

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday, October 6, 1976

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

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

**PETITION: CAPITAL TAXATION**

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 892 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would pass legislation to ease the burden of capital taxation and to make it apply equitably.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT**

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (September 23).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been told that there were two other applicants for the position of Senior Publicity Officer to which Mr. J. Mitchell was appointed.

**GRAIN**

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 12).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has told me that the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board are both bound by statute to have "reasonable regard to" the requirements of the home market. The home market includes grain demands for drought feeding of stock and crop seeding for the next year. All such grain must be purchased at standard home consumption prices.

To achieve this, the Australian Barley Board has made available for stock feeding all uncommitted stocks of barley. Some quantities of malting barley, which could be profitably distributed overseas, have been released for local feed purposes at feed prices, but because of the size of last year's harvest this is unlikely to have any significant effect on the price received by farmers for barley. Further, the Australian Wheat Board will sell to farmers, genuinely affected by drought, wheat for feed from any silo at which wheat is held, and at present wholesale prices.

The board does not expect problems in the supply of such wheat, although many country silos had all wheat stores moved to bulk terminals before the drought arose. It has also agreed to allow growers to buy back wheat put into silos. They will be required to refund the first advance and pay a small handling and storage fee. The wheat seed situation is now under review. At this stage, because

of the heterogeneity of silo wheat, no suitable seed supply is available, but it is expected that, if necessary, selected silo cells will be made available as stores for particular wheat varieties.

The drought committee of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department is undertaking a detailed assessment of the grain requirements (both seed and feed) of the State. The committee will also investigate the distribution of seed wheat and barley by "approved" growers, and an appropriate report will be forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands upon completion of the assessment.

**EVAPORATION BASINS**

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (September 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Six alternative schemes for salinity control and drainage disposal in the Riverland have been the subject of intensive technical evaluation by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The consequences of taking no action have also been examined. With the aid of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, the possibilities and effects of improved irrigation and drainage practice are being incorporated. A programme of public involvement is scheduled to commence this month, in which public comment will be invited to assist in developing the most satisfactory solution.

**LAND VALUATION**

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (September 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands has sent a letter to each landholder in the area advising that a more detailed report on the valuations will be sent to them containing information that will include ownership of the land, its legal and physical descriptions, usage, the highest and best use that could be made of the land, and a schedule of the sales used and their relevance in determining the unimproved values.

**DROUGHT**

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (September 8).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not intended to make any changes in the procedure for completion of the 10-page application form for persons seeking carry-on assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967. Information requested on the application form enables the application to be processed in the least amount of time. Under the terms of the Act, the Minister of Lands must be satisfied that any producer given assistance has a reasonable prospect of being able to continue in the business of primary production, and this is attained from the production figures and capital liabilities requested in the application and obtained by the farmer from farm records.

Arrangements are now being made for the employment of two additional assessors in the Rural Industry Assistance Branch for the processing of drought relief applications. It is not intended to use banks or stock firms as agents. However, it is expected, as in the past, that the banks and stock firms will assist in completing application forms if approached by primary producers.

The Act provides for arrangements to be made between the State and Commonwealth Governments for reduced

interest rates, as was the case in 1967, when the Commonwealth determined that advances for carry-on finance would bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent a year. I am unable to advise what the interest rate will be on these advances as negotiations are proceeding with the Commonwealth, and this information is not yet available. As soon as this information becomes available, the honourable member will be told.

#### TENDER DOCUMENT

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (September 8).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Senior officers of the State Supply Division of the Services and Supply Department are aware of the difficulties in preparing tenders within the prescribed time, and they make every effort to forward tender documents immediately upon request.

#### MEDIBANK

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (September 15).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The State Manager of Medibank has advised that, in conversation with Mr. Wallis, Federal member for Grey some weeks ago, he gave an undertaking that Medibank would rearrange office hours in Whyalla once it had moved into its new premises. The rearrangement would be for a trial period to gauge whether, in fact, a later closing would result in better use of the facilities provided.

#### MARINE GROWTH

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (August 10).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: As indicated in my previous reply of August 10, 1976, the Environment Department has not undertaken studies of the sea-bed and associated marine growth off shore from metropolitan Adelaide, but is maintaining close liaison with the study of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that commenced in 1972. The study of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has shown that large areas of seagrass, estimated at 200 to 300 hectares, have died at both Glenelg North and Largs Bay, with smaller areas of degradation throughout the metropolitan area between Brighton in the south and Middle Beach in the north. An inspection of aerial photographic records has indicated that the degradation has been occurring as a gradual process, at least since 1954.

The study has concluded that the degradation of the seagrasses is largely caused by changes in the pattern of sediment movement in local coastal waters, resulting in sediment erosion in the Glenelg-Brighton area and accumulation in Largs Bay. These changes are attributed to the numerous structural modifications along the metropolitan coastline, such as the removal of sand dunes, the construction of groynes at Outer Harbor and Glenelg, the expansion of the Paternalong Creek drainage system, and the diversion of the Torrens River outlet from the Port River to West Beach. Superimposed upon these man-made effects may be a contribution of unknown dimensions by natural geological processes, which can only be determined by surveillance over a very long period.

Clearly it is not possible for any of these changes to be corrected without severe disruption. However, it is considered likely that the total system may become more

stable in the long term and regeneration of the sea-bed may then occur. In this regard the Environment Department is particularly concerned that future coastal development should have minimum impact upon sediment movement. The department will continue its close liaison with the study of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

#### MEADOWS COUNCIL

In reply to Mr. EVANS (August 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Public Parks Advisory Committee has received an application for financial assistance from the District Council of Meadows to purchase the land owned by Mr. F. P. Smith for open-space purposes. The application will be considered by that committee and a recommendation forwarded to the Minister of Local Government.

#### DIRECTOR OF PUBLICITY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): In view of the allegations made by an Opposition member concerning the Director of Publicity who has been appointed under contract to the South Australian Government and the suggestion that his only ability in and qualification for the job was the oversight of a ticket office for a ferry to Macao, I table the *curriculum vitae* of Mr. Joseph Parkes.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JUVENILE COURT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Fifth Annual Report on the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1975, for the year ended June 30, 1976, was laid before this Parliament today by the Minister of Community Welfare. The Minister has also presented to this Parliament the letter from the Senior Judge of the Adelaide Juvenile Court to him referred to by that judge in his letter accompanying his annual report. Such letter refers to details of developments that have taken place since the expiration of the year under review. In his annual report the Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court invited me to release his letter of resignation to me dated June 30, 1976, as he considered that "it would be proper and in the public interest" to do so. I seek leave to have that letter inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### MEMORANDUM TO THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Forwarded through Acting Senior Judge Williams)

I hereby offer to the South Australian Government my resignation as a Judge authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, such resignation to take effect from October 31, 1976. I am willing to continue to serve the people of South Australia as a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court, exercising the jurisdiction of that court. I hasten to state that my decision to tender my resignation has been made after the fullest consideration on my part and with a real sense of regret. My decision is solely based upon one issue of principle, the details of which are set out below:

1. When the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971, came into operation on July 1, 1972, substantial and progressive reforms to our juvenile justice system

were brought into effect, and it brought our system into the forefront of juvenile justice systems throughout the world.

2. An important aspect of these reforms was the enactment of section 17 which provides for the appointment of District Court Judges to preside over Juvenile Courts. As the Hon. L. J. King (as he then was) said in 1974, when he was Attorney-General, "The status of the Juvenile Court was substantially up-graded by (this legislation)". This enactment also recognised the need to have persons presiding in the Juvenile Court who were of "high professional attainments and who had special interest in juvenile matters".
3. In December, 1972, I was appointed a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court and was immediately authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act. I joined His Honour Judge Marshall (as he then was), and the two of us then presided over those Juvenile Courts for which the Adelaide Juvenile Court was directly responsible, viz. Adelaide, Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth.
4. At the time of my appointment I was made aware of plans for the Adelaide Juvenile Court to expand to become a Juvenile and Family Court accepting a wider jurisdiction involving some family law matters.
5. During 1973, Her Honour Judge Murray (as she then was) and His Honour Judge Burnett were appointed and assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court. All four judges from time to time throughout the period 1973 to 1975 exercised each of the two jurisdictions, the one in the field of juvenile delinquency and the other in the field of family law. Judges presided over delinquency cases and "neglect", "uncontrolled" and "truancy" cases in Adelaide, Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth. A Special Magistrate (Mr. M. Ward, S.M. for a time and later Mr. L. K. Newman, S.S.M. (as he then was) ) was assigned to the Court to preside over maintenance and minor Family Court cases in the Family Court on two days of each week and to preside over traffic cases and other minor matters (as directed by the Senior Judge) on the other three days of each week.
6. On March 14, 1974, the Honourable L. J. King said, when he was Attorney-General,
 

"The work of the Juvenile Court has won high praise in other parts of Australia and from overseas visitors . . . I have no doubt that this Court is making a great contribution towards the well-being of the South Australian community."

It is to be noted that the then Attorney-General was speaking of the Court comprising four judges and one special magistrate. (The present proposal is that there be a court comprising two judges, three special magistrates and one special justice of the peace.)
7. During 1975, Their Honours Judges Marshall and Burnett were seconded to the Australian Government to assist in the setting up of the Australian Family Court. During the period of their secondment, Her Honour Judge Murray, Mr. L. K. Newman, S.S.M. and myself worked under considerable pressure to cope with as much of the work load as possible. It was necessary for relieving magistrates and later justices of the peace and special justices of the peace to preside over the traffic court, previously the responsibility of the Special Magistrate. Mr. Newman, S.S.M. was called upon to do the work of a judge, and he visited Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth, and presided over many trials in delinquency cases.
8. In September, 1975, His Honour Judge Marshall resigned as a judge authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act, following the announcement of his intended appointment as a Senior Judge of the Australian Family Court, and later he and Her Honour Judge Murray were

subsequently appointed to that Court. The Family Court section of the Adelaide Juvenile Court/Family Court had ceased to operate in September, 1975.

9. By Minutes to you dated October 6, 1975 and October 23, 1975, I requested you to make the necessary arrangements to ensure that four judges were assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court and one special justice of the peace. I also drew attention to the unfortunate consequences that had occurred (and were continuing to occur) on account of the lack of any such appointments. I pointed out that the public of S.A. was being forced to accept a restricted service. I emphasised that the situation was critical. I also made personal representations to the honourable the Premier and yourself on October 8, 1975.
10. Pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the Juvenile Courts Act, on November 28, 1975, I presented to the honourable Minister of Community Welfare the Annual Report on the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974 for the year ended June 30, 1975. I drew attention to the shortage of judges in the Adelaide Juvenile Court, and I stated:
 

"As an examination of both the statistics and the day to day operation of the Adelaide Juvenile Court would indicate, the work load of the court has grown to such an extent that at the end of the year just concluded the full-time services of four judges working on Juvenile Court matters alone were required in order to provide the public of South Australia with the extent and quality of service envisaged when the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971, first came into force. The Act itself provides for judges to preside in the court. There are a number of good reasons why judges only should preside over cases heard in the Adelaide Juvenile Court and the three main suburban centres at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach."

I went on to explain the difficulties which had occurred during the year under review. I further stated:

"Unless steps are taken to overcome the shortage of judicial manpower in the Adelaide Juvenile Court the aims and ambitions of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974 cannot be achieved. There is a risk that we will no longer have the ability to continue in the future the rate of progress of the past."
11. On November 11 and 12, 1975, I made further personal representations to you, but you informed me that for the time being it was proposed to appoint one additional judge (to make a complement of two judges) and to assign two special magistrates and to have one special justice of the peace undertake the traffic work. On November 20, 1975, Mr. L. K. Newman, S.S.M. was appointed a judge and in early December, 1975, Mr. B. H. Burns, S.M., and Mr. J. A. Kiosoglous, S.M., were assigned to this court.
12. In response to your invitation to me to make further representations to you as to the number and status of the judicial personnel required to exercise the jurisdiction under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, I forwarded a further minute to you dated January 9, 1976. I again urged you to appoint two more judges to this court and bring to an end the arrangement whereby Magistrates are assigned to the court. In supporting my submission, I referred to the following factors (*inter alia*):
  - (1) Section 17 of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974 provides for the appointment of judges to exercise the jurisdiction given under the Act.
  - (2) At the Official Opening of the new Adelaide Juvenile Court building on August 21, 1975, the Honourable Mr. Justice King said:
 

"The status of the Juvenile Court itself was transformed (by the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971). The Act provided for judges to preside in this court.

Persons of high professional attainments and special interest in juvenile matters were attracted to the court."

- (3) Having both judges and magistrates exercising the jurisdiction given under the Act presents some very real problems affecting the standing and effectiveness of the court.
- (4) Since 1971, the Adelaide Juvenile Court expanded and developed into Australia's first and only comprehensive Juvenile Court/Family Court. It was hailed by many as Australia's most progressive Court. It was comprised of four judges and a special magistrate. The establishment by the Australian Government of an Australian Family Court in South Australia has not unexpectedly resulted in the Adelaide Juvenile Court ceasing to exercise its family law jurisdiction, and no longer will the problems of juvenile delinquency and family disharmony be dealt with by the one comprehensive Court presided over by qualified and experienced persons possessing those special qualities and skills which are necessary to cope with both juvenile crime and matrimonial problems. It would be most unfortunate if both developments in the family law field and a failure to appoint more judges led to a reduction in the status and effectiveness of the Adelaide Juvenile Court.
- (5) At no stage since 1971 have the judicial personnel over the Adelaide Juvenile Court presided over trials in the suburban centres at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach. Only if four judges are appointed to the Adelaide Juvenile Court would it be possible to roster them in such a manner that, subject to the lists not getting any longer than they are at present, judges of the Adelaide Juvenile Court could visit the suburban centres at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach to preside over trials as well as uncontested cases.

I can see no prospect of a rostering system being successfully implemented to provide for visits to the suburban centres for the additional purpose of presiding over trials whilst the judicial strength of the Adelaide Juvenile Court comprises two judges and two magistrates and one special justice of the peace.

- (6) The opinion has been widely held that, by the enactment of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971 and the implementation of government policy thereafter, the South Australian Government has improved and expanded "the resources, facilities and procedures available for the care, training, and treatment of children and young people who are deprived or who have serious problems in conducting themselves in accordance with the accepted norms of our society", and thereby achieved the objectives of the legislation. (Second reading speech of the Hon. L. J. King (as he then was) to Juvenile Courts Bill—September 1, 1971). If Magistrates are called upon to do the work hitherto performed by Judges, that would necessarily involve a change in stated Government policy.

I felt constrained to speak bluntly and forcibly in making representations to you because of the importance of this issue as it affects the Adelaide Juvenile Court. I said:

"If the Government were to decide finally not to appoint two additional Judges and to confirm the assignment of two Magistrates to the Adelaide Juvenile Court then, in my considered opinion,

such a decision will be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974.

the status of the court will be downgraded, the effectiveness of the court will be reduced, the rate of progress of the past few years in the S.A. juvenile justice system will no longer be achieved.

many of those closely associated with the Adelaide Juvenile Court, which has been recognised as both progressive and a leader, will feel demoralised.

13. During the time my representations were under consideration, I attempted (with little success) for the first time since the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974 has been in force to arrange the Rosters in such a way as to divide the work-load (upon some reasonably sensible criteria) between the three classes of judicial officers assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court (i.e. judges, magistrates and a special justice of the peace). For the first time, Juvenile Court matters were divided into judges' matters (i.e. matters which in an adult setting would have been finally dealt with in the Supreme Court or the District Criminal Court and other important matters) and magistrates' matters (i.e. matter which in an adult setting would have been finally dealt with in a magistrates' court) and traffic matters (for the special justice of the peace).
14. On February 5, 1976, I became aware of a press report (*Advertiser* 5/2/76) that you had apparently stated in Parliament that the staffing problem referred to by me in the Annual Report for the year ended June 30, 1975, had "since been resolved".
15. On February 6, 1976, I wrote a minute to you pointing out that I did not regard the problem as having been resolved, and again urging you to appoint judges.
16. Subsequently, my attention was drawn to *Hansard*, February 4, 1976, at pages 2079 to 2081, where your statement to Parliament was reported in full. In referring to the judicial standing of the officers of the Juvenile Court you not only stated "that it is this Government's continuing policy that the Juvenile Court should be manned by Judges of the District Court, Magistrates and Special Justices", but also you stated: "It has always been the policy of this Government that similar matters to those dealt with in the adult courts by judges should be dealt with by judges in the Juvenile Court, and that similar matters to those dealt with by special magistrates in the adult courts should be dealt with by special magistrates in the Juvenile Court . . . this was the policy of the Government then (when the Juvenile Courts Bill was introduced) and it is still the policy of the Government."
- I must be frank: the above statements, insofar as they refer to the period preceding December, 1975, are either untrue or else the Government's policy (as stated by you) was never implemented.
17. On February 17 and 24, 1976, you informed me that it was the Government's intention not to appoint any more judges at present; you also informed me of the Government's decision to assign an additional magistrate to the Adelaide Juvenile Court (to make a team of two judges, three magistrates and one special justice of the peace), and to ask us to accept the additional responsibility (never before undertaken by us) of presiding over trials in Juvenile Court cases at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth.
18. You have also indicated to me personally and indirectly through Mr. Langcake, Secretary of your Department, on several occasions since February that you would reply to my several minutes (previously referred to) and state therein in an official way the Government's decision.
19. I have to this date not received any official confirmation from you. However, I have noticed that you have commenced to implement what you had stated was the Government's decision; an

advertisement has appeared in the press calling for applications from applicants for the position of a special magistrate interested (*inter alia*) in Juvenile Court matters; and no opposition has been expressed to several initiatives taken by me in anticipation of you doing as you indicated you would, viz.:—informing me in an official way what the Government's decision is. I refer to the initiatives relating to the following:

- (a) The provision of chambers for the magistrates assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court;
- (b) The approval of the use of courtroom No. 1 in the old Family Court premises in I.A.C. Building, 345 King William Street, Adelaide on a permanent basis;
- (c) The question of Mr. Kiosoglous, S.M.'s, leave;
- (d) The appointment of magistrates;
- (e) The appointment of additional special justices of the peace.

20. Since I became the Senior Judge of this Court, I have become increasingly concerned that the Adelaide Juvenile Court has not received the same level of support from the Government as my predecessor received. I illustrate my point by referring to the following circumstances:

- (a) Because of the shortage of manpower, visits to Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth by judges in order to preside over Juvenile Court cases in those centres have had to be abandoned. It is to be noted that in 1973 and 1974 judges made such visits regularly; and their work was appreciated by the people living in those areas. The public in those areas has not been well served as far as Juvenile Court matters are concerned for some considerable time now, and I consider that the neglect of those areas is inexcusable;
- (b) In last year's annual report I made reference to the need for additional Court and supportive staff and facilities, and, in particular, the need to appoint a public relations officer and research staff. I am concerned that I have received no word as to whether or not any of my recommendations are to be implemented. An urgent problem regarding the provision of staff to supervise children held in custody at the Adelaide Juvenile Court (which arose late last year) has not yet been resolved;
- (c) The official government vehicle, which was previously made available to the Adelaide Juvenile Court (and under the control of the Senior Judge) for the purpose of regular visits to Juvenile Courts at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth and for other official purposes, has been withdrawn, and my colleagues and I are now compelled to use pool vehicles.

Whilst I do not regard any of these circumstances as being sufficient alone to justify my resignation, they collectively lend support to the fear held by me late last year when I presented last year's annual report and to the view I now regret to say that I hold that the Adelaide Juvenile Court has reverted to the status of a "poor relation" in the legal system as a whole.

- 21. Because of problems associated with having three different levels of judicial officer required to work in the same court and empowered to exercise the same overall jurisdiction, the division of work into judges' work, magistrates' work, and traffic work will be cumbersome and difficult. The court's operation will necessarily become inefficient.
- 22. The implementation of my proposals would have involved four judges and one special justice of the peace (five in all) undertaking all the work presently envisaged for the judicial officers of the Adelaide Juvenile Court. The implementation

of what you have described as the Government's policy will involve two judges, three special magistrates and one special justice of the peace (six in all) undertaking such work. I suggest that from the viewpoint of salaries alone (to say nothing of administrative costs), the implementation of the Government's policy will involve the use of an excess of public moneys.

- 23. As one who has been closely associated with the Adelaide Juvenile Court and as its Senior Judge since September 11, 1975, I feel demoralised. I am aware of others who share the same feelings.
- 24. Finally and to summarise, the decision to have the Adelaide Juvenile Court staffed by two judges, three magistrates and one special justice of the peace will involve a reduction in the status of this court. I believe that the implementation of such a decision will be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974. It will be a retrograde step. Such a decision, when fully implemented, will necessarily mean that—
  - (i) the court's effectiveness will be reduced;
  - (ii) the rate of progress of the past few years will no longer be achieved.

