainly it would be very much more useful if we could have the benefit of that report before we take action.

Mr CRAFTER: What is the Government's intention in regard to bringing into operation the Debts Repayment Act?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I have been asked questions in the Legislative Council about that matter. I have made perfectly clear that the Government has no present intention of bringing the Debts Repayment Act into operation. There were some very grave defects in the original form of the Bill that was presented, most of which were cured. The Bill went very much further than it need have done, and indeed it would have been a very grave imposition on industry. A number of amendments were accepted.

If there was to be legislation of this kind in regard to small debts (as there is in parts of the United States and Canada), the Act in its present form would be probably a quite effective piece of legislation, but because of the fact that the cost would be very considerable and because there does not appear to be any grave problem at present in the community in that area, the Government has decided not to proclaim the Act at this time.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I understand that about 200 000 used cars are sold annually in this State. How many complaints are received relative to used cars, how many consumer claims are upheld, and, perhaps, how many prosecutions are effected? How many officers of the department are assigned to used car trade transactions and complaints?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I will ask the Director-General to answer that question. I believe some of this information appears in his report.

Mr Noblet: The latest period for which detailed figures are available is the year ended 31 December 1980. Figures are being collated for the year ended 30 June 1981. However, I will refer to the figures for 1980, because that is a 12-month period, and I guess one period is similar to any other period. During that period, the number of complaints in relation to the purchase of secondhand vehicles was 1 126. That represented 13.2 per cent of the total number of complaints, which was 8 541.

In fact, this was the largest single complaint category in South Australia. It is probably true to say that in other States it is also the largest single complaint category. Just this week I received the annual report of the Western Australian Commission of Consumer Affairs, for the year ended 30 June 1981, which made the point, that, in Western Australia the purchase of a secondhand motor vehicle was the largest complaint category.

Going back to the 1980 calendar year in regard to motor vehicles and other transport equipment (which is a wider category), this category comprised 22.9 per cent of the complaints in South Australia and 25 per cent of the

complaints at a national level, so we are slightly but not greatly under the national average. We do not keep detailed statistics of the number of consumer claims that are upheld or not upheld. The main reason for that is that this turns out in the end to be a fairly subjective judgment on the part of one officer as to whether the claim was justified and whether it was upheld fully, partially, or whatever.

Mr GLAZBROOK: How many prosecutions were effected?

Mr Noblet: In the 1980 calendar year the Secondhand Vehicles Act accounted for more prosecutions than any other Act that the department administers. There were 11 successful prosecutions for unlicensed dealing under that Act, 12 prosecutions relating to failure to display or correctly display information on the windscreen of a car, three prosecutions for altering odometer readings, and one prosecution for obtaining a consumer signature on a defect notice when the defect notice was not affixed to the car.

The other part of the question I think related to the number of officers in that area. The number of officers in C section of the Consumer Services Branch is 17.5. That includes country areas, I am advised. There are some 1 200-odd licensed secondhand motor vehicle dealers in South Australia.

Mr CRAFTER: The Minister referred earlier to his concern about paternalism in the conduct of the work of the Prices Branch of Consumer Affairs Department. I presume by that he means that it is more desirable to have consumers themselves participating to some extent in that decision-making process so that they become somewhat more mature in that sense. How does the Minister reconcile that with the reduction of some 15 per cent in grants to consumer groups in the current financial year, and also the fact that no Consumer Council has been established whereby consumers can participate in the activities of the department?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: There is no reduction. Last year it was \$17 000. This year it is \$17 000. The sum of \$20 000 was provided last year, but only \$17 000 was spent. The explanation of that is fairly simple. The \$17 000 spent was to the Consumers Association of South Australia (CASA). When they originally started, I think they got a grant of \$25 000 from the then Government. They got that on the strict understanding (I remember going to the opening of their premises and hearing the then Minister say this) that they would spend most of that money for a membership

drive and were to become self-sufficient. They did not become self-sufficient. They did not do so last year, and they have not yet done so this year. They are still trying to do that, and I intend to see that they are funded until they are able to do that. Of course, a consumer organisation being funded by the Government is a little ambiguous. In the United Kingdom and the United States, they would not hear of that. They would say that they ought to be independent, and that it is quite anomalous that they should be funded by the Government.

The explanation of the \$20 000 and the \$17 000 is that previously money had been provided to the Consumers Association and also for the Tenants Association. Out of the \$20 000, the sum of \$3 000 was kept aside for the Tenants Association if it applied, but it did not do so. So, we have provided for the Consumers Association the same amount of money this year that it received last year.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister of Consumer Affairs—Miscellaneous,
\$17 000—examination declared completed.

The CHAIRMAN: I lay before members the House of Assembly report of Estimates Committee A.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I move:

That the draft report be the report of the Committee.

Motion carried

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Minister of Community Welfare and his officers for attending the Committee. I also thank the officers at the table and those other officers who have sat in during most of the Committee's proceedings for their assistance and help.

Mr BECKER: What about poor old *Hansard*?

Honourable members: Hear Hear!

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the member for Hanson for reminding me. I thank everyone else who assisted the Committee. The Committee is adjourned.

At 10 p.m. the Committee concluded.