For me to have continued as the Senior Judge of the Adelaide Juvenile Court would have necessarily involved me in—

- 1. being less than honest to myself;
- 2. compromising my principles;
- 3. accepting a situation which I regard as intolerable;
- 4. giving tacit approval to the down-grading and the reduction in status of the court of which I so recently became its Senior Judge;
- 5. standing silently by whilst a Minister of the Crown makes a statement to Parliament in relation to this court which has serious implications;
- 6. being compelled to work in a jurisdiction which because of recent changes made by the Government can no longer be truly effective.

Lest it should be thought by the Government that I am reluctant to serve the public of South Australia, I hasten to emphasise that I am willing to continue to serve as a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court. It is with a deep sense of regret that I must indicate that my philosophy (as it applies to the Adelaide Juvenile Court and as it has developed, in particular, from 1972 to 1976) and the implementation of the Government's decision are incompatible.

As I indicated at the commencement of this memorandum, I ask that my resignation take effect from October 31, 1976. My reason for suggesting that date is that this will allow sufficient time for me to prepare and deliver reserved judgments and to complete all outstanding work including, in particular, the task of preparing the Annual Report on the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, for the year ended this day, June 30, 1976.

I should also make it clear that my decision is in no way intended as a personal criticism of, or reflection against, the special magistrates presently assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court.

(Signed)

JUDGE A. B. C. WILSON,  
Senior Judge in the Juvenile Court

June 30, 1976.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In his letter Judge Wilson offered to the South Australian Government his resignation as a judge authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act, such resignation to take effect from October 31, 1976. Judge Wilson has not tendered his resignation as a judge of the Local and District Criminal Court. Judge Wilson sets out in his letter details of the one issue of principle upon which he states his decision is solely based. He summarises this issue as being that "the decision to have the Adelaide Juvenile Court staffed by two judges, three magistrates and one special justice of the peace, will involve a reduction in the status of (the) court". He states that he believes "that the implementation of such a decision will be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act. It will

be a retrograde step. Such a decision, when fully implemented, will necessarily mean that—

- (i) the court's effectiveness will be reduced;
- (ii) the rate of progress of the past few years will no longer be achieved".

Judge Wilson says that for him to continue as the Senior Judge of the Adelaide Juvenile Court would involve him in, *inter alia*, "giving tacit approval to the downgrading and the reduction in status of the (Adelaide Juvenile) Court; standing silently by whilst a Minister of the Crown makes a statement to Parliament in relation to (that) court which has serious implications; (and) being compelled to work in a jurisdiction which because of recent changes made by the Government can no longer be truly effective".

The Minister referred to by Judge Wilson is myself, and the statement to Parliament is a statement made by me on February 4, 1976, when I said that "it has always been the policy of this Government that similar matters to those dealt with in the adult courts by judges should be dealt with by judges in the Juvenile Court, and that similar matters to those dealt with by special magistrates in the adult courts should be dealt with by special magistrates in the Juvenile Court . . . this was the policy (when the Juvenile Courts Bill was introduced) and it is still the policy of the Government". Judge Wilson has said that this "statement, in so far as (it) refer(s) to the period preceding December, 1975, (is) either untrue or else the Government's policy (as stated by (me)) was never implemented".

Judge Wilson's resignation is based on what he considers to be a reduction in status of the Adelaide Juvenile Court. His Honour refers to representations made by him to me on a number of occasions that that court should be constituted by four judges and one special justice of the peace. Anything less than such a constitution would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Act, would downgrade the status of the court, would reduce its effectiveness and would demoralise many of those closely associated with the court, according to Judge Wilson. In particular, the constitution of the court by two judges, three special magistrates and one special justice would have these effects, he says. Furthermore, Judge Wilson is unable to reconcile the recent appointment of a third judge with the best interests of the Adelaide Juvenile Court.

In asserting that the Government's action is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act, Judge Wilson relies on section 17 of the Act, which provides for the appointment of District Court judges to preside over the juvenile courts. He quotes the then Attorney-General (now the Hon. Mr. Justice King) as saying in 1974 that "the status of the Juvenile Court was substantially upgraded (by this legislation)". The former Attorney-General stated the position accurately: the status of the Juvenile Court was upgraded, and section 17 was included in the Act for that purpose. However, that section must be read in light of the remaining provisions of the Act and in the context of the Government's policy of having a three-tier court system for the administration of justice in this State.

Section 19 of the Act, with the marginal note "Constitution of Juvenile Court" provides that "a juvenile court shall be validly constituted of a judge, a special magistrate, a special justice, or of two justices of the peace chosen from a panel of justices prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section". Section 20 provides that a juvenile court shall be constituted where reasonably

practicable by a judge or a special magistrate. A number of sections of the Act (sections 51, 54, 66 (11) and 67 (3)) provide that certain powers are only exercisable by a judge.

Clearly, then, the Act envisaged that juvenile justice could be administered not only by judges but also by special magistrates and special justices of the peace. Indeed, the Juvenile Courts Act has been administered by special magistrates and special justices since its enactment, especially in country centres. The Government does not now consider, nor has it ever considered, the assignment of magistrates to the Juvenile Court sitting in Adelaide as reducing the status of that court. On the contrary, it considers, as indeed was recognised by the Act, that the necessity of having judges hearing minor traffic infringements by juveniles would be a downgrading of the status of those judges.

In 1973-1974, the Adelaide Juvenile Court dealt with 3 081 traffic offenders. Of these, 211 were dealt with by judges, 2 498 by special magistrates, and 372 by special justices. In 1974-1975, 3 287 traffic offenders were dealt with, 32 of whom were dealt with by judges, 1 244 by special magistrates and 2 011 by special justices. In 1975-1976, 3 902 traffic offenders were dealt with, three of whom were dealt with by judges, 23 by special magistrates and 3 876 by special justices. It is the Government's opinion that these later figures show a more proper division of judicial responsibility, which leaves the judges of the court time to deal with the more serious matters coming before the court.

Equally, the Government does not consider the reduction in the number of judges assigned to that court from four to three, or even two, as reducing the status of the Juvenile Court. When four judges were appointed and assigned to the Adelaide Juvenile Court, the Government was in the process of setting up the Adelaide Family Court, which was to exist alongside of, and be constituted by, the same judicial officers as the Adelaide Juvenile Court. As Judge Wilson says, all four judges exercised each jurisdiction throughout the period 1973 to 1975, and in this period a special magistrate was permanently assigned to the court.

The Family Court section of the Adelaide Juvenile Court/Family Court ceased to operate in September, 1975, on the establishment of the Australian Family Court. Two judges of the State court were appointed to the Federal court, and in November and December, 1975, appointments of a judge and two magistrates to the Adelaide Juvenile Court were made to bring its strength to two judges and two magistrates. At this time the former Senior Judge of the two courts, now Mr. Justice Marshall, advised the Government that his opinion was that two judges plus one magistrate on full-time duty in the Adelaide Juvenile Court would provide an efficient service for Adelaide, Port Adelaide, and Christies Beach. This advice no doubt quite properly took into account the reduced jurisdiction of the Juvenile/Family Court once the Adelaide Family Court ceased to operate.

It is relevant to note here that in 1974-75 the Family Court heard 2 653 cases. In the same year the number of juveniles appearing before the Adelaide Juvenile Court was 2 654. It is a fair conclusion to draw that, at least in September, 1975, the jurisdiction of the Adelaide Juvenile Court was half that of the then existing Adelaide Juvenile/Family Court. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table setting out Adelaide Juvenile and Family Court statistics for the last three financial years without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## ADELAIDE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT STATISTICS

Year	Judicial Staff					AJC court appearances by individuals as a result of offences			Family Court Cases	Juveniles and family cases Grand Total
	J	SSM	SM	SJP	Total	Offences	Est. adjournments	Sub-Total		
1973-74 ..	4	1			5	2 152	1 280	3 432	667	4 890
1974-75 ..	4	1			5	2 654	1 725	4 379	2 653	7 332
1975-76 ..	2		2	1	5	2 698	1 543	4 241	—	4 241

In addition to the cases shown are a number of minor traffic cases which are heard by J.P.'s in the majority of cases. The following table shows the distribution of these cases and the effects of their inclusion on the overall court figures.

Year	Individual appearances				Total + above total
	Judge	SM	JP	Total	
1973-74 ..	211	2 498	372	3 081	7 180
1974-75 ..	32	1 244	2 011	3 287	10 319
1975-76 ..	3	23	3 876	3 902	8 143

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government views with concern the public assertion by Judge Wilson that the Government's action concerning the constitution of the Adelaide Juvenile Court downgrades and reduces the status of the Adelaide Juvenile Court. Rather, the Government has acted in recognition of the loss of jurisdiction of the Juvenile Family Court and upon a need only to provide the Juvenile Court with a sufficient and varied number of judicial officers adequately to administer the Juvenile Courts Act. Furthermore, the Government is unable to appreciate how, by its appointments to the court, the effectiveness of the court will be reduced and the rate of progress of the past few years will no longer be achieved. The Government is also unable to appreciate the "serious implications" of having judges deal with the more serious offences by juveniles and of having magistrates deal with those matters they would ordinarily deal with in adult courts.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Ministerial statement (a copy of which the Attorney-General has now been kind enough to send me) is inordinately long, so the Opposition would be happy if he moved to seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it.

The SPEAKER: That is a matter for the honourable Minister to consider.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't do that.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I seek leave to have a portion of my Ministerial statement incorporated in *Hansard*. There are other matters I wish to refer to in the House.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the Attorney-General have leave to have certain portions of his Ministerial statement incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading them".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask, what portions? As I understand Standing Orders the only thing that can be incorporated in *Hansard* is statistical matter. If it is only statistical

matter that is all right, but I have not had the advantage of seeing a copy of the report and I am sure the Leader will not let me see his, so unless it is read in the House I will never know what it is, and I am particularly interested in this matter.

The SPEAKER: It must be by leave of the House.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If this action means that judges will be able now to hear contested matters at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth, a thing that they have hitherto not done, I cannot see that this would be a "serious implication" to the detriment of the juvenile courts system. Following receipt of Judge Wilson's letter of resignation, I made arrangements for an appointment for him and me to see the Premier. As a background briefing for the Premier for that meeting, I prepared a memorandum answering Judge Wilson's letter, and I now seek leave to incorporate a copy of that memorandum in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### MEMORANDUM TO THE PREMIER CONCERNING THE RESIGNATION OF JUDGE WILSON AND COMMENTS ON HIS RESIGNATION

Judge Wilson has offered to the South Australian Government his resignation as a Judge authorised to exercise jurisdiction under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, such resignation to take effect from October 31, 1976. His resignation is dated June 30, 1976, the date at which the administrative year of the Juvenile Court ends for purposes of the report upon the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act to the Parliament of South Australia. He is not tendering his resignation as a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court. My comments in detail upon the matters raised in his minute of resignation are as follows:—

1. No comment necessary.

2. The upgrading of the status of the Juvenile Court was in line with the upgrading in the status of the Local Court and the creation of the District Criminal Court under the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969. That Act created the Local and District Criminal Court and set up the jurisdiction of that Court to be exercised by Judges and



Magistrates. The particular matters to be dealt with by Judges were the matters considered to be of a more serious nature and this is spelt out in the legislation. Following the implementation of that Act and in accordance with that policy when the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971, was being drafted, provision was made for Judges to hear matters in that Court as had been provided for in the legislation covering the Adult Courts. The jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court was stated in that Act to be exercisable by both Judges and Magistrates. However, this has been specifically limited by a number of sections which provide that certain powers may only be exercised by a Judge. These provisions are as follows:—

Section 51, provides that certain powers relating to sexual offences shall only be exercised by a Judge. Similar powers are provided in Section 54 and Section 66 (11). Again Section 67 (3), powers of that section are limited in their exercise to that of a Judge.

In Section 19, the constitution of the Juvenile Court is set out and subsection (1) states that the Court is to be constituted of Judges, Special Magistrates, a Special Justice or of two Justices of the Peace, etc. It is clear from these sections that it was always the Government's intention that the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court should be exercised according to the seriousness of the particular matter, that is, the most serious matters to be heard by Judges, less serious matters to be heard by Magistrates, and minor matters to be heard by Special Justices or two Justices of the Peace. I shall comment further on this matter later in this minute.

3. The Adelaide Juvenile Court was established initially as part of the Juvenile Court structure to be established under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971, throughout the State. Whilst the Judges sat and heard most matters, including trials, at Adelaide, they did not in fact hear contested matters at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide or Elizabeth, at that time nor have they done so since. Those important matters were left to be heard by Magistrates.

4. No comment, except that it is of note that the then Attorney-General had plans for the Family Court at the time of Judge Wilson's appointment and no doubt the need for the appointment of further Judges to exercise both jurisdictions was well to the fore in his thinking.

5. Contents of this paragraph are factual. Further, I have intimated to Judge Wilson that it is the Government's intention to appoint a further Magistrate to the Juvenile Court and, in fact, arrangements have been made by me for Ms. J. Sanders, a lawyer, to become a Magistrate in the Juvenile Court. Judge Wilson is well aware of this fact.

6. March 14, 1974, was during the time when the Family Court of South Australia was in existence and only about half of the matters heard were juvenile cases. Accordingly it can be assumed that only half of the judicial manpower was working on judicial matters.

7. No comment.

8. The significant factor in this paragraph is that the Family Court section of the Adelaide Juvenile Court ceased to operate in September, 1975. It is to be noted that Mr. Newman, S.S.M. (as he then was) presided over many suburban trials. Judges have only ever presided over uncontested matters in the suburbs.

9. On October 8, 1975, we had a meeting with Judge Wilson to discuss the staffing of the Juvenile Court. You will recall that we accepted the urgent need for the appointment of further judicial personnel. At no time was there any agreement, however, that four Judges and a Special Justice of the Peace would be provided to the Court.

For the record, I quote from the second last paragraph of a minute from Judge Marshall of August 29, 1975:—

"I understand that Judge Wilson may make representation to the Government regarding a need for more than two Judges to be appointed to the Juvenile Court. My view at this stage is that two Judges plus one Magistrate (on full-time duty) would provide an efficient service for Adelaide, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach. If Mr. Newman, S.S.M., is no longer available as a full-time Magistrate for the Juvenile Court, my suggestion is that Mr. Matison, C.S.M., be asked to roster his country Magistrates so that each one spends a period of three to six months at the Adelaide Juvenile Court. The new Juvenile Court building in Wright Street allows for three courts and three sets of chambers and the rotation system would

assist greatly to provide a reasonably uniform system of Juvenile Court justice throughout the State."

10. Judge Wilson here confuses what he sees as the shortage of judicial manpower with the status of the judicial officers provided for the Juvenile Court. It is difficult to see, as Judge Wilson asserts, that the workload of the Adelaide Juvenile Court has increased dramatically. (The Annual Report, at page 25, shows there was an increase of 44 children appearing before the Court.) He goes on to conclude that "No significant change has occurred over the past year with regard to the numbers of children appearing in Juvenile Courts nor in the numbers of offences committed."

The "number of good reasons why Judges only should preside in Juvenile Courts", are not evident.

11. Contents of this paragraph are correct. However, the emphasis by the use of the words "for the time being" should not be read as meaning that I had agreed with him that the appointments were only of a temporary nature.

12. I did, in fact, invite Judge Wilson to make further representation to me at any time, on any matter including the number and status of judicial personnel required to exercise the jurisdiction under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974. On November 12, 1975, and other occasions, I made it clear to him that the Government's continuing policy was that Judges should sit in matters in which in the Adult Courts would be dealt with by Judges and that Magistrates or Special Justices should sit in matters which normally would be dealt with by Magistrates or Special Justices in the Adult Courts with the exception that Judges were, of course, to sit in the matters specially reserved to them under the Juvenile Courts Act.

Speaking as if the legislation had never provided for the appointment of Magistrates to the Court, Judge Wilson in this paragraph comments "I again urged you to appoint two more Judges to this Court and to bring to an end the arrangement whereby Magistrates are assigned to the Court".

12. (1) In this paragraph, Judge Wilson selectively quotes Section 17 of the Juvenile Courts Act which provides for the appointment of Judges to exercise the jurisdiction given under the Act. Of course, Section 19 (1), 20 and 21 provide for the appointment of Magistrates to exercise the jurisdiction and to constitute Juvenile Courts as well as Judges.

(2) The statement by Mr. Justice King must be read in the context of the Government's overall policy of creating a third or middle tier judiciary.

(3) Judge Wilson fails to expand on this statement.

(4) This comment continues to place emphasis on his desire for higher status for the Adelaide Juvenile Court.

(5) I completely reject this assertion and challenge its validity. In doing so, I have the support of the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, who is of the view that if four Judges could handle the work of the Juvenile Court at Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach, then any combination of Judges and Magistrates could do likewise. It is also interesting to note that Judges of the Juvenile Court have only visited Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach to preside over uncontested matters since 1971, and this seems to me to be a very unsatisfactory situation. I would have thought that the judicial personnel with a higher status and therefore presumably those best qualified and experienced to hear such matters would have prescribed at trials. I will deal further with this matter under paragraph 17.

(6) The statement that "If Magistrates are called upon to do the work hitherto performed by Judges that would necessarily involve a change in stated Government policy" is incorrect. The Government's policy can be seen from the legislation under the Juvenile Courts Act and that provided that Magistrates were to have concurrent jurisdiction with Judges in most juvenile matters.

I have on a number of occasions, made it clear to Judge Wilson that it is not the Government's intention to appoint two additional Judges to the Adelaide Juvenile Court and that the two Magistrates, Messrs. Burns and Kiosoglous, were on permanent assignment to the Adelaide Juvenile Court.

Any suggestion that that was not the case is pure figment of Judge Wilson's imagination. I did indicate to him that should the "Judges' work" in the Juvenile Court increase then I would give consideration to the appointment of a further Judge.



**Judge Wilson comments—**

"If the Government were to decide finally not to appoint two additional Judges and to confirm the assignment of two Magistrates to the Adelaide Juvenile Court then, in my considered opinion, such a decision will be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974."

My decision was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Juvenile Courts Act, and in defence, I simply ask the question why was it necessary to reserve certain powers under the Act to Judges if it had been the intention to have Judges sit on all Juvenile Court matters apart from traffic cases.

If it had been the Government's policy that all matters apart from traffic cases were to be dealt with by Judges general jurisdiction could have been granted to the Judges with a special limited jurisdiction reserved for the concurrent exercise of Magistrates and Justices.

"The status of the Court will be downgraded".

The status of the Court has inevitably been downgraded by the removal of the Family Court jurisdiction.

"The effectiveness of the Court will be reduced".

How and why is not spelt out.

"The rate of progress of the past few years in the South Australian justice system will no longer be achieved".

Again, how and why?

"Many of those closely associated with the Adelaide Juvenile Court will feel demoralised".

It would be interesting to know of such persons. The Magistrates are certainly not demoralised and the other Judge is not demoralised. The Community Welfare Department to my knowledge is likewise not demoralised.

13. I have checked the contents of this paragraph with Justice Marshall and his view is that whilst a strict division into Judges' matters and other matters was not necessary during his time as Senior Judge of the Court, it was a fact that certain matters were set aside to be dealt with by a Magistrate or Special Justice. This action gives effect to the Government policy.

14. No comment.

15. No comment.

16. My statement in the House was a correct statement of Government policy. If it were not so, why was provision made in the Juvenile Courts Act to deal with the appointments of Magistrates to the Juvenile Courts. And more particularly, why was it necessary for certain limited powers to be reserved for the exclusive use of the Judges.

17. The facts as stated in this paragraph are correct as I recall them. If Judge Wilson's concern for the treatment, care and training of young people is as great as he claims, then the responsibility of presiding over trials in Juvenile Court cases at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth by the personnel of the Adelaide Juvenile Court should have been welcomed (which in fact it was at the time).

18. I have not replied in writing to Judge Wilson's several minutes as on some occasions he had sought an interview with me, and this has been granted, and for others he has spoken to the Secretary of the Attorney-General's Department, Mr. W. C. Langcake. In each case this was sufficient reply to his minutes.

19. I had indicated to Judge Wilson the Government's intention to appoint a further Magistrate, as confirmed by him in paragraph 17 of his minute of resignation.

(a), (b) and (c) were matters of an administrative nature and Mr. Matison, C.S.M., the then Permanent Head of the Local and District Criminal Courts Department, handled those matters as was proper and correct in the circumstances.

(d) This matter is being handled by the Public Service Board in the normal course.

(e) I advised Judge Wilson in our discussions on February 17 and 24, 1976, that it was not my intention to appoint a further Special Justice of the Peace at this stage.

20. (a) There are a number of points that should be made concerning the manning of Courts at Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth.

(i) Prior to my appointment as Attorney-General, these Courts were only serviced by personnel from the Adelaide Juvenile Courts in matters where there was no contest. Trials were dealt with by the Magistrates from the summary

courts. It was my view that a more satisfactory arrangement than this was needed and accordingly I instructed Judge Wilson to make the necessary arrangements for this. I have now ascertained that this instruction has not been carried out.

(ii) Magistrates from the Juvenile Courts have, in fact, been regularly visiting Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth to hear uncontested matters and for the Judge of the Juvenile Court to say that "the public in those areas has not been well served as far as Juvenile Court matters are concerned for some considerable time now, and I consider that the neglect of those areas is inexcusable" is a slight on the magistrates who exercise jurisdiction in the Juvenile Courts.

(iii) It is significant that the lists at Elizabeth have been allowed to get completely out of hand, the trials in some cases having to be set down 12 months in advance. I have only recently become aware of this matter and I will make further verbal comments concerning the same.

(b) Judge Wilson's statement that he is concerned that he has received no word as to whether or not any of his recommendations are to be implemented is incorrect. I have advised him that provision of staff to supervise children held in custody in the Adelaide Juvenile Court is to be proceeded with and the Community Welfare Department and my Department are liaising in reference to this matter. I also advised him that it was not the Government's intention to provide a Public Relations Officer and research staff for the Juvenile Court. I advised Judge Wilson that it was the Government's view that professional public relations for the Juvenile Court was not a matter of high priority and that research staff could be provided through the Community Welfare Department.

(c) Comments to follow.

21. The Chief Stipendiary Magistrate has indicated that in his view jurisdiction could be exercised quite efficiently with a division of work between Judges, Magistrates and traffic work by Special Justices, and that such a division would not be inefficient. Judge Wilson has failed to indicate what the real problems associated with this division would be. When I have challenged this statement, he was not able to substantiate the ? ? ? ?

22. There is a fallacy in the proposition suggested by Judge Wilson in this paragraph. His proposal simply is that four Judges and one Special Justice of the Peace would undertake the work in the Adelaide Juvenile Court. He uses the words "presently envisaged" whereas he has indicated earlier in the document that he has now accepted my directive that the Juvenile Court should undertake juvenile work at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach. The Government's proposal is that two Judges, three Special Magistrates, and one Special Justice of the Peace should undertake the work at Adelaide as well as Christies Beach, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth.

23. Again, I am at a loss to know of any other persons who feel demoralised. Judge Newman and the two Magistrates in the Court do not share this feeling.

24. It is very clear that the whole basis of Judge Wilson's complaints lie in the question of status. It was inevitable that when the Adelaide Juvenile/Family Court reverted to the Adelaide Juvenile Court upon the establishment of the Australian Family Court that this would involve some reduction in status, simply because of the loss of jurisdiction. Judge Wilson was aware of this upon acceptance of his appointment as Senior Judge and his actions since then have endeavoured to enshrine the status of the Court at the level it was prior to the establishment of the Family Court of Australia.

I make no comments about paragraph 24, sub-paragraph 1 to 4.

However, I object strongly to the implication in paragraph (5). Just what these serious implications are is not spelt out. However, the implication is that I have not stated the Government's policy correctly. Such an allegation is farcical and incorrect and I strongly deny it.

Further matters:

1. Judge Wilson has continually sought to increase the status of the Adelaide Juvenile Court and therefore of his own status in a number of ways.

- (i) Proposals for the extension of the Juvenile Court to country areas with the appointment of additional judges to handle the workload. The effect of this of course is for a gradual transfer of a significant proportion of the work of the summary courts in the country from Magistrates and Justices of the Peace to judicial officers of the standing of Judges.
- (ii) For the appointment of a public relations officer and research staff for the Juvenile Court. This would make it the only court in Australia with such facilities.
- (iii) By obtaining the exclusive use of a Government vehicle.

2. There has been continuing debate as to the role of the Head of the Department in the affairs of the Juvenile Court and I have properly supported Mr. Matison, C.S.M. in the exercise of his administrative functions. This matter came to a head over arrangements for Mr. Kiosoglous, S.M. to take annual leave and an extra month's leave without pay to travel overseas.

3. There has been a series of minutes from Judge Wilson concerning the question of whether or not the Juvenile Court should have for its exclusive use a Government motor vehicle. I looked into this matter carefully upon the first occasion that it came to my notice and the facts briefly were that Judge Marshall was given the exclusive use of a car on a temporary basis when the Adelaide Juvenile Court was being set up. This use continued until he was seconded to the Family Court. At that time the car reverted to the pool of vehicles in the Local and District Criminal Courts Department and has remained there for use ever since. Judge Wilson has seen this as a lowering of status. It is not anything of the sort. Other specialist courts use cars from the vehicular pool within the Local and District Criminal Courts Department and the flexibility involved in this arrangement is most desirable. Mr. Matison, C.S.M., informs me that on all occasions when officers of the Juvenile Court have sought a vehicle that such has been made readily available.

4. I was well aware of the difficulties involving the Juvenile Court. In an endeavour to get some rationality into this whole matter, I have requested the Public Service Board to set up a Committee of Inquiry into the efficiency of the Local and District Criminal Courts Department, with particular regard to the judicial officers. The Committee has now been set up and is chaired by Mr. Justice Walters, members being Commissioner Iris Stevens and Magistrate, Mr. J. Crammond, S.M. One can only speculate as to the findings of that Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have dealt in some detail with the reasons give by Judge Wilson in offering to the Government his resignation as a judge authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act, as his comments themselves have serious implications to the administration of the Act. Included in these is that it might otherwise be construed that the Government is intent on reducing the status of the Juvenile Court. This implication has no factual foundation and the Government will continue to give strong support to the Juvenile Court in the exercise of its functions under and within the framework of the Juvenile Courts Act.

In his annual report Judge Wilson states that he was "extremely concerned about the quality of the Juvenile Court", and that he was "worried about the adverse effect of the Government's recent policies upon the administration of juvenile justice in South Australia". The Government's "recent policies" are those which existed at the time the Juvenile Courts Act was passed by this Parliament, and the Government has not, as is claimed by Judge Wilson, reduced its level of support to the Juvenile Court.

He reports that "the administration of juvenile justice in this State is less effective than it was previously . . . By virtue of the Government's present policy relating to the appointment of judges and other judicial officers to the Juvenile Court, the community has neither been properly served nor protected. With an insufficient number of

judges, with several levels of the judiciary being called upon to exercise the same jurisdiction, and with persons who are not legally trained being called upon to preside over the traffic court, and with the communities at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach receiving a lesser quality of juvenile justice administration than they received previously, the Adelaide Juvenile Court and courts for which it has a responsibility have been deprived of their capacity to do a job in the manner of the past three years".

I have said that the Government's present policy does not differ from its policy in 1971. The assertion that a community has neither been served nor protected is not supported by the statistics of the court appended to Judge Wilson's report. Neither is the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable Attorney that he must seek leave of the House to continue.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I seek leave to continue. Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Neither is the implication correct that judges of the Juvenile Court previously heard all matters at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Christies Beach. In his report Judge Wilson has recommended some modifications and alterations both to the law and to the procedures that are adopted within the juvenile justice system. The Government will study these recommendations in due course.

In his letter to the Minister of Community Welfare that has been tabled in Parliament today, Judge Wilson has made a number of allegations which cannot go unanswered. Judge Wilson asserts that the Government has decided upon "an unsatisfactory, expensive and cumbersome compromise which will prove to be not only inefficient but also less effective than in the past". I am not sure what Judge Wilson refers to when he says the court will be less effective and inefficient than in the past. I remind members that, until the Government of which I am a member came to occupy these benches, the Adelaide Juvenile Court was staffed by one judicial officer, a stipendiary magistrate. The jurisdiction of the Juvenile/Family Court was greatly diminished in October, 1975, when the Australian Family Court began functioning. The State Family Court, which was administered in conjunction with the Juvenile Court, and jointly staffed, was closed, and two of the judges were appointed to the Australian Family Court. Judge Wilson has demanded that four judges be appointed to exercise the remaining jurisdiction, that of the Juvenile Court. This would mean that judges of the Local and District Criminal Court (the second most senior judicial officers in the State), of whom there are currently 15, would be hearing for a considerable period of their time minor offences.

The salary of a Juvenile Court judge is \$35 250 a year, with a non-contributory superannuation scheme, sabbatical leave provisions, etc. Magistrates are now hearing contested matters and other Juvenile Court matters in suburban and country courts. It would seem unfair if geographic boundaries dictated the seniority of the judicial officer who heard the case. This Government would not be party to a policy of providing a standard of juvenile justice in country areas that was not comparable with that obtaining in metropolitan Adelaide, and if Judge Wilson's proposal to have juvenile matters dealt with by judges is taken to its logical conclusion and applied throughout the State this would lead to a dramatic and unwarranted increase in the number of judges.

Furthermore, Judge Wilson was aware, at the time of his resignation, of the imminent assignment of a third

special magistrate to the Adelaide Juvenile Court. It was in recognition of the need for judges to hear contested matters in suburban and country areas that a third judge was recently appointed to the court. Judge Wilson refers to his predecessor in the office of Senior Judge of the Adelaide Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Court, when Judge Wilson's predecessor was Senior Judge, had considerably less staff than it does today, although it had more judicial officers to choose from because it was combined with the Family Court. In fact, Judge Marshall, as he then was, was consulted on staffing requirements of the Adelaide Juvenile Court and, on August 29, 1976, wrote to the then Attorney-General that "at this stage . . . two judges plus one magistrate (on full-time duty) would provide an efficient service for Adelaide, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach".

I seek leave to have that letter inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Memo. to the Hon. the Attorney-General:  
(Forwarded through His Honour Senior Judge Ligertwood)  
RE: AUSTRALIAN FAMILY COURT AND SOUTH AUSTRALIAN  
JUVENILE COURT

Following the announcement on August 28, 1975, of my appointment as a Senior Judge of the Australian Family Court, to take effect as from January 5, 1976, I hereby tender my resignation as a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court, to take effect on January 5, 1976.

The appointment as a Senior Judge and the continuation of my secondment to the Australian Attorney-General's office as a member of the Australian Family Court Advisory Committee, follows discussions and correspondence between the Australian Attorney-General and your predecessor, now the Hon. Mr. Justice King. Under the terms of the secondment the State is reimbursed by the Australian Government for my salary. I understand that the secondment will continue until the date on which the Australian Family Court commences, i.e. January 5, 1976.

I also tender my resignation (effective forthwith) as a Judge empowered to exercise jurisdiction under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974. The effect of the resignation is that Judge A. B. C. Wilson (the next senior of the judges) becomes the Senior Judge in the Juvenile Court and responsible for its administration.

My long period of service with the South Australian Government (which commenced in March, 1938) has been a rewarding and enjoyable experience and I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to you and the S.A. Government.

Pursuant to a request from your predecessor I will soon be in a position to submit a report on a number of transitional matters relating to the commencement of the Australian Family Court in Adelaide and the closing down of the S.A. Family Court. However, there is one important matter to which I must draw your attention at this time, namely, the need for the Government to appoint another Judge to the Juvenile Court as soon as possible, and preferably before the Court occupies its new premises in Wright Street on October 1.

I realise that it is not for me to suggest a name for your consideration but I feel that I would be avoiding an obligation if I failed to point out that Mr. L. K. Newman, Senior Special Magistrate, has been attached to the S.A. Family Court/Juvenile Court since February, 1974. During that time he has carried out his judicial duties to my entire satisfaction and he has won the admiration and approval of my judicial colleagues, all of whom are aware of the fact that he has on many occasions performed judicial work that would in normal circumstances be reserved for a Judge. Your predecessor is well aware of the nature of Mr. Newman's work in the Juvenile Court and of my opinion that he has all the qualities needed for appointment as a Judge in the difficult jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court. Mr. Newman's standing in the eyes of all concerned in the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act is such that there would be great disappointment should his services be lost to the Court.

I understand that Judge Wilson may make representation to the Government regarding a need for more than two Judges to be appointed to the Juvenile Court. My view at this stage is that two Judges plus one Magistrate (on

full-time duty) would provide an efficient service for Adelaide, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach. If Mr. Newman, S.S.M., is no longer available as a full-time Magistrate for the Juvenile Court, my suggestion is that Mr. Matison, C.S.M., be asked to roster his country magistrates so that each one spends a period of three to six months at the Adelaide Juvenile Court. The new Juvenile Court building in Wright Street allows for three courts and three sets of chambers and the rotation system would assist greatly to provide a reasonably uniform system of juvenile court justice throughout the State.

Finally, I thank you personally for taking such a keen interest in the Juvenile Court and for your attendance at the opening of the new Court in Wright Street.

August 29, 1975.

Judge J. Marshall

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Judge Wilson refers to my "several memoranda (all of which had been unanswered . . .)". This is simply not an expression of the truth. I had either telephone or personal discussions with Judge Wilson after almost every one of his written communications. The Secretary of the Attorney-General's Department, Mr. W. C. Langcake, spoke to Judge Wilson on other occasions. I could see no purpose to be served by repeating in correspondence the views that I had often personally expressed to Judge Wilson.

Judge Wilson alleges that the Government had exerted "pressure on (him) to exercise (his) statutory responsibility in a particular way, and an interference with (his) judicial independence". There has never been any direction by the Government to exercise responsibility of Judge Wilson or any other judge in a particular way, nor has his judicial independence been interfered with in any way. It is noted that there are no facts to support these allegations and, on behalf of the Government, I absolutely and totally reject them.

In summary, Judge Wilson's judicial capacity is not in question. Judge Wilson has not, in his raising "a matter of principle", questioned the number of judicial officers made available by this Government for service in the Juvenile Court. What is at issue, and what has been questioned, is who has the responsibility for deciding the status of the judicial personnel in the Juvenile Court. To that question there can be only one answer—the Legislature and the Executive, this Parliament and this Government. It is a responsibility which the Government has exercised properly in accordance with the provisions of the Juvenile Courts Act and in the best interests of the people of this State.

I conclude by informing this House that the Government has accepted Judge Wilson's resignation as a judge authorised to exercise the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts Act, such resignation to take effect from October 31, 1976. The necessary action will be taken to rescind the proclamation appointing him to exercise that jurisdiction.

## QUESTION TIME

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Question Time in this House to extend to 3.25 p.m. this afternoon.

Motion carried.

## QUESTIONS RESUMED

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier extend the current session of Parliament, and arrange the sittings to enable proper consideration of legislation coming before this House and to avoid a repetition of the deplorable situation

that resulted in the House sitting until after four this morning? Members well know when the House rose this morning. For most of this session the Government has adopted a casual and leisurely programme for its legislation. The weekly time table has been reasonable, and has been adhered to, but since the opening in June we have had only 24 sitting days, and apparently only 17 more are contemplated. The Opposition offered in June to sit for additional days to get legislation through, and has made clear that it has been willing to sit more frequently. This would have been advantageous to both the Government for the dispatch of its business, and to the Opposition, for the additional time for questions, private members' business, and matters of grievance, all of which it has a right to raise. However, the demand by the Government programme for this week that the Budget lines be completed in one night was patently absurd, as shown by the outcome of yesterday's marathon sitting. I now repeat the Opposition's offer to sit more frequently, and for a longer session, within normal hours, so that proper consideration can be given to the affairs of the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the Leader of the Opposition is rapidly qualifying as one of the best comedians this State has seen in politics.

Dr. Tonkin: You tread the boards fairly well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may well be true, but in that case I am qualified to judge. The Leader has complained about the sittings of the House during last evening and this morning and has said that the Opposition has been prepared to work. The Opposition was not prepared to sit beyond 10 p.m. for the discussion of business in this House and refused us pairs in order to continue sitting and do the work. It said it did not want to sit on Thursday evening either in any circumstances. It did not want to work and when it was faced with having to work it complained. The reason why we went so long last evening was outlined to this House in some detail yesterday, not by the Government but by the Leader's erstwhile colleague, the member for Mitcham, who pointed out that yesterday afternoon we had a consistent filibuster of the most trivial nonsense from members of the Opposition, including a series of repetitive questions when I, dealing with the Premier's Department line, had to get up and say "That question has already been answered this afternoon on several occasions."

Members opposite were endeavouring to spin out time yesterday, deliberately not dealing with the matters of work before the House. If, in consequence, since we do not move the guillotine, members are required to sit here until the work is done, that is on their own heads. As to the sittings of the House, we have not said when the end of this session will be. Members may have to sit for some time to get the business done. We have a lot of work to do, and we expect them to do it.

Dr. TONKIN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: One thing should be cleared up: the Premier has said that the Opposition has refused pairs to go on past 10 p.m. I should like to make the position quite clear for members, because there has been much misrepresentation. I wrote to the Deputy Premier on, I think, Monday (or perhaps Tuesday) and said quite clearly that the pair that had been granted to the member for Henley Beach would be honoured in all circumstances, but that there would be no pairs granted for abnormal sittings of the House on Thursdays (which means, in my

interpretation, after 6 p.m. on Thursdays), and that we would not grant pairs for the application of the guillotine at any time other than that granted to the member for Henley Beach. Normal sittings of the House do not include, by common practice of this House, Thursday evenings, Mondays, or Fridays. However, the Government is not prepared to sit during normal times.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Leader is going beyond a personal explanation: he is now getting into the arena of debate.

Dr. TONKIN: I am simply claiming that I have been misrepresented to the extent that the Premier has suggested that I am not prepared to let this Party sit during the accepted normal sitting times. We are more than happy to do that, and will do so. It is not a question of how long for each sitting; it is a question of how many sitting days in each session.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader has indicated to the House that he wrote to me, I think on Monday last, or Tuesday (that is yesterday), and set out conditions for pairs that I take it will obtain for the future. I have received that letter, although I have not yet acknowledged it or discussed it with the Leader. Let me make clear to the House that, before Tuesday of this week, it was my very clear understanding (and I was left in no doubt about this) that, up to this time, the sittings of the House would not be tolerated by the Opposition outside the normal sitting hours. He did not specify only Thursday nights. He said to me, in effect, as follows: Tuesdays, 10 p.m.; Wednesdays, 10 p.m.; Thursdays, 5 p.m. That was my clear understanding of the arrangement with the Leader. I reported that to my Party, and I am telling you, Sir, that that was my clear understanding of a discussion I had with the Leader of the Opposition in relation to pairs. The Leader has also said that he gave me a clear understanding (and he did, in a letter) about the pair for the member for Henley Beach. However, it took three letters before I got that. I gave the Leader the understanding that I would not, without good reason, apply the guillotine in the absence of the member for Henley Beach, but I would not give him a written guarantee: he had to trust my integrity in that matter. I said that I would not, without good reason, have the House sit beyond the normal sitting hours. We are now in the beginning of October, and we have done virtually no work.

Mr. Dean Brown: Whose fault is that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Davenport often gets beside himself, and he should not point his finger at me; I am likely to bite it. The reason why the House has not sat later during this session is as I have explained. I honoured the understanding that I had with the Leader of the Opposition by not having the House sit beyond 10 p.m. on Tuesdays or Wednesdays and 5 p.m. on Thursdays. There has been a deliberate filibuster on the part of Opposition members; there is no doubt about that and they have made no secret of it. They have told me that they will do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable Minister that he is now debating the issue.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is fast reaching the situation in relation to pairs where it does not really know from day to day where it stands, because the

rules change according to the circumstances. I have received the letter to which the Leader referred. It indicates to me that the Opposition is not prepared, apart from the case of the member for Henley Beach (and we have an unqualified assurance in relation to a pair for him) to grant us a pair to sit beyond 6 p.m. on Thursday. That is the latest set of conditions. My clear understanding, which I reported to my Party (and everyone in the Party knows it), was that pairs were not to be granted beyond the normal sitting hours of the House up until the period when the Opposition considered we were justified in doing so.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say on what occasions the Opposition has refused to grant pairs for the normal sittings of the House? We believe that this is an important matter, because members of the public expect responsible behaviour from both sides of the House when it comes to sittings of the House. The Government has, unfortunately, had at least two ailing members for some time, and the Opposition has always granted them pairs. One of the Government's ailing members has been granted a pair for today's sitting. I have read carefully, as a result of an approach by the Minister for Planning, a letter sent by the Leader to the Government. That letter seems to be clear in its intent. By personal explanation, reference has been made to the sittings of the House on Thursday evenings. It is made clear that members will be granted pairs by the Opposition for normal sittings of the House, which are defined by normal practice. The Government knows perfectly well that, if it arranges its programme, it is unnecessary to sit on Thursday evenings, when country members have traditionally and normally always returned home after the week's sittings and when members have frequently taken speaking engagements. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that you are allowing my explanation, because this matter should be cleared up once and for all. Although Standing Orders determine the normal sittings, Parliamentary practice extends that, and that has been the normal practice. The number of sitting weeks this year has been minimal, and only once since I have been a member have we had two weeks recess for the Royal Show. Regarding the charge made about deliberate filibustering, I point out that 27 hours has been devoted to debating the Budget, whereas the average has been 48 hours. The Opposition has been more than co-operative with the Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do you mean by 48 hours?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: By examining *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's rubbish.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister had better have another look.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On what occasion has the Opposition refused to give the Government pairs for the normal sittings of the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Premier made clear what was his understanding from the Leader of the Opposition on the subject of pairs, namely, at the early stages of the session until now, pairs would not be granted for sittings of the House beyond 10 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, in addition to Thursdays.

Dr. Tonkin: Except when necessary.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Come on!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The clear understanding was given to us that the Opposition did not consider it necessary in the early part of the session, whereas in fact the Government did. The Opposition complains about the

fact that there have been breaks in the session on this occasion. We have previously been asked by the Opposition to proceed to measures of this kind to have a number of weeks on and some weeks off.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That has been constantly suggested by the Opposition. Now that we have acceded to it, the Opposition says that we are not working the House hard enough.

Mr. Mathwin: Why did you have only three days in June?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order.

Mr. Goldsworthy: When haven't we given you a pair?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were told that there would be no pairs.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Leader has written—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier will answer the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were told that no pairs would be given in respect of the sittings of the House beyond the normal times of sitting on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. Frankly, that then meant that we were faced with a lack of pairs for the times after 10 o'clock on Tuesdays and Wednesdays for the first part of the session up until now. We went along with that, but that has meant that, as we get towards the end of the session, we will have to sit longer at night in order to get the work done. It is a choice the Opposition has made, and I think it extraordinary that it should now complain about it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've been dreaming.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, he has not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin: Four weeks in six months!

Mr. Dean Brown: We got up for your birthday party.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second time I have had to warn the honourable member for Davenport this afternoon.

## GAS ACCOUNTS

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare investigate the present method of applying concessional allowances for the payment of gas accounts by pensioners? Constituents have complained to me that, following a change of address, the concessional allowance has been withdrawn. In the existing circumstances, it is necessary for pensioners to make a fresh application to the Gas Company in order to be eligible for continuation of the concession, with the result that many pensioners who are unaware of this condition are not receiving concessional benefits. Will the Minister approach the Gas Company for the purpose of having a card forwarded to pensioners following a change of address?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to my attention. I shall certainly look at the position he has disclosed to see whether anything can be done. On the face of it, it would seem that, if the company were willing to send a notice based on the records it holds indicating that persons were eligible for concessions, it would not be too much of a hardship for the company to send such a notice to people who changed their address. I shall examine the matter and let the honourable member know the result.

## CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

Mr. OLSON: Has the attention of the Minister of Community Welfare been drawn to a report appearing in the monthly publication *Scope* of September 23, 1976, headed "Yatala worse than Pentridge"? The report relates to a surprise visit to the prison—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much cross-examination between the benches. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr. OLSON: The report relates to a surprise visit to the prison by the Chief Justice (Dr. Bray), accompanied by the Supreme Court Justice, Roma Mitchell, and claims that South Australian prison authorities, because of poor conditions for prisoners, got the shake-up of their lives as a result. Part of the report claims that, in certain instances, three to five men share a cell, and only some prisoners benefit from fewer than 16 hours spent in a cell each day, or have their own separate cell. On a recent inspection of the prison, three Parliamentary colleagues and I were told by the authorities that, for a considerable time, it had been the practice for each prisoner to have his own cell accommodation. Further, it was explained that the sharing of cells by two prisoners was necessary only about two years ago, when the number of prisoners exceeded single-cell accommodation. Will the Minister investigate the unhealthy and undignified conditions as claimed in the report, and the report that neither judge would commit any man to prison, because of the state of the accommodation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This matter comes within the province of the Chief Secretary. I believe that the honourable member asked whether my attention had been drawn to the article. My attention had not been drawn to it until now. I assure the honourable member that I will take the trouble to read the report. Any action he wishes taken in the matter will need to be carried out by my colleague, who I am sure will take note of what has occurred here today.

## MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Monarto Relocation Committee is still working on a "good deal" for the public servants who have to move to Monarto and what assistance will be given them under that "good deal"? In March, 1974, a report in the *News* states that the Premier had said that a relocation committee was working on this matter and that those public servants who moved to Monarto would receive a "good deal". He said that assistance would be given to these people to move, allowances would be given, and accommodation would be provided. Can the Minister say whether this committee is still working and what aspects of assisting public servants it is considering?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The relocation committee has made an initial report, but further work has to be done. Until we are able to determine the commencing date of construction, that additional work is not likely to be finalised.

## RAILWAYS TRANSFER

Mr. VENNING: Will, or can, the Minister of Transport say what progress occurred in his recent interview with the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon? There

was much hoo-ha by the Minister of Transport when he said that he had been breaking his neck in wanting to meet and speak with his Federal counterpart concerning the railway transfer agreement and other matters. Therefore, I ask the Minister what progress he can report on matters that were discussed during the period of their togetherness.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Last Monday week at the opening of the A.R.T.F. conference in Adelaide I had a brief discussion with Mr. Nixon, and he promised (and made a public statement) that he would meet me (and he used the words "within a fortnight"), hopefully to pursue further and perhaps resolve some of the outstanding matters associated with the transfer. Only this morning my Secretary received a telephone call from Canberra on behalf of Mr. Nixon asking whether it was possible for me to go to Canberra tomorrow week for those discussions. I have applied to the Opposition for a pair, but unfortunately it will not grant me a pair after 5 p.m., so I will not be able to go to Canberra to meet Mr. Nixon.

## CLUSTER TITLES

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to provide for cluster titles relating to housing applications? Is the Minister aware that problems similar to those in South Australia have arisen in other States and that legislation has been introduced in those States in connection with strata titles that permit land to be subdivided into lots and common property and for titles to be issued when plans for subdivisions are lodged and approved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is a matter of considerable importance. Obviously, it is of great significance concerning the financing of cluster development, because, if titles cannot be granted until the whole project is completed, the project has to be completely financed by the developer from start to finish, and no title can be issued to anyone before that stage so that substitute finance can be obtained. As the Government considers that medium density development, such as that involved in cluster development proposals, is important from the point of view of containing the future size of Adelaide, the matter of amending legislation is important and urgent. However, as the honourable member would appreciate, the Victorian legislation has created certain difficulties, and there is no point in introducing amending legislation that is so complicated that it cannot be made to work effectively and simply. The great advantage we have had in this State from the Torrens title system must be maintained, and we have to devise a method of overcoming the problem whilst still retaining the relative simplicity that exists in the present arrangement. The Urban Development Coordinating Committee, of which I am Chairman, at its last meeting decided to ask Mr. Den-Ouden of the Monarto Development Commission to undertake an investigation into the legal, practical, and planning difficulties that lie in the way of cluster or tract development, and we hope that, with consultation with the Parliamentary Counsel, the Registrar-General, and officers of the Attorney-General's Department, it will be possible to devise a relatively simple solution to this aspect of the problem. The problem is not confined to the issue of titles: there are other difficulties that we have to tackle, and when I am able to make a recommendation to Cabinet I will do so, and will press it.

## COUNCIL OFFICERS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Local Government examine the special circumstances of several officers attached to councils in country areas who I understand now operate under a special dispensation issued by the Minister that expires on March 1 next year? One officer who has spoken to me has passed his Royal Society of Health examination, which covers most matters that he has to supervise in his council area. To do that has entailed him—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is so much private conversation that is so audible that it is difficult to hear the honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: —in seven years of study, and he now supervises six other inspectors in his office. The regulations now, and after March 1 will, require these officers to pass an examination conducted by the Further Education Department under the auspices of Marlestone Technical College, and they have to show competence in Building Drawing 1 and 2, Building Theory 1, and the Building Act, 1970-1971, as amended from time to time. The officer who approached me said that he would be faced with about 2½ years of further study. It seems, because of the practical application and satisfaction that this officer has given (and there are other officers in a similar position), that this dispensation should be considered in a commonsense way, so that these officers will not have to run the gamut of conditions laid down in the regulations.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to obtain the details of this specific case, have it investigated, and supply the honourable member with what information I can. I have not been quite able to work out whether the person to whom the honourable member is referring is an unqualified health inspector, an unqualified building inspector, an unqualified overseer or an unqualified clerk, but obviously he is unqualified and acting in the position, presumably under the dispensation provisions that I have vested in me under the Local Government Act. What we have done, in general, is encourage people with every effort we can to obtain qualifications. I cannot recall one instance where I have withdrawn the temporary approval for a person to carry on the task provided that the person could demonstrate that he was making a reasonable effort to attain qualifications. The only case I can recall was one where dispensation was not withdrawn but was refused to be continued. This was in the Far North, where a clerk had been operating on dispensation for 14 years, and I think at that stage he had failed the first-year course about seven times.

Mr. Venning: What council was that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not remember, and I would not like to say if I did. If the honourable member will give me the details I will have a look at the matter. I make the observation that we want qualified people, but we are not pursuing an unrealistic course in getting them.

## WEST LAKES SCHOOLS

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Education say what final provisions will be made for the educational needs of children within the area of West Lakes? Many constituents of Albert Park, now residing in West Lakes, took up options to buy land and built at West Lakes on the assumption that certain areas would be set aside for schools. Because of circumstances beyond the State Government's control, changes to programmes have been

made, causing much concern to constituents about the future programme for the building of schools in that area.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Some information was given about this matter during the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill, and the member for Henley Beach also had some specific information from me. From memory, there are two schools in the planning stage, one which is provisionally known as West Lakes Shore and the other which is provisionally known as Delfin Island, which name causes some comment from those who do not know that part of the metropolitan area very well. West Lakes Shore is planned to proceed at an earlier date than Delfin Island and, as I recall, tenders are to be called late in the next financial year or early in the following financial year. Tenders for Delfin Island will be called a little after them. I think I should obtain some more specific information for the honourable member. There are also one or two other school sites more to the northern end of the development about which I do not have in mind at this stage any specific information for honourable members.

## NANGWARRY HOUSES

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister for Planning take immediate action to have electric wall heaters supplied and fitted to all the houses in Nangwarry as a positive step to reducing the risk of fire in houses which, if ignited, burn at an alarming rate? This is a time of tragedy in the town of Nangwarry, a tragedy that I will not go into further at the moment as an inquiry will be held soon. However, at this time the people of Nangwarry are seeking some positive action to reduce the risk of further tragedies, and I am certain that they will respond favourably to the request I have made in the question. The residents believe that not enough has been done in the past and that perhaps nobody cares. I am concerned and the people of Nangwarry are concerned. They are concerned enough to have taken steps to form a progress association in the town to further the interests of the town. This action has been prompted largely by members of the social club, and some support by the Government along the lines suggested in the question would support and stimulate greater community spirit. I hope the Minister will be able to take some action immediately.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I made clear yesterday that the South Australian Housing Trust, which has had responsibility for these old houses at Nangwarry for only a relatively short period, has already undertaken quite significant upgrading and has, in fact, undertaken some upgrading of the house where the tragedy occurred. I can assure the honourable member that he is not the only one in this House concerned about the matter. If the honourable member had listened yesterday, he would have appreciated the action that has already taken place to install an up-to-date fire alarm system to connect all houses in Nangwarry in the same way as has been done in Mount Burr to the Emergency Fire Service headquarters, so that, automatically, if there is any difficulty there is an immediate alarm.

Mr. Vandeppeer: They don't all have telephones.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Arrangements obviously have to be made to ensure that any alarm system works and is manned effectively at all times. As I mentioned yesterday, the trust understands that the equipment for this has already been ordered from Telecom. It may be unfortunate that this did not take place much sooner.



I will certainly have the honourable member's suggestion examined by the South Australian Housing Trust, but I am not an expert on these matters (and I suspect that the honourable member is not an expert, either), and any suggestions that are made have to be carefully considered to see that they are feasible and will help to produce the desired result. These problems are not always open to straightforward and simple solutions. I will have the honourable member's question examined in detail and reported on, and I can assure him (and I should have thought this was obvious and did not require the kind of statement made by the honourable member today) of everyone's concern, and particularly the concern of the Housing Trust, in relation to this matter.

#### BICYCLE TRACKS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report about whether consideration has been given (and, if not, I ask that it be given) to the incorporation of exclusive bicycle tracks when roads are to be reconstructed and widened? I refer particularly to three roads in my district (the Lower North-East Road, Grand Junction Road and Smart Road) where such work will eventually take place. I know that it is the Government's policy to encourage the best mode of transport for a particular trip and, if this should be by bicycle, the Government endeavours to provide safe facilities when sufficient demand for them occurs. Several planning studies have been undertaken that have recommended the use of low volume residential streets to reduce conflict with motorised traffic. The Government has financed two experimental tracks through the park lands and has offered to subsidise the construction of bicycle tracks by the Adelaide City Council, and to date one has been constructed.

Methods of financing cycle track construction are being examined with the intention of improving cycle facilities. In conjunction with councils, the Government is financing studies to determine low-cost alternatives for the safe movement of non-motorised travel, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians. Exclusive bicycle tracks incorporated in the roads to which I have referred would be used by schoolchildren and those adults who wish to use this mode of transport. The building of such tracks in more areas would afford greater safety to cyclists.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter has been the subject of fairly extensive investigations for some time. I cannot give detailed information now about the area to which the honourable member refers; however, I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ACTUARIAL OFFICER

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement. I can assure members that it is short.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following the attack made on a temporary public servant, Mr. Whelan, in the House last night at the behest of the former Public Actuary, I have obtained a report from the Chairman of the Public Service Board as to the basis on which the Public Service Board recommended his probationary appointment. I propose to read that report, as follows:

Mr. Whelan has had experience in all of the important areas of duty required from a Government actuary. Some of these include superannuation, life insurance, friendly societies, investment, supervision of large departments preparing financial advice, development of new financial advisory services, and membership of an executive team responsible for 250 people, with, in some cases, a continuous period of experience of more than 10 years. For four years before joining the South Australian Public Service Mr. Whelan was employed by one of the three largest life insurance companies in Australia, National Mutual Life Association of Australia. By any standard, Mr. Whelan's promotional progress in that organisation was outstanding; he had at least four major promotions in four years. Mr. Whelan's last appointment was actuary for South Australia, with additional executive responsibility requiring him to contribute to decision-making over the whole range of that organisation's activities in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Was that in the A.M.P.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Within the National Mutual Life Association. The report continues:

Mr. Whelan moved from Melbourne to take up a position in Sydney over six years ago. Mr. Whelan found the position unsatisfactory and returned to Melbourne after one year. He cannot understand how his departure could under any interpretation be regarded as dismissal. He qualified as a Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries in 1973. Mr. Whelan is well qualified in this area and is respected within his profession.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PAIRS

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to explain the situation regarding two pairs that have been granted with some qualification relating to them. The Minister of Transport has raised the subject of the pair to be granted to him on October 14. I negotiated with the Government Whip about a pair for the Minister of Labour and Industry for next Thursday. Last evening in this House the Leader and the Deputy Premier agreed that we would not sit tomorrow evening, and on that basis the Minister's pair was granted. At the bottom of the document shown to me by the Government Whip I wrote words to the effect, "As long as the House does not sit after 6 p.m. the pair is agreed to". Regarding the Minister of Transport's wishing to speak to the Federal Minister, the two Whips considered that the same circumstances would apply and a similar statement was put at the bottom of that application, too. The Deputy Premier has raised the point that the Government cannot accept a pair with a qualification attached thereto. He claims that he said to the Leader that the Government did not intend to sit after 6 p.m. on Thursday evenings unless an extreme emergency arose. He also said that he knew that, in those circumstances we would, in all probability, agree to a pair's being granted. I assure the Deputy Premier that, if there was an emergency, we would agree. Because there seems to have been a misunderstanding about a pair with a qualification attached thereto for Thursday evening, I believe the matter should be discussed again. I promise the Deputy Premier that I will speak to the Leader and other members of the Party on that basis and that I will then negotiate with the Minister and his Whip. I do not think there will be any problem. I believe a misunderstanding arose between both Whips, and that the situation should be clarified.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PUBLIC ACTUARY

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the Budget debate last evening and this morning I referred, amongst other things, to the retiring Public Actuary and the Deputy Public Actuary. In view of the Premier's Ministerial statement this afternoon there are two short matters on which I wish to make a personal explanation. First, I quoted from the Auditor-General's Report at page 336 and then said:

Mr. Stratford tells me that he would have preferred that note to have been written as follows:

The investigation as at July 1, 1974, has been done, but a re-assessment will be necessary before a certificate can be given by the Public Actuary.

That is the same sentence that appears in the Auditor-General's Report, a sentence I had quoted just before making the statement to which I have referred. I made a mistake in quoting it again, because I looked at the wrong note that I had in my hand. What I meant to say (and I give this explanation so that it will make sense in *Hansard*) is as follows:

A valuation of the Police Pensions Fund was made on the instructions of the Under Treasurer by the Deputy Public Actuary. The Public Actuary has been unable to satisfy himself as to its accuracy and he will not sign it. The second short matter arises out of the Premier's strictures on my raising the matter in this place. This morning I have received a copy of the only medical certificate which was tendered to the South Australian superannuation board and apparently on which Mr. Stratford was retired. The certificate is dated September 14, and is given by a medical practitioner—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is introducing new matter and that he is confined to making a personal explanation. The honourable member is introducing new matter that opens up a new area of debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It arises out of the Premier's strictures on me. The certificate shows that Mr. Stratford is not mentally disturbed, as the Premier suggested last evening that he was. The certificate is from a general practitioner only, and all it states is:

I have been asked by Mr. Stratford to give a report on his medical condition. I would say that I have been seeing him for some years now, and that he has always been showing evidence of overworking and stress at work—all his visits to me have been to do with mental strain, etc. Lately things got much worse, and I had to advise him to change his work load, etc. This I believe he is doing, and I feel already that he is showing the benefit of same.

It is on that letter and that letter alone apparently that the superannuation board has acted. I suggest that that letter shows anything but the mental unbalance to which the Premier referred last evening and on which he apparently based his strictures on me.

## QUESTIONS RESUMED

## CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education assure the House that the undertaking he gave some time ago about the building of an agricultural block at Ceduna Area School will proceed this year? I have raised this matter with the Minister several times, the last occasion

being during the Estimates debate, when the Minister stated that his undertaking stood. I have been told in the past few days that it seems that the work will not start until some time next year. Will the Minister therefore state exactly what is the position?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If the facts are as outlined by the honourable member he knows more than I do about the matter. The assurance that I gave during the Loan Estimates debate still stands. The only possible contingency that could affect the project would be costs getting completely out of hand, as this would reduce our ability to produce X units with Y amounts of money; otherwise, the position is as stated previously.

## LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether the repaving of the paved area at Loxton High School is being delayed because it has been found necessary to relay water services in the built-up area of the school because of suspected subterranean subsidence, which seems to be responsible for the subsidence of a certain section of the solid-structure building? If what I have said is correct and the repaving is being delayed for that reason, will the Minister obtain a report for me about the proposed work schedule for carrying out the work. If the information is incorrect, will he state when it is intended that the repaving, which has been delayed for some time, will be undertaken?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain the specific information for the honourable member. I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for the hospitality of his constituents on a certain memorable occasion recently.

## GLENELG INTERSECTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say when it is expected that traffic lights to be installed at the intersection of Jetty Road and Brighton Road, Glenelg, will be completed and when they will be in operation? The Minister is aware of the situation at this intersection. It is causing great problems to pedestrians, many of whom are aged. With the roadworks almost completed, the traffic flow is more consistent and heavier because of the wider road. It took one of my constituents 20 minutes to cross Brighton Road last week. I have been told that last weekend there were two bad accidents at this intersection. The installation of lights there is now urgently needed because of the influx of visitors for the holiday season, so I ask when it is expected that the lights will be installed and in operation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot give the date, but I imagine that when they are completed they will be put into operation. That is the normal course of events.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member asked me when they would be completed and when they would be in operation. He asked two questions, and I am trying to answer them together. If some of the honourable member's colleagues would shut up for a while he would be able to hear what I am saying. The contract has been let for the traffic signals. Regrettably, the position is beyond my control, because the contract having been let, the job is now in the hands of the contractor. I hope the honourable member will be delighted to know that

later we expect to encompass the installation of signals within the Highways Department's work force. In other words, the work will be done by Highways Department day labour rather than by contract, and when that day arrives we will be in a much better position to control the situation than we are at the moment. We are entirely in the hands of a private contractor. I will make some further inquiries and, if I can get a date that has any meaning in it, I will let the honourable member know, particularly taking into account the Christmas period to which he has referred and which I know is important.

#### NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government knows that cool drinks in non-returnable bottles are being marketed under the name of Canada Dry from the Underdale premises of Passiona Bottling Company (Melbourne) Limited? If it does, does the Government expect manufacturers who market in returnable bottles to continue doing so when the Government seems to be taking no action on the use of non-returnable bottles? Recently, the Minister introduced an amendment to the beverage container legislation as a matter of urgency to correct a situation that was developing in South Australia concerning plasti-shield bottles. In view of the action the Minister took then, what action does he intend to take about non-returnable bottles now being marketed?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I was not aware that these bottles were being used, but I will draw the matter to the attention of my officers and see what action should be taken under the legislation passed earlier this year in order to control the use of these bottles.

*At 3.25 p.m. the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### INDUSTRIAL PROMOTION

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House condemn the Government for its total lack of understanding of the real problems confronting established industry, and industrial development in South Australia, as evidenced by its recent announcements on pay-roll tax and relocation benefits, and its failure to remedy basic problems, such as workmen's compensation.

I take this action because it is becoming increasingly apparent to the people of South Australia that the measures being taken and announced by this Government are nothing more than window-dressing. It has been suggested to me that the measures announced recently on land tax, pay-roll tax concessions and many other matters are basically nothing more than paper tigers and that this should be called a paper tiger Government, because basically one reads these announcements in the newspaper, where they are given great prominence, but when it comes to the point little real advantage comes to South Australia as a whole.

Industrial development in this State has not come to a standstill but it has nearly done so. If one examines the publication of the lists of the various developments, the expansions for which the Premier's Department takes credit, one finds that they are the normal expansions that occur in the day-to-day running of firms already established in South Australia. The number of new industries identified as setting up in South Australia since June, 1973, is

still only 14. Most of these industries have been relatively small. The total capital value of 13 of them is only about \$11 000 000, and the only really large industry, as has been said before, was the new lube refinery, which had a capital value of about \$43 000 000. Even that development was bound to come as a natural extension of the refinery process at Port Stanvac. The Playford Government developed industry in this State by using a cost advantage factor and because the Premier went out actively and sought industry, travelled to other States and overseas, and offered real incentives to industry to establish in South Australia. Industrial development that has occurred since this Government came to office is a different picture indeed. Obviously something had to be done. In November last year, it was announced that firms would get a tax rebate incentive to establish in three growth areas of South Australia. Obviously, having promoted these schemes, the Liberal Party was pleased indeed to see that the Government was apparently taking some notice of it. Pay-roll tax incentives were matters canvassed by this Party for some months before then. We have been well aware that the situation is getting desperate in South Australia.

The Premier announced that, although final details had not been settled, it was expected that rebates would be available up to the full rate, now five per cent of a company's gross wages and salaries payments. He was speaking at the time at Port Pirie and he referred to the growth areas as being the iron triangle, the green triangle and Monarto. The less said about the latter the better. He said that the concession would be a valuable incentive to industries considering moving to South Australia and that it was designed to attract new industries to the three regions and create extra employment. He also said:

The Government's policy is to create security of employment through decentralisation and diversity of industry. This generous remission demonstrates our commitment to regional development and will provide a real stimulus to worthwhile industrial commercial ventures in the three regions.

When one looks at their effectiveness and examines just how successful those pay-roll tax concessions have been since November, one finds a sad story indeed. Those incentives have been virtually worthless. We have heard in this House, I think in the early hours of this morning, about reimbursement of incentive payments to establish factories throughout the State, and when that item was debated we found that the sum of \$18 892 was made up almost completely of the Fletcher Jones enterprise in the green triangle, and not much else.

The Premier has been remarkably devious in releasing details of other firms which have been receiving concessions. I am not surprised, because my understanding is that not too many other firms, if any, are receiving those concessions. We have contacted authorities in those areas, and we find that in Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Whyalla (the iron triangle) and in Mount Gambier, Millicent, Penola, and Naracoorte (the green triangle) the authorities contacted knew of no new industries set up in that time in those areas which would attract the pay-roll concessions. There may be one or two they do not know about. Perhaps they have sneaked in. Perhaps the Premier can tell us.

Basically, the scheme for pay-roll tax incentives in those growth areas has been a monumental flop, window dressing, a show, a sham, because the conditions are such that they do not provide any incentive to industry to go to those areas. Other factors are militating against the movement of industry to those areas. One industry in Mount Gambier, I understand, has an application at the moment

before the Development Division. Many councils commented that the incentives offered by the Government last November were superficial, and of little benefit. They have seen through the show this Government is putting forward. There has been virtually no response to the proposals put up.

So much for the growth centre incentives put forward. The sum of \$160 000 appearing against that item as expenditure for this year indicates just how little use the Government expects to be made of these pay-roll tax incentives. Indeed, when it announced its programme earlier this week for country centres, the Government is reported as having said that it expected to spend \$1 200 000 over five years; that is a little more than \$200 000 a year, which is not a significant sum if we are to obtain new industries, to relocate industries, and to provide 500 more jobs a year. What a load of bunkum!

Certainly, we would like to be able to provide 500 more jobs a year. We would like to be able to provide 10 times that number, but the Government knows full well that the measures it has proposed will not have that effect. Once again, in a few months time, we will look at this newspaper report, painted in such glowing terms, and we will be able to say exactly the same thing: a spectacular flop. The conditions laid down are almost impossible in their stringency. They will do nothing to attract new industry to country areas, any more than they attracted it to the growth centres.

There are still these same basic factors militating against industrial development in this State. The Government does nothing whatever about them. Let us look at the conditions applying. For existing firms, the rebate would apply only to the expanded work force and only if the expansion involved five or more jobs. Some industries in this State are desperately hanging on. They can in no way expand, and they are fighting for their lives; they could well close. Expansion is the last thing they are thinking of, even with these so generous pay-roll tax exemptions!

The rebate would be offered initially for three years. A firm would have to be a manufacturing, commercial, or resources based processing enterprise to be eligible for the rebate. It should not be located in the three designated growth areas, and it should be diversified to produce a different product. That requirement is one of the major factors which prevent firms from taking advantage of the provisions. It must demonstrate that the proposed new development would not fragment the industry concerned or threaten unfairly the viability of an existing enterprise. I thoroughly agree with that. Firms would also have to demonstrate that the proposed development would be dependent primarily on markets outside the region in which the proposed development was to be located. And so it goes on. I predict that, unless some far more definite change is made, these incentives will be of as little value as were the original incentives for growth areas.

The whole point about these reports in the paper (and that is why I call this Government a "paper tiger" Government) is that they receive great publicity and they are tremendously valuable window-dressing exercises, but when it comes to the point they do very little to achieve what they say they will achieve. In the matter of pay-roll tax incentives, we see the adoption of another Liberal Party policy. It is getting to be quite a joke. The Dunstan Government is becoming something of a joke because it is adopting (or trying to give the appearance of adopting) one Liberal Party policy after another. It is an amazing performance and, if this Government so desperately wants to give the impression of being a liberal Government,

perhaps it would be better to put in a real Liberal Government which had a fundamental feeling for the matters that affect the people of this State.

Obviously, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. In its attempts to imitate the Liberal Party, the Labor Government is paying the Opposition a tremendous compliment, but no amount of window dressing, no amount of adoption of policies such as pay-roll tax incentives, succession duties and land tax concessions, or the setting up of a small business bureau will change the fundamental facts: this Labor Government is not prepared to take serious action on the fundamental factors which are keeping industry from South Australia. It is an amazing situation. This is a Government of deceit. One remembers the recent Budget and the statement that came with it to the effect that no rises in State charges or taxation had been announced in the Budget. That is typical; they were all announced beforehand.

Mr. Nankivell: Taking effect from July 1.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. In spite of that, huge increases are apparent in the Budget in receipts from State taxation. I refer honourable members to page 11 of the Auditor-General's Report, which states that receipts from all forms of State taxation amounted to \$281 266 000 in 1975-76, 25 per cent greater than last year, and 86 per cent greater than the year before. In spite of all those window-dressing concessions which have been made in succession duties and land tax, State charges have gone up and have been ripped off the people of South Australia to an amazing degree. State taxation is one of the fundamentals keeping industry away from South Australia, and State charges is another factor that is keeping industry away from this State. The increase in water charges and the fact that companies establishing have to pay the normal rate for water are also factors keeping industry away from South Australia. These are worthwhile concessions (not the show concessions that have been made in the Budget) that could be made. These are worthwhile concessions which, if made properly, would at least put us somewhere near being on an equal footing with the other States in attracting industry. In putting up the show that the Premier has put up, he is deliberately deceiving the public of South Australia.

The next major factor keeping industry away from South Australia is workmen's compensation. It is appalling to find that everyone in this State and in other States acknowledges that our workmen's compensation legislation as it stands is crippling industry here and is actively keeping people away from this State. There are no two ways about it: even the Government acknowledges that fact. We saw an attempt in the last session to introduce a Bill to correct the situation. However, that Bill was put off.

Mr. Mathwin: The Government got its knuckles rapped.

Dr. TONKIN: It was finally withdrawn; it lapsed.

Mr. Dean Brown: Even before we had a chance to say anything about it.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes; so the Liberal Party took action to introduce the necessary correcting legislation. The Bill has been through another place, yet it remains on our Notice Paper, and the Government will not debate it; it will not face up to it. Workmen's compensation provisions are such that an employee who has worked substantial overtime in months preceding his injury can now receive far more money by staying home than his workmates receive by going to work. There is the case, which I think the member for Davenport quoted, of an employee who received \$224 a week while on compensation, but

who would have dropped back to \$175 a week if he had returned to work. No wonder that a situation called "compensation neurosis" arises.

There has been a great increase in the number of workmen's compensation claims made since the Act came into operation in 1971. The number of wage and salary earners in South Australia increased by just over 10 per cent, from 408 000 to 449 000, but the number of workmen's compensation claims increased by 50 per cent, from 56 000 to 84 000. Workmen's compensation premiums have had to be increased sharply. The cost of premiums for every \$100 paid in wages to an employee is now \$16.50 for builders' labourers working on buildings of not more than two storeys, \$37.40 for timber fellers, and \$31.40 for underground miners. Increased premiums have resulted directly from increased compensation payments. The sum of \$36 200 000 was paid out in South Australia during 1974-75 under the new Act, compared to \$15 400 000 paid out during 1972-73, which was the last full year under the old Act. That represents a staggering increase of 135 per cent in workmen's compensation pay-outs under the Act in only two years. Each South Australian workman is now paying the equivalent of \$64 a year for workmen's compensation pay-outs. The cost of building a new house has increased by between \$800 and \$2 000 extra.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring to the honourable Leader's attention that, on Wednesday, October 20, a workmen's compensation Bill is listed to come before the Chamber. If the honourable Leader is anticipating this Bill, I must point out to him that I cannot allow this debate.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I am in no way anticipating the Bill. I am simply speaking to the motion that gives as one of its examples workmen's compensation in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow debate on that. If the honourable Leader makes a passing reference to it, I perhaps can allow it, but I cannot allow him to debate the issue, knowing that it is intended that the Bill will come before the Chamber.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You are quite right. I have finished my passing reference to the subject. However, I repeat that the Government is unwilling to take an honest look at the workmen's compensation situation here and to take effective action to correct it. That is another reason why industry will not come to South Australia.

I refer now to the threat of the Premier's programme for worker participation—industrial democracy, call it what you will. Under the terms that have been laid down, I would call it worker control: there are no two ways about it. Although the Premier has gradually resiled from his original position where he said that this was essential and would come into being within two years (then it became five or six years, later 15 years, but it does not matter particularly; he quietly came further and further away from it), the fact is that the report adopted at the Australian Labor Party conference on worker participation or industrial democracy will stand in the Party's platform.

We have a definite policy on worker participation (which we prefer to call worker involvement), which is a real and proper policy. It does not involve majority control of trade union members or Government representatives on company boards. I remind members of the ridiculous situation presently pertaining in the Premier's own department, in which members of the consultative council have

expressed the wish to have some say in who shall be appointed to a position in his department (a senior position, certainly). Although the Premier would absolutely support that point of view if it were a private company, it will not do in his own department, and he will not have a bar of it. The Premier has been hoist with his own petard, he knows full well he has, and he has been made to look ridiculous over it.

The window-dressing that has gone on in so many spheres and the apparent adoption of Liberal Party policy in so many areas are the biggest pieces of public relations window-dressing and the biggest sham of all time. The benefits that are said to be there are, on examination, not there, certainly not to any significant extent, and they will not have any effect in persuading industry to come to South Australia. Unless there is a major change of attitude by this Government, we can whistle in the wind for industrial development, because as long as these major factors of high State taxation, exorbitant workmen's compensation, and the threat of worker participation exist, industry will not come here and South Australia will continue to suffer. I said yesterday that South Australia desperately needed industrial development. I did not say at any cost, but we certainly need industrial development if we are to maintain our prosperity.

If we do not have industrial development, the quality of life, which is boasted about and which the Premier says is the envy of every other State, will not be possible, because we will not be able to afford it. Perhaps that suits the Premier, as he may want to see the State run down. The Premier is doing nothing positive to induce industry here and shows no evidence of changing the fundamental attitude, which must be changed if we are to have industrial development. Unless there is a major change in attitude by the Government, this State will not progress industrially any further and, if we do not progress industrially, we will not progress in prosperity.

If the Premier is so anxious for his Government to have the appearance of being a Liberal Government but is not willing to change his fundamental attitude, let him get out and allow a Liberal Government, which does have a different fundamental attitude and which believes strongly that we must give meaningful and significant incentives to industry, to take charge and show what it can do. I have no doubt that, with its fundamental changes in philosophy, it will obtain industrial development for this State. All the sham and show will be to no avail as long as the Labor Government stays in office in this State.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion so ably moved by the Leader. As he said, the incentives announced last November by the Government and extended again yesterday to other areas of the State are virtually of no consequence. However, I acknowledge that what was announced today by the Premier concerning the Riverland fruit industries will be of enormous benefit to that area. Previously, I had moved a motion concerning decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebate incentives, and I have said many times that the Victorian Government has operated this sort of legislation since 1972. The South Australian Government has nothing to fear from this type of legislation and could introduce it immediately because, under the provisions of the Victorian Act, an industry has to prove that it needs this form of rebate and assistance, which does not automatically apply across the board to all decentralised industries. An industry that can show a need for this benefit so that it can remain viable can apply for assistance.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Have you looked at the qualifications?

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, I have a copy of that Act; I have had it for about three years and have read it many times. I understand that the new Labor Government in New South Wales also undertook (before the recent election) to introduce similar legislation to that operating in Victoria. It is recognised that, because of the vast distances involved in Australia, decentralised industries suffer many disadvantages compared to industries established in metropolitan areas in each State. Not only are additional costs involved because of pay-roll tax but also freight and other charges have to be withstood by industries established in remote areas. Pay-roll tax is an iniquitous tax, because it is a tax on productivity and not on profit. This is a problem facing industries in the Riverland. The Government has now recognised this problem in the Riverland and has taken some action.

Industries along the river are labour intensive and have a high level of pay-roll tax. In 1974-75, Riverland Fruit Products paid \$110 650 in pay-roll tax but in 1975-76 this amount had dropped to \$81 000. That reduction clearly indicates the enormous decrease in employment and productivity of that company; unless productivity is maintained the company must eventually close. What the Government has now announced will assist in this area. However, the motion that I introduced concerning decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebate incentives and the concept that I have put to the Government a few times in the past three years could be introduced in South Australia across the board, as it would assist all decentralised areas in the State and not a selected isolated area.

If we examine the so-called incentives that were announced in November of last year and again yesterday, we find that they relate to pay-roll tax rebates for existing firms and to an expanded work force. In many Riverland industries the number in the work force is falling, and productivity is being reduced, so that that incentive would have no benefit. The action taken in the Riverland will be of immense value to that section of the community, but the incentives that have been offered to the State as a whole are of no value at all.

Industries in the Riverland have a high labour content, and consequently payments in relation to workmen's compensation have an effect on production. These industries cannot be highly mechanised, and therefore high rates for workmen's compensation have to be paid. It is not unusual for a small fruit-growing property to pay a workmen's compensation premium of more than \$1 000. That is a substantial figure. The Workmen's Compensation Act should be reviewed, having regard to the fact that some industries are more hazardous than are other industries. I believe that many primary-producing industries have a low level of claims on workmen's compensation compared to other industries. In such cases the amount of premium should be applied to the type of industry and the past history of the incidence of claims that have been made, but in the past the Government has considered these aspects overall rather than individually.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day: Other Business to be postponed until after Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 9 be disposed of.

Motion carried.

Mr. ARNOLD: I wholeheartedly support the motion moved by the Leader and point to the urgent need to

introduce decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebates legislation for the whole of South Australia and, also, for an urgent review of workmen's compensation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I listened, as usual, with attention to the Leader this afternoon. I find that there is a singular pattern about his addresses to this House, because the more he has no case and no facts on which to base the contentions that he puts to the House, the more he mops and mows, shouts and shrugs, and that is what he did this afternoon; he did not do very much more. At the outset he said that the provisions that the Government has made in assistance in rebates and remissions of taxation have been a mere sham, sheer window-dressing. The removal of the provision in relation to succession duties with regard to spouses and the provisions that the Government has made in relation to succession duties to allow rural properties to be dealt with under joint tenancies (a provision previously rejected by Liberal Governments) are not slight—they are considerable. It was interesting to note that, when the Leader of the Liberal Government in Victoria recently announced to his Party's congress a policy for the Liberal Party to pursue in Victoria, every one of the items that he cited to the Liberal Party there had already been implemented by the Labor Party in this State.

Mr. Nankivell: You're a good Labor Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader says that we are, somehow, stealing Liberal policy. There was a strange contradiction in the Leader's statement this afternoon. He said that somehow or other the Labor Party was trying to be a Liberal Party, and he resented that. Then he said that what we were doing was not good enough, although he did not say what he would do. Not one single specific of alternative policy was cited by the Liberal Party Leader this afternoon; there was not a single proposal.

Dr. Tonkin: What about the workmen's compensation legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has not detailed what are his proposals regarding workmen's compensation; he did not cite them this afternoon, nor did he talk about what he would do alternatively, in relation to pay-roll tax incentives and other incentives to industry.

The Leader said that our remissions in land tax were mere window-dressing. That was not the view of the Stockowners' Association or of the United Farmers & Graziers of S.A. Incorporated. I must confess that those organisations were almost speechless with delight when I told them what was to happen in relation to the Land Tax Act, and that legislation was before the House. Many people from the farming community have told me what a tremendous thing we have done for the farming community in South Australia by abolishing land tax on the farming community. Everyone who would have qualified for the \$40 000 exemption under the old Act now gets a complete exemption. The Leader says that that is window-dressing, and not doing anything for the people in South Australia.

Mr. Allison: He held a rally to convince you, didn't he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand he held a little old thing down in Victoria Square; it wasn't too good. I got a report about it while I was overseas. People rang up and said, "It's a complete fizzer; very poorly attended; he hasn't been able to get any enthusiasm, for all his carry-on." If he carries on in the way he has carried on this afternoon, he will get even less enthusiasm than that.

Mr. Allison: It made its point if they rang you up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I always keep in touch, although I appreciate that members opposite have complained bitterly about the amount of my phone calls from overseas. However, I keep in touch with South Australia, wherever I am. The Leader went on to say that the situation in South Australia was grievous in relation to attracting industry, and that our State charges were keeping industry away. He did not cite one industry that has been kept out of South Australia on this basis; he could not do so because there is not one.

Dr. Tonkin: You give us examples of some that have come?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have been cited by the industrial development division. It is true that in the last year and a half to two years we have not had a great deal of expansion (nor has any other State in Australia, except in the mineral areas). If we had mineral resources we could get expansion of that kind, too. In industrial areas of Australia where has there been an expansion? In Melbourne and Sydney there has been a reduction. This situation is as a result of a national economic situation which has been compounded and made worse by the economic policy of the present Federal Government. The State that is doing best with its economy, where manufacturing industry, commerce, and retailing is doing best, is South Australia.

Those facts will be cited by every commercial and industrial leader in this State. I see them constantly and they say, quite clearly, that South Australia is doing better than elsewhere—the figures show it. For the Leader to say that, because of economic conditions in Australia recently, somehow or other it is because of State charges in South Australia that some utterly unspecified industry (which he cannot cite) has been kept out of South Australia, is persiflage and he knows it. The Leader then said that we ought to have greater incentives but he did not specify what they should be. As a matter of fact, we have always had the ability to make deals with anybody interested in establishing an industry in this State. For instance, the Leader cited the lube refinery at Port Stanvac and dismissed that as being a natural extension of the existing refinery. It was not. It was necessary for us to do some very hard negotiating in order to get that lube refinery here, because the threat was that it was to be built in Singapore.

Mr. Coumbe: They may have gone to Singapore if they knew you were going to change the rates ultimately.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The position was that, with regard to rates, they were told what the position would be.

Dr. Eastick: After the negotiations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have told them about it constantly: they have got a ruddy fair deal, as a matter of fact. There was a provision made in our negotiations for a remission of wharfage and that was given to the Mobil refinery. That is not in the normal list of incentives for industry in South Australia, but we negotiate in areas where there are certain incentives that can be important to an industry.

I can remember a previous Leader (who was Leader some time before the new Leader, because the Liberal Party has had a succession of changes of leadership in recent years at several levels) bitterly attacking me because I had offered to an industry that was considering coming to South Australia land at Port Adelaide at no cost. I was also attacked by that Liberal Leader because I gave assistance to the establishment of G. H. Michell and Sons

(Australia) Proprietary Limited to bring all its wool scouring operations into one plant in this State. I was condemned bitterly for assisting that company. That assistance was negotiated: it can be done and we are doing it.

The assistance given to country industry at Mannum was assistance given apart from the ordinary assistance that is given in the list that is published relating to what is widely available. We consider individual cases to see where we can attract industry. We did so with Leylands and Fletcher Jones. We are completely flexible in providing the necessary assistance to get job security and diversity in industry in South Australia. We have been so successful in this practice in the past six years that, for the first time in the history of this State (in a period of economic downturn), South Australia is doing better economically than any other State and has the lowest level of unemployment in Australia, whereas previously South Australia had the highest unemployment figure, under any Government.

The Leader then referred vaguely to worker control. Apparently he likes to dream up all sorts of bogies and to pronounce them from that cloud cuckoo land of unreality in which he lives. In the whole of his speech, the Leader did not bother to consider one fact or cite an instance; all he did was to shout about a whole series of shibboleths and adages. The Leader has produced no case whatever. To say as he did that the assistance that we were giving to industry was illusory was belied immediately by the seconder of the motion. Today I announced in respect of canneries and packing sheds in the Riverland not only the assistance of conversion of the outstanding loan to the Riverland cannery to a grant of \$545 000 but also remissions of pay-roll tax of an additional \$500 000.

Mr. Keneally: It's a sham, they said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is sheer window dressing! Let us see whether people in the Riverland think that it is window dressing. It is real assistance to an industry in this State. Country industry in South Australia has received more assistance from this Government than from any other Government in this State. Industrial incentives and assistance given to industry in South Australia are greater than those given in any other State. The Leader cited Victoria and New South Wales, but they do not have the Housing Trust system of building on a lease-back arrangement on anyone's property anywhere in the States at concessional rates of interest. That assistance just does not exist in other States.

The degree to which the Government has gone in assisting industry is far greater than that reached by any Liberal Government. The Leader calls it a sham, but industry and the people of this State certainly do not call it a sham. I am sure they will be satisfied with the type of Government they have. If the Leader complains that this is a Liberal Government, he can continue to do so. I am aware that some of his supporters used to accuse a previous Liberal Premier of this State of being the greatest Labor Premier that this State has ever had! With modesty, I would contest that claim. Now the Opposition says that I am the best Liberal Premier the State has ever had. However, I do not know whether that is the case, but I can see the tendency of their view. I appreciate that the Leader does not like what I am saying, but it is not a question of what is done by a Labor or a Liberal Government but a question of whether we have good government. That is what South Australia has.



Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Last Friday I received a telephone call from Mr. Bill Davies of the Premier's Department apologising nicely for not having replied to a request I made for the remission of pay-roll tax for local industry that had established in Mount Gambier. It was just a small industry. However, he said that the Premier would make an important announcement soon. When I picked up the *Advertiser* and saw the headline "South Australia boosts incentives in country industries quest" I was most impressed with the announcement until I realised that the incentives being offered had applied to Mount Gambier and other regional growth centres since November last year.

It was obvious that, unless the terms of qualification had been substantially redefined, the people for whom I was seeking assistance would not qualify. In fact, they have not qualified. I can appreciate the South Australian Government's concern in getting industry to South Australia. I have tried at many different venues to attract people to Mount Gambier. I know that is a rather parochial view, but that is what I have done. A major frozen food company from Melbourne—

Dr. Eastick: Which was genuinely interested.

Mr. ALLISON: —came to the South-East to look at Mount Gambier and South Australia. We approached the Premier's Department for assistance for the company. Ultimately, however, the company decided not to continue with this absolutely new venture in Mount Gambier. A small metal industry that processes aluminium has decentralised into Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln. It was seeking pay-roll tax remissions, among other things, in order to establish itself on a firm footing. It is obvious that that company will not qualify for assistance under the incentives that were announced recently.

A local dairy industry has relocated in Mount Gambier from Eight Mile Creek. Again I sought assistance from the Premier's Deputy for that industry. Let me make clear that two gentlemen from the Premier's Department, Mr. Henry Oh and, more particularly, Ron Manuel have been extremely helpful each time I have approached them. They have been polite and pleasant and are always interested at a personal level. However, they have always made clear that the Premier's Department is a lender in the last resort. Most people looking for assistance look for low interest rates first because high interest finance is freely available elsewhere.

I am anxious that the Government's decentralisation policy should work, because Mount Gambier, among other regional growth centres certainly needs that sort of encouragement and incentive. A few telephone calls around the South-East yesterday (because I am my own research assistant) revealed no tremendous flocking of industry to the area as a result of the incentives that were re-announced yesterday for the rest of the State. That is a fair indication that the media, whilst making great play of the announcement, would have, had it considered the November announcements and what followed them, probably realised that there was not as much potential as was first thought.

The lengthy list of qualifications for aid offered by the Premier includes the following: expansion of five or more men, which is reasonable; assistance is available for a three-year term (Fletcher Jones in Mount Gambier qualifies for an indefinite period, so that is discrimination); industry must diversify into a completely different product (so there is no real assistance for existing industry to expand); industry must not be already located in an existing growth area and must not fragment an industry undesirably

(whatever that means, because it would be hard to define); it must not threaten another industry's viability (on the surface that is reasonable, but where does their competition enter or end); and it must market outside the region and must use local resources. These are specific qualifications, and any company that meets any or all of them would be entitled to receive the incentives, but few in South Australia would qualify, as the \$160 000 made available for the incentives would indicate.

That \$160 000 seems to have been doing twice the work of any other \$160 000. I heard it announced over the radio a couple of weeks ago that it was available to attract overseas industry to South Australia. It appeared in the Budget as a reimbursement incentive to industry in South Australia. It is being made to do overseas and local work. That makes the Government's generosity seem to be twice as good. The remissions offered are 100 per cent of the pay-roll tax for the three-year period on trial, \$25 000 relocation for a firm, \$500 personal relocation for key personnel, and South Australian Housing Trust and Land Commission assistance. These have been offered for nine or 10 months in selected areas of the State but they have not had the desired results.

What other reasons are there why industry is so tardy in accepting these incentives? Pay-roll tax has three immediate effects. A tax on people, on staff, discourages a firm from employing more people. Even though the employment of people is discouraged, the firm still has to produce and meet its markets, so it moves into the use of machinery and automation, and that may be a bad thing when taken to excess. I thought the Premier would have asked why, as industry in Mount Gambier was expanding, I was grousing. I will tell him why.

Industry in Mount Gambier and the South-East has expanded considerably in a few major firms at Millicent and Portland (the Portland industry diversified from Mount Gambier into Victoria to take advantage of the incentives which the Premier decried but which the South Australian firm was happy to receive), and several other Mount Gambier firms have expanded within the city. Whilst increased mechanisation sounds good, it will not necessarily increase the requirement for staff. The reply to a Question on Notice regarding automation in the Woods and Forests Department confirmed that. I was told that unskilled workers would be phased out and skilled workers as a throughput would be needed further on in the production line, but it was unlikely that a substantial increase in staffing would take place. If the Government itself is following that policy, how can the Premier say that any private enterprise firm should do any differently? That is a significant factor: if it is good for the Government, obviously it is good for private enterprise.

In the South-East a particular worry of mine is that timber productivity is near its plateau. Therefore, work available is just about at its optimum level and, if we are going to increase the amount of work done, we have to do more work on that raw material to change it into a manufactured article so that we can obtain the extra income and the extra labour as a result of that. At the moment, we do not have much sign of this extra work being done. We have to attract the type of industrialist into the South-East to do that type of manufacture. However, he will not move to the South-East, because his freight costs on the manufactured article from a decentralised zone like Mount Gambier would be excessive. Several times, among other things that have been sought from members on this side, during the past 15 months in which I have been a member, I have asked for freight concessions (I have asked both in the House and in personal letters to the Treasurer).

I am pleased to hear that the Premier was accepting that Liberal points of view were not so bad after all. He seemed smug to think we were considering him to be a Liberal Premier, and in that smugness he gave part of the game away because he is admitting that the things we on this side have been asking for are worth handing to the people. That is patently obvious.

Members on this side have asked persistently for pay-roll tax, land tax and stamp and succession duty remissions, and for many other concessions, for decentralised industries. If the Premier is taking notice of them, however reluctantly he may acknowledge that the ideas came from this side, it is significant that Liberal points of view have been heeded. I have been talking with local industrialists, as well as with senior members of the Woods and Forests Department, not on political lines but simply on humane lines, because I think this whole problem goes far deeper than politics. We are dealing with people, and the Minister of Labour and Industry would be probably more sensitive of that than would any other person in this House, because he is dealing directly with the work force. The concern even of industrialists who know that the increases that have been gained by the unions (workmen's compensation concessions, equal pay for women, and adult pay at 18 years of age) have been won, but to my way of thinking it has been something of a pyrrhic victory because in winning there has been a tremendous loss. Are women's jobs easier to find as a result? Children come to my office and say they are too young and unskilled at 15, and at 18 they are too old because they are untrained adults. It is a sad state of affairs when people with back injuries stay off work for longer than they might do because they are afraid that when they get back to work, because of the workmen's compensation conditions, they will be dismissed from their jobs. They hang on as malingerers instead of going back to the work force.

There has to be co-operation between industrialists, unionists, and the work force, and just simple politicking on these issues will certainly not bring any of these problems closer to a solution. Automation in the South-East has made unskilled work more difficult to obtain. It has created a greater problem for the under-educated persons, particularly in these times of economic hardship, because the better educated person comes along and takes the job without any trouble at all. Automation uses more material in less time from a resource in the South-East, that we can regenerate, but we cannot regenerate the timber quickly because it grows slowly. We cannot increase timber productivity at a rapid rate. The quicker we use the timber the less we are going to have to use in the future. Automation reduces physical work and lessens the chance of injury. There are many good things about automation. It gets products on to the market more quickly, and it especially helps firms to meet a demand which could not be met if they depended on manual labour.

The present incentives are \$160 000 in the Budget Estimates for pay-roll tax reimbursements this year and \$1 200 000 mentioned in the *Advertiser* in the next five years for regional decentralisation incentives. To put that in perspective, this year alone we expect to receive \$139 000 000 from pay-roll tax alone, of which the Engineering and Water Supply Department will pay \$1 170 000, so one Government department pays in pay-roll tax the amount of the incentive offered to industry over the next five years. For Government service departments such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the E. & W.S. to pay pay-roll tax is incidentally another way of getting a tax from the people into the Government coffers.

The Premier asked us to give some alternatives; he asked how we would solve the problem. I reiterate that I have asked him several times to declare decentralised areas in South Australia. In those areas I would like to see declared decentralised industries: irrespective of whether they are developing new or current resources or whether they are just expanding a current manufacture, they should be eligible for remissions. The types of concession I would like to see are further pay-roll tax remissions and freight concessions to enable country manufacturers to get their products on to city markets competitively with city manufacturers. If anyone thinks that we do not have a case, I point out that Mount Gambier timber in the raw state can be purchased in Adelaide at the same price as it can be purchased in Mount Gambier, because the timber industry absorbs the freight to Adelaide. However, the Government is not willing to give concessions to industries decentralising in the country: it is a one-way traffic. In the long run, it must surely be a far more attractive proposition to people and to the Government to spend substantial sums on decentralisation to attract industry and people to existing, acknowledged, soundly based growth centres than to spend far larger sums on developing dormitory areas, wherever they may be situated. The Borrie report bears out the wisdom of this, because we are dealing with an existing population that is not rapidly expanding.

I therefore ask the Government to re-examine its policy for Monarto, even if it is only in the 10-year to 20-year term, and to consider existing growth centres as an immediate solution to the over-population problem in Adelaide and to the problem of getting people in industry to the country. The Monarto site may be a cheap investment for long-term, future development in South Australia. No-one has a crystal ball that would provide the answer to that question. As a result of talking to industrialists in the South-East and elsewhere about automation, I point out that machinery is unfortunately cheaper than people. Machinery can be depreciated, and it does not have workmen's compensation problems.

There are all sorts of advantages of automation, because people are pricing themselves out of work instead of into work. The Woods and Forests Department is acknowledging this through its move into automation, to become competitive. Also, this is happening in private enterprise. So, the concessions we have won represent a pyrrhic victory, because the losses seem to outweigh the gains. The world-wide humanitarian problem of machines doing people out of work will have to be solved. In Australia, the problem is particularly acute, because every ship, piece of machinery, and timber forwarder that we buy from Volvo, America, or Germany results in money going out of Australia, and it does not provide work in Australia; it creates a further imbalance for our people. We are bringing automated equipment in, but we are not providing the people who are put out of work with jobs that involve manufacturing the equipment in Australia; that, too, is an extremely serious problem.

The Federal Liberal Government recently announced that it would provide a subsidy of \$58 a week to firms taking on apprentices. I praise that move, but I am still critical, because I believe that that subsidy is too restricted. We have already taken up this issue with our Federal colleagues. In 1972-73, the Federal Labor Government introduced an apprenticeship scheme whereby between \$600 and \$1 100 was made available to industrialists, depending on whether they were based in the city or in

the country, for apprenticeship subsidies and accommodation subsidies. There was a peak in 1973 for apprenticeships taken up, but in 1974 and in 1975 the number declined in many industries. The present incentives may be a short-term answer to the problem. The unions are currently resisting youth worker participation. In the South-East we had a committee inquiring into this matter. In a joint answer to a question that I had asked, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour and Industry said that there was no solution to the problem this year, but it was currently under examination. The unions presented problems; it makes me wonder whether unionists realise that these are their children and ours whose welfare we are investigating. We must have a much more sympathetic approach to the problem. I ask for reasonableness on all sides in this connection.

I realise that, whilst this debate is obviously political, the problems are not entirely of this Government's making, but it is for this Government, irrespective of whom it may blame for the problems arising today, at least to consider solutions to this humanitarian problem. We are not dealing with machines: we are dealing with people. Mankind's salvation depends on how we treat one another. This industrial world is fairly savage from the viewpoint of extremists in unions becoming far too politically motivated. Many of them want to move from unions into politics; I am not referring to the movement of all of them, because there are some very respectable members in this House. I would like to see the unions tackle the workers' problems first and the political aspect last; that is what the Labor Party used to do when I was a kid. I was brought up in that sort of environment. I ask the Government to heed the points I have raised. I have raised them not with animosity but with a deep concern for people, particularly those in the South-East.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In answering the charge laid against his Government this afternoon, the Premier sought to justify the State's position by praising himself and the Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Adulation!

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. Yesterday, the Premier gave us a history lesson; he sought to write history to suit himself by suggesting that this State, industrially, had never done as well as it has done under a Labor Government. He implied that Whyalla had never happened. Actually, Whyalla grew up under the impetus of a Liberal and Country League Government headed by Sir Thomas Playford. The Premier implied that Elizabeth was still open paddocks on which cows and sheep grazed. Further, he implied that Sir Thomas Playford and the L.C.L. Government did not create the whole Elizabeth scene, with its massive industrial complex, which unfortunately could collapse if we continue to export our jobs to other States and other countries, as a result of the attitude of the Labor Government and its fellow travellers to its most important industry, the motor-car industry. I do not want to canvass the matter again except to say that I have warned members opposite of the consequences of continual attacks on the motor industry of General Motors-Holden's and of Chrysler, and of the possibility of that industry leaving the State because it cannot make a go of it with all the harassment, the pirating, and the other attacks on its productivity, its viability, and its capacity to exist in a modern industrial society.

Mr. Max Brown: You are not joining Fraser in union bashing, are you?

Dr. EASTICK: I thought the member opposite would know me better by now. I am not union bashing. I did not suggest in my remark that I was union bashing. I have a far greater regard for the floor members of the unions than I have for the hierarchy of many of the unions. I can justify that situation by looking at events that have occurred in this State within the past 15 months or 18 months. We do not have to go beyond the debacle at Port Adelaide involving the Transport Workers Union and the waterside workers. I blame for that the Transport Workers Union, and not the waterside workers. I can refer to the occasion when a woman with guts had to assist her fellow workers to get back to work at Chrysler. Many people at Elizabeth and in the surrounding district are openly expressing fear for their jobs because of the activities of a few.

The Premier would suggest that all that is in industry in South Australia is as a result of the Labor Party. I cannot wear that. I do not believe members opposite will comfortably wear it, even if they could get it on. This sort of adulation is wearing thinner and thinner in the public eye in relation to the Premier. It has been said that we have a Government of excesses. That is highlighted in the excess of self-praise, backed up by the media monitoring octopus and the whole of its back-up staff, a situation which unfolds where statements are made by back-bench members opposite as the first announcement of Government policy, as mentioned by the member for Fisher recently.

We have a blatant use of taxpayers' money in the promotion of political adversaries of members of this Party, a position which is becoming better understood by the public. I warn members opposite that it will have serious repercussions for them. We have a Government which excels in suggesting that, because it is a pace-setting Government, it is a Government that will be supported continuously and for ever. However, we must ask ourselves (and the people of South Australia are consistently asking themselves) at what cost this pace-setting is being achieved. What is the cost to us? We have a Government, in this pace-setting role, which would seek to remove the tort clauses from our industrial legislation, clauses which the Premier himself found of tremendous value in finally helping to solve the Port Adelaide steel debacle.

My colleagues have mentioned the workmen's compensation situation and the refusal of this Government to come back to the importance of looking at the matter realistically. We have an unemployment scheme, and, whilst I laud the aspect of it which gives people the dignity of being able to work, it does nothing for industry generally because of the 20 per cent loading placed on the permanent employment provided within the framework of that unemployment scheme. I recognise that a person employed under one of these schemes is not necessarily guaranteed employment for 12 months, but I know from discussions with many people who have been able to work rather than remaining idle that they would work for the basic salary (not the basic wage, but the basic salary applicable to the undertaking being followed), and they find that the bonus they receive with the additional 20 per cent is a denial of one-fifth of a job for an unemployed person.

The Government, by this scheme, is denying one job in six. It cannot be proud of that position; it is not assisting in productivity and full employment, and it is not assisting in many people being prepared to stay at work when they know that, by becoming unemployed and

making themselves available for one of the schemes, they can reap a 20 per cent bonus and return to the normal job later at the basic figure.

Mr. Max Brown: I don't know that that is what Fraser is saying either.

Dr. EASTICK: If Mr. Fraser is saying it, he is saying it as a fact. The member for Light is saying it, based on reality and fact, and on reality in the minds of the people embroiled in the scheme. We have a Government of excesses that has been so involved in many aspects of legislation that it has by-passed the essential pieces of legislation which would genuinely assist industrial promotion.

Under the Planning and Development Act, interim control is given to the State Planning Authority or to a local government body, and that body can refuse industry the opportunity to develop in a certain area. It can direct people to what is to be known as an industrial area, but it can do nothing to create the climate which allows land development to proceed for industrial purposes. It draws an area on a map, assisting in that regard, but it stops at that point and does nothing to give assistance from a Government source or an incentive to those involved to create the area on the map as an industrial site.

In Gawler, people are seeking to establish small industries, making employment available, but they are being denied the opportunity to develop; employment is being refused. The excesses have been the province not only of this Government but also certainly of its Federal counter-part, the Whitlam Government. We have only to think of the disasters that hit the clothing industry, the footwear industry, and other similar industries, taking away job opportunities from many people, young and old. Again referring to Gawler, part of my district, a thriving clothing industry which consistently employed between 130 and 260 people is at present employing only 45 production workers. This will mean the loss of many jobs because of the way in which the Whitlam Government destroyed the viability of many industries, this one being a clothing factory. I have indicated that I am concerned at the way in which this Government's excesses have helped to export jobs out of South Australia, and the Premier's announcement is doing precious little to assist in recovering any one of those jobs or, indeed, in giving an incentive to increase the real and permanent job opportunities in this State. Yesterday, the Premier became uptight when I asked a question under the heading of "Supplies and services" as follows:

Can the Premier say whether the Government has as a matter of policy issued any direction that, where supplies and services are available for South Australian factories and organisations at rates comparable to those that apply to interstate organisations, preference will be given to such tenders? More particularly, is the Premier satisfied that any direction so given is being fulfilled?

The Premier, in his classic play-acting manner, replied:

Obviously, the honourable member is unaware that that policy has existed in South Australia for many years.

To my interjection regarding whether it was being followed through, he said:

Yes. Not only is preference given to South Australian goods and services but a substantial preference in price is given, too.

I will not develop that latter part; I will stick to the fact that the Premier gave an unequivocal answer yesterday that the Government gave preference to the local product. I pose the simple question: what about supplies to the new Education Department building? Whence did they come? I suggest that the Premier examine M.T.T. tender

No. 7/76 and say whose specifications have been used, whose product will be produced, and from which State that commodity will be supplied.

The acceptance of a tender from another State for a product which was developed in this State and which can be supplied here competitively will deny 10 South Australians jobs for the next six months, an income that would mean the generation of about \$150 000 for the on-going activity of this State. I will not ask any more specific questions now. I believe that, if the Premier is genuine and has nothing to hide, and if his Government is practising what it preaches, South Australia will benefit internally from self-generating projects. However, that is not the present situation.

Certainly, in his statement this afternoon the Premier said nothing about productivity or about what the Government is doing significantly to assist in the right approach to productivity. I am not suggesting for a moment that we should adopt a slave-driving attitude to the workers, but I believe that a situation has evolved in which a proper approach might result in a lift in productivity. However, that lift in productivity and benefit to the South Australian industrial scene will not come while we have headlines such as we saw on July 27, 1974. An article headed "Workers must get say—Dunstan", over the byline of political reporter Ian Steele, stated:

If South Australian industries and unions refuse to co-operate with the Government's worker participation policy, legislation may be introduced to make them.

Apart from the number of occasions on which the Premier has said that he did not really mean that and that there would be no legislative procedure, the fact that he made that statement (from which he has not resiled, other than to suggest that it would not apply in a certain period) has done nothing to boost confidence in the minds of people who might otherwise establish industries in this State. The Government's excesses are denying the significant advances to this State that it could obtain if there were a more realistic and factual approach to these matters, instead of the play acting and the attempt to make cheap political points.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I thank my colleagues who have supported the motion, but I cannot in any way say that I was impressed by the Premier's contribution. He indulged in personal attacks, as he usually does when he is searching around for answers. His arguments were not at all convincing. He accused the Opposition of not putting forward specific suggestions. He knows as well as you do, Mr. Speaker, that it is not competent for me to discuss the details of the workmen's compensation legislation which appears on the Notice Paper and which was introduced by my Party. I do not intend to do that, because it would be wrong of me to do so. However, I suggest that, if the Premier has not already read the details of that legislation, he should do so, because it contains a positive suggestion and a positive action.

Mr. Max Brown: Anti-worker again, as usual.

Dr. TONKIN: If the honourable member only knew what he was doing to the work force in this matter, he would not talk like that. He is creating a tremendous problem among the work force, the people for whom he is supposed to have been working all his life. I am amazed at his lack of insight and understanding of what is happening to those people. The Premier asked for suggestions regarding pay-roll tax. The concessions he has announced, under the conditions that would apply under a Liberal Government, would be very worth while

and would be taken up. I am not quarrelling about them; indeed, I welcome the announcement and am pleased for the Riverland cannery, which will be helped by today's pay-roll tax announcement. That is fine; that is what the company needed, and I hope that the degree of Government control that seems to be intruding into the conditions is not too great.

The same pay-roll tax incentives under the Liberal Government would mean something and would be taken up, and the same position applies to State taxation, suggestions about which I have already made to the Premier. Instead of doing as little as is absolutely necessary so that he can say he has done something, he should do something to benefit the entire community. Let us not forget that the workers in any new industry are subject to State taxation and will pay it. No industry can ignore that fact. Worker participation has been referred to by Opposition members but the Premier deliberately steered away from that subject. However, that is the major factor keeping industry away from this State. The Premier is in the hands of the trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party Convention and, as long as that agreement stands approved by the convention, this Caucus, this Party, and this Government, are all bound by it. People in South Australia can be sure that worker participation will be introduced: I doubt whether the Premier will have any real say about the timing of the move.

All of these concessions, and especially pay-roll tax concessions that the Premier has made, amount to a sham, a facade, and a show, for the simple reason that this Government is not tackling the fundamentals of high State taxation, workmen's compensation legislation, and worker participation.

Mr. Max Brown: Business houses are not saying that, though.

Dr. TONKIN: Contrary to what the Premier has said today, and what the member for Whyalla says, industry is not impressed. Members of industry from other States that may conceivably come to South Australia are not impressed, and will not be coming whilst the present situation pertains. There seems to be a great need in this State for a fundamental change in attitude by the Government. Without that change we will not have any significant industrial development and, if that change of attitude by the Government does not occur, there is only one conclusion—there must be a change of Government. The sooner that happens, the better. This motion is most pertinent and sums up the entire situation. As long as the Labor Party remains in Government, there is little hope for this State.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Boundy and Evans. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

## INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1043.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): When this measure was being discussed previously, I had commenced by asking the Minister of Labour and Industry to fulfil the promise he had made a few seconds before I began to speak. It is known now to Government members that the Minister was big-timing, because he has not been able to fulfil the request made of him after he had given the invitation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where are the assurances?

Dr. EASTICK: I indicate to the Minister that the provision of papers as outlined in what he said to the House on September 15 appears at page 1041 of *Hansard*. I will not say anything about whether the papers from the Vehicles Builders Union were to be made available to me. The Minister denies that, and I accept that it was another of his colleagues who made that statement.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You accept that?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, but that does not alter the fact that it was the Minister who said that he could provide any document of the nature we were discussing that I might need. Indeed, as has previously been established, the Minister said he could put a pile of papers on the desk in front of me so high that I would not be able to see over it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where does that occur in *Hansard*?

Dr. EASTICK: That does not appear in *Hansard*, but the Minister knows full well that that is what he indicated.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Speak about *Hansard*.

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister wants to resile from that position, let us return to what he said—that he would make material available. He received specific detail regarding the papers that I wanted, and that information appears on pages 1042 and 1043 of September 15 *Hansard*. It is probably unnecessary for me to say that the other matters relating to the availability of these documents and my accusation, which I believe to be correct, that the Minister was trying to suggest that he was capable of an activity of which he is incapable, are outlined at page 1191 of *Hansard* under the heading "Availability of documents".

I referred then to the contribution which my colleague, the member for Torrens, made, and which drew the Minister's attention to the provisions of the Act. Why did I want these documents? So that Government members in the back corner of the Chamber do not get upset or suggest that I am union bashing, let me examine the question, which relates, amongst other things, to a sustentation fee.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What page of *Hansard* did you refer to?

Dr. EASTICK: Page 1191 was the last one, and I think the other reference was at page 1041. As I have taken the slips of paper out of my volume of *Hansard*, I will find those references for the Minister later. We are referring to a sustentation fee, and we are talking about the attitude of people regarding their membership of a union, the continuation thereof, or whether or not overall they should be compelled to be members of a union.

It is right that people in the community should be able to choose where they spend their money. If they are called on to expend funds specifically for the purpose of the conduct of union affairs, but not involving an

extension of those funds into the political arena, I believe Government members would certainly not experience the difficulties that they are experiencing at present in obtaining members.

Mr. Max Brown: I don't know what your line of reasoning is.

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member should continue to listen to me, as I am about to tell him why I was interested in the documents relating to the two organisations to which I have referred. I am not suggesting that those two organisations comprise an exhaustive list. However, they were two organisations whose affairs I knew something about. I also knew something of the problem that existed in the minds of some of the members of those organisations because of the very unsatisfactory (I hesitate to say "unsavoury", although Government members may accept that they are unsavoury) financial activities that had occurred within those unions. One of the unions was the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union.

I asked the Minister to obtain these details for me so that there could be no doubt about the authenticity of the documents. I do not believe there is any doubt about the authenticity of the documents to which I am going to refer and to which any member is at liberty to have access. Regarding the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia, South Australian Branch—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us why you want that particular organisation.

Dr. EASTICK: I have already started to do so. If the Minister was not so intrigued by the document in front of him, he will have to read *Hansard* when it is next printed, so that he might catch up with me. However, if he listens now, he will be able to see why.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us about the Storemen and Packers' Union.

Dr. EASTICK: I am.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You've always been very truthful, so be truthful today.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you; that is a position that I hope I will always maintain in this House. I believe that I have done so in the past, and it is my desire to continue to do so in the future. I have already told Government members that they may have access to these documents to enable them to check their authenticity. Then, of course, they would have to go to the Minister and get him to use his good offices (not "officers") to obtain the documents which he was unable to obtain or which he did not want to obtain for me. That may well be the whole crux of the matter.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I told you in reply to the question.

Dr. EASTICK: Not in so many words.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I said that I am not your messenger boy.

Dr. EASTICK: It was deeper than that. There was a reason why you did not want to be my messenger boy: you knew full well that they contained information that was not in the best interests of any organisation, whether it be one associated with Government members or with Opposition members.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You tell us why you wanted the Storemen and Packers' Union—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable Minister and the honourable member that they are both using the term "you", which is unparliamentary.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Sir. The document to which I now refer was declared at Melbourne, in the State of

Victoria, on August 30, 1973. It was declared by a Mr. J. Petrie, before a Mr. Tracey. It is as follows:

Conciliation and Arbitration  
Act 1904-1972

Principal Registry

In the matter of

the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia

and

compliance with Conciliation and Arbitration

Act—section 152

Statement of receipts and payments and balance sheets as at June 30, 1973, of the South Australian Branch of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia I, Jack Petrie, of 17-25 Lygon Street, Carlton, in the State of Victoria, do solemnly and sincerely declare:

1. That I am the General Secretary of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia, an organisation registered under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904-1972, and that I am authorised to act in this matter.

2. That annexure marked "A" is the audited balance sheet and statement of receipts and payments as at June 30, 1973, of the South Australian Branch of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia.

Mr. Petrie then goes on to make the declaration, and I have already stated before whom it was made. I refer also to the balance sheet of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia, South Australian Branch, which has, on the face of it, an auditor's report. It read as follows:

To the members of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union of Australia (South Australian Branch).

We have examined the balance sheet of Federated Storemen and Packers' Union (S.A.) Branch as at June 30, 1973, and the related statement of receipts and payments for the year then ended. Our examination included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We report that:

- (1) Proper books of account were not kept during the period July to December, 1972.
- (2) We were unable to satisfy ourselves that all receipts and payments of the union for the period July-December, 1972, have been correctly recorded.

Subject to these reservations, in our opinion:

The above balance sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union (South Australian Branch) as at June 30, 1973.

What else could be said? The grave deficiencies had already been highlighted, and then the following statement was made:

The accompanying statement of receipts and payments gives a true and fair view of the transactions of the union as recorded in the union's bank account for the year ended June 30, 1973.

We have there another admission that there were grave difficulties and all that could be done was to highlight the facts. The difficulties and deficiencies that had occurred could not be resolved. I have referred to this document because it highlights the cause of the grave doubts in the minds of floor members of such organisations. It creates resentment and increasingly public resentment in the minds of people who are forced into the membership of such organisations, especially when such membership is repulsive to the people concerned, if not to society generally.

I have no objection to telling the House that this information was made available to me by a witness who appeared before the Select Committee associated with the Trades Hall. He is so senior that he is a past President of the organisation. He was concerned that his name was being trapped in such a mire. More recently I indicated to the House my concern about a constituent who had been recently sacked, relieved of his position.

Mr. Keneally: You don't sack people these days—you retrench them.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the letter this person received from his employer. I have already referred to this matter

and honourable members opposite can find it reported in *Hansard* of September 23, either in the grievance debate held on our going into the Budget debate or the later grievance debate. This employee was informed of a termination of services for reasons that could not be sustained. Indeed, these reasons resulted in action taken in the State Industrial Court, which has now been transferred to the Commonwealth jurisdiction and is now, I believe, being considered by a discrimination court or committee, or some other body. However, because the matter is *sub judice* I will say no more about it, other than to say that the view expressed on behalf of this person has been sustained; the action is continuing.

Why did that person come to me initially? Why was I interested in his plight and the organisation concerned? This person also was a past President of his union in this State. He faced the problem of his union meeting behind his back and the Secretary, about whom he had been complaining to his Federal Secretariat, was elevated to the position of union President and another person took over the position of union Secretary. This does nothing to assist people's appreciation of what happens. Some of the documents I have with me can be made available to members opposite if they wish to see them. I have already read part of a letter that the person concerned received from the Federal Secretary of the organisation. I will now read that document in its entirety.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Table it!

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister is again showing his ignorance of the situation. He knew full well that he could not fulfil the obligation because he did not have the power. He cannot require me to table the document I intend to quote. Anyway, members opposite can have access to these documents. The letter is dated September 30, 1975, and gives an indication of the type of problem. It is as follows:

I guess the problems you raised with Barney French and now with me just make my problems mount a little closer to the sky. It is somewhat difficult to answer your questions other than to say—that the question of South Australian Branch financial statements have been the bane of my life for a long time and reports have been made to Federal council. I probably will be the one who has to answer to the court when the matter is raised in February, 1976.

It probably goes back to when a public auditor company charged \$175 for a \$300 branch income and I yelled, and then George Gibson had an accountant friend who did the work for a couple of years for a nominal sum and I believe he then moved and George was stuck. I suppose Einstein would find it difficult to work out now, but I am informed George is now battling with it. I wish to Christ you had not raised it now with all the strife we are having with the M.W.U. it has been impossible for me in a one-man office to cope properly with other things which need to be done, as the M.W.U. drained my office funds through forced legal costs, and I have had to seek advances from the Victorian and New South Wales Branches to ensure my own wages.

I say this because it helps me to understand George's problems in a one-man office situation, although there is no excuse really for not keeping the books in order. But you must remember he has built the branch from nothing to over 1000 members, and has reduced the required subsidies from \$5 500 a year to \$1 000 a year, and this has meant added demands of members and additional book work, apart from his many bouts of ill health.

I am not capitalising nor would I wish to capitalise on the unfortunate aspect if ill-health is involved. I want members to accept that the background of this sort of situation does nothing to allay the fears of many people in the community and in unions, particularly those who are forced into unions against their will, that all is well and that they are providing funds for an organisation that

is doing what it should be doing on their behalf. I am on record as having said that I am in full accord with the need for a strong trade union movement—

Mr. Keneally: But.

Dr. EASTICK: But nothing; where union members have the right to determine their own destiny, which means that they can opt in or out of a union as they wish. More pertinent is that they can identify with the union without being humiliated and without facing the impossible set of circumstances outlined by the member for Florey. That is that they are not put into a position of having to justify what is to them (and to other people) a personal right to indicate where a sustentation fee, if it or a component of such a fee exists, can be directed without being in a position where they could be thumped, pressured or whatever. I do not have to spell out what might arise.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How much right have you got to the superannuation scheme in this House?

Dr. EASTICK: The matter of importance in this debate carries on, but I must agree to a right to demand information regarding the funds of the branch, but I do not know that one can refuse to sign cheques without the authority of the committee of management. But, apart from that, apparently the authority at the bank required only two signatures. In other words, in the background, without the knowledge of the committee and without the President of the organisation being able to obtain information as to how the funds were to be expended, cheques were being signed. It was probably a lack of experience on the part of the person himself who admits that, in the first instance, he had signed a complete cheque book as one of the signatories, leaving the book available for the Secretary of the organisation to mark up the second signature as required.

That is a situation which, whilst not a good method of conducting the business of any organisation, is not a method unknown to every member of this Chamber, not necessarily in a union organisation or in a political Party but certainly in a number of community activities. I do not subscribe to its being a good method of conduct, but it is not infrequently encountered.

Mr. Max Brown: That would happen in dozens and dozens of organisations.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, we are agreed on that point.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Businesses as well as unions.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes; there is no argument on that, but at least one would anticipate that a person who was a signatory to such a cheque would be able to obtain detail of who was the second signatory, how much the cheque was for, to whom it was directed, when, how, where, and why. I do not think anybody would dispute that.

Mr. Max Brown: We are getting on well now; we are agreeing.

Dr. EASTICK: We are agreed on a number of matters, and I hope we agree on the fact that the worthwhile measure that the member for Glenelg has brought to this House—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You have not said much about it.

Dr. EASTICK: I have said a good deal about it, in essence, because I have pointed out the ways and means whereby members would want to be members and sustain their membership if they were not to be intimidated and if they were to be certain that their affairs would be conducted as they should. I do not intend to conclude reading that letter; I have told members that they can have access to it if they so desire. Members opposite should look



seriously at the points I have made and relate them to the importance of the measure brought forward by my colleague, and give it full support.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I oppose this Bill. The member for Glenelg, when introducing it, asked for the full support of all members, Government and Opposition. All I can say is that, if the honourable member receives any support from any member on this side of the Chamber, I shall be prepared to buy him a new Rolls Royce, a caravan, and a speed boat to go with it—and I am not being facetious about that in any way.

The member for Glenelg continues to inform this House that he supports trade unions and that he was once a member. I fail to see how he can support the trade union movement when he is no longer a member and when he introduces a Bill of this nature. Most trade unions in South Australia are affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. Rules provide that unions may, by a resolution passed at a summoned meeting, be affiliated with the Australian Labor Party of South Australia and the Trades and Labor Council and shall send delegates to those organisations in accordance with their rules; and the delegates are expected to report back to their general meetings, which they do. If the union members decide at a summoned meeting to affiliate with an organisation, it pays sustentation fees in accordance with the rules of the body with which it affiliates. So, if the member for Glenelg wants to alter that situation, he had better try (I repeat "try") to join the Australian Labor Party and alter those rules—I certainly wish him luck.

My union does not strike a political levy; in fact, very few union rules contain provisions for political levies. Most unions affiliate because it is the wish of the membership; they know very well who helps them most and, when a call is made for funds at election time, that is when the members decide how much they will donate. During the years that I was Secretary of my union, I was very proud of the record in respect of donations made to the A.L.P. I was only sorry that we were not able to donate much more. We had nothing to hide or deny; in fact, we bragged about it and we made public the amounts of money that were donated.

The only real bother we had was that the members, on occasions, wanted to donate larger amounts. That was a very fine principle, of course, but it tended to deplete the funds somewhat. I recall one year in which the executive committee of my union recommended a donation of \$10 000, and the members at the meeting called to discuss that proposition wanted to increase that figure to \$20 000; they wanted, in fact, to double it, and the only thing that stopped them from doing so was the rules, which require a certain procedure to be followed.

Mr. Allison: You must not spend more than you have.

Mr. ABBOTT: When the Minister of Labour and Industry spoke to this Bill, he referred to a decision handed down by the High Court of Australia in the 1959 case of *Williams v. Hursey*. There are also other cases that can be referred to: for example, in the Fifth Edition of *Mills and Sorrell, Federal Industrial Law*, at page 336, in *Wheatley v. Federated Ironworkers Association of Australia* (1960), Walsh, J. expressed the opinion that a rule of a union which provided for affiliation with other organisations having similar objects and "paying affiliation fees to and assisting financially any *bona fide* labour or trade union organisation" would not fail under section 140 of the Commonwealth Act, dealing with requirements as to rules.

Mr. Max Brown: Does the member for Glenelg know that?

Mr. ABBOTT: I suggest that the member for Glenelg make himself aware of some of these decisions in the Federal Law Reports. The member for Light was concerned about the availability of certain material. He wanted the balance sheets of two unions and, when I offered the Vehicle Builders Union balance sheets, he said, "No; I am content. I am not a greedy person." It was I who made that offer.

Dr. Eastick: If you are prepared to give them to me, I will accept them.

Mr. ABBOTT: I made that offer; it was not the Minister, as recorded in *Hansard*. I think that point was cleared up a few moments ago. I assure members that there are ample safeguards in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act concerning the balance sheets, etc., of registered associations. I was reminded on one occasion by the Senior Clerk of the Industrial Commission when I overlooked notifying the Registrar of an alteration in officers of my union, when I was the Secretary, and I should like to read that letter. Addressed to the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation of Australia (South Australian Branch), Trades Hall, 11-16 South Terrace, Adelaide, it reads as follows:

In accordance with sections 128 and 129 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, all registered associations must forward annually to the Registrar, Industrial Commission, the following:

1. In the month of January in every year a list of all officers (including trustees) and the number of members of such association as on the preceding 31st day of December. (Please verify by statutory declaration.)

2. In the month of July in every year a list of alterations which have taken place during the six months ending on the preceding 30th day of June in the persons who are officers (including trustees) of such association. "Nil" alterations must also be advised. (Please verify by statutory declaration.)

3. The secretary of every registered association shall, within one month after the completion of the yearly audit of the accounts of the association, deliver to the Registrar—

(a) a duly audited balance sheet of the assets and liabilities of the association made up to the date of closing the accounts; and

(b) a duly audited statement of the receipts and expenditure of the association during the year covered by such audit.

Such balance sheet and statement must be audited by a registered company auditor within the meaning of the Companies Act, 1962, and be accompanied by a certificate under the hand of the auditor. Our records show that we have not received Item (2) above. As this return is outstanding would you please forward to this office at an early date.

That letter was signed by the Senior Clerk and was a reminder to me when I was Secretary of my union. The safeguards are quite adequate in this respect, and the safeguards concerning the Federal Industrial Registrar are also adequate. All unions are bound to notify any change in the election of officers, to supply balance sheets, and to attend to any other matter as required by the State and Federal Registrars. If Opposition members want enormous industrial turmoil in South Australia, they will support the Bill. I oppose it.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MEDIBANK STRIKE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Dean Brown:

That this House urge the State Government to supply free legal assistance to any person who has received notice

of a fine by or expulsion from a union, or the threat thereof, for working during the Medibank strike on Monday July 12, 1976.

(Continued from September 22. Page 1158.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): This motion contains two major points. One is the opportunity for legal assistance to be given if so desired. This is to protect individuals against possible victimisation that may come about as a result of industrial action. Secondly (and this is the point that I emphasise), this motion does not interfere in any way with the internal affairs and workings of any particular trade union. In the past 10 days two significant statements have been made on industrial matters. One was made by the Prime Minister and the other by the South Australian Minister of Labour and Industry. Both statements were in a similar vein, stressing the need for more understanding, co-operation, liaison, and information-giving between unions and management, and that is an important aspect of industrial understanding. I conclude by saying that the motion is designed to reduce what could be inter-union strike, back-biting, back-fighting, or in-fighting within a union that may occur, to the detriment of individual members of a union. Above all, the motion provides principles of basic justice. It is clear in wording and concept and it should receive the approbation and support of the House.

Mr. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, a referendum should be held in conjunction with the next State election to decide the future of daylight saving in this State.

(Continued from September 22. Page 1159.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): One would have thought that the debate on daylight saving was now a dead letter, something that has been argued thoroughly and something on which the verdict of the community has been made clear, without the expense of a referendum. However, the member for Eyre wants a third annual joust at the straw man, so I suppose that we must indulge him in what we may call his vendetta on this subject.

Mr. Chapman: Are you speaking on behalf of the industrialists, the fishermen, or the dairymen?

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: I understand the reason for the interjection, because members opposite speak for narrow sectional groups, whereas we speak for the people of South Australia. Doubtless, the member for Eyre has been motivated by his sectional interest to raise this matter again. The State Government has carefully "tested the water" before going into daylight saving. First, there was legislation for a trial, and then the firm arrangement, that, until further notice, we advance our time each year by one hour from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in the next March.

Daylight saving was introduced in Australia originally during the First World War, and the member for Torrens may remember this!

Mr. Coumbe: You'll keep.

Mr. KENEALLY: It was abandoned in 1917, and it was reintroduced in 1942, during the Second World War. The

reasons given for its reintroduction are interesting. The time was advanced one hour on January 1, 1942, primarily to conserve fuel and electricity. However, as one contemporary observer noted, there were other advantages.

Mr. Chapman: Will you tell us why Queensland doesn't have daylight saving?

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable gentleman is patient, I might tell him a lot of things. If there is one gentleman in this House who needs a lot of education and help, it is the honourable member for Alexandra. One contemporary commentator of the time felt there were other advantages to daylight saving. He said:

In summer it saves in the aggregate an enormous amount of fuel and electricity. It gives an extra hour of work by daylight.

We have not been able to improve on that; it still applies today. The statement continues:

To others it gives an hour of relaxation in the open . . . it enables us to make use of the wasted hour of morning freshness and coolness.

That was a sensible comment made by a person in 1942. It is equally as relevant today as it was then.

Mr. Chapman: Are you saying you support squeezing another hour of work out of the work force?

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Alexandra is quite incoherent. His knowledge on this subject is appalling, and I wish he would not make such a stupid ass of himself by interjecting when I am trying to make a sensible contribution to a debate.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting.

Mr. KENEALLY: It surprises me that the few simple comments I am making stir up such emotions in members opposite, most of whom, I am sure, support daylight saving, as any vote on this issue will prove. A little historical background does not hurt the House in any debate, and I hope honourable members will be patient. Tasmania was the first State to bring back daylight saving after the war, in 1967. Tasmania, because of its latitude, has most to gain. Queensland, for the same reason, had the least to gain and perhaps showed the least interest. All polls confirm that Queenslanders show the least enthusiasm, although Brisbane, in the south of the State, usually shows a small margin in favour of daylight saving. Today is not the occasion to argue at length the tedious for and against; that is not what the motion is about. The member for Eyre wants a referendum. We do know he is against daylight saving, but that is not the point now at issue.

The member for Eyre looks up in surprise, but the House is quite aware he is against daylight saving, and there are probably people in his electorate who share his view. However, other members, at odd times, go to his district and they find many people who hold a different view.

Mr. Gunn: Put it to the test.

Mr. KENEALLY: We are concerned primarily about public opinion and the test to which this matter has been put. We have not had a test by referendum in South Australia. The Western Australians, as members opposite will no doubt be quick to point out, have, and so has New South Wales. The New South Wales result was so decisive as a test of public opinion across a broadly comparable State that I wonder why the honourable member decided to persist with his crusade on hearing of the result. I suppose he has studied the figures. If he has not, I suggest he do so. Western Australia is a State which, like Queensland, seems to pride itself at times on being different, if not difficult. It is part, I

suppose, of its comparative isolation and the isolationist sentiments often promoted by individuals striving for a place in the political spectrum.

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote this nonsense for you?

Mr. KENEALLY: I wrote it, and I think I did a very good job. The Western Australians voted on daylight saving in 1975 and rejected it. I understand they voted without having had experience of it. That is the point the member for Eyre failed to mention. He made a strong point about Western Australia's rejecting daylight saving, but he did not think it was necessary to point out to the House that they had had no experience of daylight saving when they voted on it. The vote was anything but decisive: 250 000 for daylight saving, and 290 000 against, about 87 per cent of the electorate casting their votes. I understand also that the vote was thought to have been influenced by a lengthy dry spell and a hot February. Anyway, it was hardly a conclusive decision. A subsequent Gallup poll, taken this year, showed 54 per cent of Western Australians were for daylight saving and 45 per cent against. It may be that people there at the time of the referendum did not appreciate the three-hour time differential with the Eastern States when those States altered their clocks and the Western Australians did not.

The far more recent test of opinion in New South Wales was totally clear. The latest figures I have been able to obtain (they are not final, but they are plain enough) show that 1 455 000 people were in favour and only 699 000 against. That is more than two to one. I think that is a significant test of public opinion in a State that, broadly speaking, has similarities to South Australia. Every test, however taken, has come to the same conclusion in that State, in Victoria, Tasmania, and in this State. I have explained what is involved in Queensland and Western Australia. I do not consider we need put the people of South Australia to the expense of a referendum. Let us look at South Australian tests of opinion. The *News* asked its readers in 1972. Although most of the activity, as always, was by the opposing faction, 1 047 voted for and 804 against. The *News* commented that the 1971-72 trial of daylight saving looked like "blossoming into a lasting relationship". A recent poll carried out by a local market research organisation which interviewed 800 adults showed 76 per cent in favour after the last daylight saving season. This was 4 per cent up on the previous year. There have also been some sectional surveys, which were not truly representative. The *Stock Journal* (a publication quoted with a great deal of pride by members opposite) asked for reader reaction in 1973. I doubt that that test could be properly described as impartial. The form they printed to attract reader response began this way:

What do you like most about daylight saving? The day it ends? If that's the way you feel, maybe the *Stock Journal* can help you do something about it.

A fairly unbiased question to include in a poll! So was it any real surprise when only 2 per cent of those responding favoured daylight saving? It was certainly not a fair test. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### FIRE AND ACCIDENT UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

In Committee.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1287.)

Schedule.

Labour and Industry, \$3 374 600.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I give notice that I intend to move that this line be reduced by \$100 or \$1 000. I am giving notice so that other members may ask questions on the line before I formally move the motion.

Mr. GUNN: The new regulations under the Shearers Accommodation Act will cause graziers to spend large sums on upgrading facilities. Because some graziers have had to quit some of their stock because of the drought, will the Minister consider extending the period before the requirements become mandatory? I am particularly concerned about graziers who run only a small number of stock, and who are on the borderline of qualifying under these regulations.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to which item he is referring.

Mr. GUNN: I am speaking about the administration of the Labour and Industry Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Which item?

Mr. GUNN: On administration.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must nominate the item on which he is speaking.

Mr. GUNN: The item is "Administrative, clerical and general staff" of the Labour and Industry Department. I assume that inspectors of shearers' accommodation are covered by that item.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see anything in the line concerning stock, and I ask the honourable member to refer to the line dealing with the Labour and Industry Department.

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, the matters to which I have referred are under the Minister's control. People do not have to provide shearers' accommodation unless they have stock to shear.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want the honourable member to refer to the line, and at this stage I cannot see anything about stock in the line concerning the Labour and Industry Department. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I think I have explained my question satisfactorily.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I hesitate to speak, because the Minister of Labour and Industry was on his feet, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Davenport well knows that at all times the Chair has control as to who gets the call, and I again give the honourable member the call.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister outline the present manpower development policy? I realise that the Community Welfare Department operates job hunters clubs, but I wonder what else is being done to reduce the high level of unemployment among young people.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): First, I wish to reply to the member for Eyre. As he is not in the Chamber, I have now decided not to reply to him, if that is the attitude of the Liberal Party.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has the opportunity to reply to the question asked by the member for Davenport.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Why have I not an opportunity of replying to the member for Eyre as well, if I so desire? I am under the impression that, if I so wish, I am permitted to reply to several questions at a time.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Minister taking a point of order?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, Sir, I am looking for clarification. I was on my feet and ready to reply to the question asked by the member for Eyre, whereas you, Sir, quite rightly saw the member for Davenport and called him. Surely that does not deprive me of the right to reply to the member for Eyre.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister may answer as he sees fit. When the question was asked, the honourable Minister did not rise to answer, so I called on the member for Davenport.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will deal with the member for Eyre and his ignorance in asking questions when leaving the Chamber. I see that he has now returned. I am obliged to answer his questions, because I think they are important. The Shearers Accommodation Act is most important, because shearers, shed hands, and woolpressers for many years have been deprived of reasonable accommodation. The new Act was assented to in April, 1975, and since then there has been considerable consultation with all involved in the industry, such as unions, the Trades and Labor Council, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia, and the Stockowners Association of South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the line about shearers' accommodation. I want the Minister to reply to the question asked by the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am answering not the member for Davenport but the question from the member for Eyre.

The CHAIRMAN: I ruled that question out of order, and I ask the Minister to reply to the question asked by the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I must insist on my right to answer the member for Eyre, and I am going to answer him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll have to move dissent to the ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already ruled that the question asked by the honourable member for Eyre was out of order, and that the honourable Minister must refer to the item under consideration. I see nothing in it about shearers' accommodation. The honourable Minister must reply to the question asked by the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Now that you, Sir, have ruled the question out of order, I accept your ruling.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was not aware that you, Sir, had ruled the question out of order. There is already a motion for disallowance moved by the member for Alexandra on the Notice Paper. If you rule me out of order, I will not question your ruling. I will now deal with the important question asked by the member for Davenport, because the Manpower Development Branch handles manpower placement and training. I have recently had two of my officers, namely, Max Smith, who heads the branch, and the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission, examining the retraining and replacement of personnel. I am concerned about retraining, because I do not believe that, because a person accepts an occupation at the age of 15 years or 17 years, that person should be caught with that occupation, as a result of an apprenticeship, for the rest of his life. I have instructed these two officers to examine the whole of the placement and retraining complex throughout Australia. I understand that they will report to me by the end of the month, so that I may be able to make a useful announcement after I have received their report.

Mr. MATHWIN: The allocation for Commissioners and Industrial Magistrates last year was \$124 760, which has been increased to \$173 826 this year. Coupled with that, the allocation for Assistant Secretaries for Labour and Industry, Industrial Registrar, Deputy Industrial Registrars, Industrial Inspection and Research Staff has been increased from \$324 567 last year to \$655 665 this year. I assume that there will be an increase in the number of commissioners and industrial magistrates, together with ancillary staff.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There has been a reorganisation of the Industrial Research Section.

Mr. Venning: A very costly one!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is not, because, if the honourable member examines the previous item, he will find that there has been a reduction because of staff changes and because of the administration change in setting up the office. We now have extra staff, such as Assistant Secretary Johnson and Deputy Assistant Secretary Bannon. The industrial inspectors and research staff, previously included in the Administration Division, now allows for two additional industrial inspectors. So, the number of personnel in that area has been increased by three. The staff has been transferred from the other section, which explains the increase. The number of personnel has increased because, before I assumed office as Minister, provision was made for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary and, on my recommendation, two industrial inspectors have been employed to good effect. I found that the inspection work being done in the branch was being done mostly on call, and that meant no spot checks were being made. I thought this should be changed so that employers would know that there was a strong possibility from time to time of someone's inspecting their premises, books, and so on. Cabinet agreed to increase that staff by two members.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the item, "Chairman, Apprenticeship Commission and Apprentice Supervisors". Has consideration been given recently to eliminating the maximum age for the completion of an apprenticeship, and amending the provisions of the Act relating to the wage structure? Has the Government considered assisting industry to employ adult apprentices, bearing in mind that the industry would have to receive some form of subsidy while adult workers were undergoing their training, and that it would be futile to encourage apprenticeships in an industry in which there was unemployment?

Also, has the commission made inquires whether this could be a means of overcoming some unemployment in the various age categories, as I understand that most apprentices must complete their courses by the age of 22 or 23 years? Some States have no age limit: indeed, I understand that Queensland's apprentice of the year was 39 years of age. At the same time, we must recognise that apprenticeships cannot be encouraged in industries in which there is unemployment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is correct when he says that the Act provides that no-one over the age of 23 years shall complete an apprenticeship. I disagree emphatically with that provision. The Commonwealth and State Ministers, at their meeting held in Adelaide early in September, decided unanimously that the apprenticeship system in Australia needed to be examined, rejuvenated, and overhauled. Indeed, the conference set up a working party to examine the situation, and its report should be completed some time in November, when a conference is to be held in Melbourne. This indicates how serious the Ministers consider the situation. One must remember that it may not be the total answer to train apprentices irrespective of age because, having trained them, it may be found that no work is available for them. We must examine industry's manpower requirements and, having done so, set about training apprentices. All nations are affected by what happens to their craft workers. The honourable member has made a good point, and I will be in a much better position to give the House more information after the working party has made its report.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister agree that the real danger at present is that many people are moving out of the crafts because the wages they receive therein are not an incentive for them to stay in the industry? The action that this Government took in the first two or three years it was in office destroyed the advantages that accrued to a skilled person compared to an unskilled person, seriously hampering the craft industries. In the railways, for instance, I believe that the difference in salary between a skilled and an unskilled worker is about \$3.50 a week. So, there is no incentive for a person to give up his time and do the work to acquire extra knowledge and skills, when he will receive only an extra \$3.50 a week. Although everyone should have a reasonable take-home pay, if salary differentials are destroyed the incentive for persons to stay in their crafts will also be destroyed.

Mr. Evans: Reward for effort.

Dr. EASTICK: That is so. It is more rewarding financially for an electrician to leave the electrical industry and drive a truck, and for skilled metal workers to be cleaners, taxi-drivers, or truck drivers than to remain in their trade. Although I do not blame the Minister for this situation, it emphasises that the Government has an important role to play in initiating and sustaining an interest in work, which will improve productivity and attract skilled people back into the important areas. I hope the Minister's overall plan encompasses many of the points I have made.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I can agree with some of the points made by the honourable member, especially concerning reward for effort. This aspect is important in whatever occupation one follows, whether it be a craft occupation, shearing, truck-driving, and the like. However, the Government is not a wage-fixing tribunal.

Dr. Eastick: It has been a pace-setter.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is not its responsibility. The Government is not responsible for wage fixation of

any classification; that is the responsibility of industrial courts. My Government recognises that, as do most Australian Governments. How the honourable member can lay the blame at the feet of the South Australian Government for not creating incentive in relation to wages, I do not know. This Government has kept parallel or in front of any other State Government's over-award payments, service payments and bonus payments, where they exist, throughout Australia. The fact cannot be argued.

However, that is not the whole of the criteria so far as I am concerned. I agree (and I am pleased to see the member for Light support this) that tradesmen are currently badly done by. I hope the investigation into their wages will improve the situation. I recall the time when the Metal Trades Award was the yardstick award in Australia, followed by other unions. Tradesmen under this award were considered to be the specialists, they were paid in a specialist area, and other unions followed that lead. I do not lay the blame for the change in that position at the feet of the unions, the industrial tribunals or anyone else. However, there is no doubt that metal industry tradesmen are currently the most underpaid workers in Australia. I throw out that challenge to industrial tribunals and anyone who wants to take it up. I am pleased to receive support from the member for Light in respect of the low wages paid to these classifications.

Mr. MATHWIN: I, too, am concerned about relativity and the gradual whittling away of the system by some unions, thereby adversely affecting the position of certain tradesmen. I refer to tradesmen in the automotive manufacturing industry. Years ago one was told that if one accepted an apprenticeship and the early lower wages there would be later wage advantages over the unskilled trades.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want the Committee to begin a full-scale debate concerning apprentices. This item concerns the Apprenticeship Commission and the Industrial Training Council. As the debate is getting a bit wide at this stage, I inform honourable members that they should come back to the item under consideration. The member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The position applying in relation to apprenticeships is most important. Because the Government did not take action in recent years the position now is completely out of hand. Concerning the item "Overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved) and officers", I believe it is important that the Minister undertakes overseas study trips. I was disappointed to learn that the Minister was not given a study trip to investigate worker participation. Is the Minister expecting to undertake an overseas study trip? As the sum of \$10 000 is allocated, what areas will he investigate?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, unfortunately I do not expect to undertake a study trip. Much advantage is obtained from such overseas trips. If one does not glean knowledge from such a trip, where does one obtain it? True, there is much to be learnt, and all members should be given the opportunity to learn as much as they can. Such trips broaden everyone's mind. However, the \$10 000 is a carry-over from the June payments. The actual payment in 1975-76 was \$18 226, and \$10 000 is the estimated sum for unpaid accounts, including payment for the head of my department, who undertook an independent trip. In fact, he was on a Commonwealth trip and certain expenses were met by the Commonwealth Government, but the State Government required him to examine matters in England and Canada. The \$10 000 is the State's responsibility in relation to his expenses. There may be no further

sums owing. The \$10 000 has not been allocated for any trip this year, and it is not my intention to take one next year, either.

Mr. MATHWIN: Concerning the item "Purchase of motor vehicles", in 1975-76 the allocated sum was \$91 995, yet \$139 554 was spent. As only \$80 000 is allocated this year, what type of vehicles are to be purchased? If more inspectors are to be appointed to the Minister's department, does this sum cover their vehicles? What is the \$80 000 for?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It will be the responsibility of my department this year to purchase 22 motor vehicles, 13 of which will be replacements and nine will be additional. One of the problems with the legislation that I introduce into this House is that it always creates extra inspectorial staff, because it is no good having legislation determined by both Houses of Parliament and having no-one to police it. So, with the extra legislation that has gone and is going through this Parliament it will be necessary to procure extra vehicles as well as those 13 replacements. This year there will be 13 replacement vehicles and nine extra vehicles.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If there are no other questions, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I have given other members the opportunity to speak. The member for Davenport has jumped up on several occasions, and I now ask him to ask a question or move his motion.

Mr. Dean Brown: I will wait and see whether there are other questions before I move my motion.

Dr. EASTICK: As regards the trend-setting associated with wage structures, if the Minister looks at page 3277 of *Hansard* of December 2, 1970, he will see that that is one area where in the railway system the State Government was very much involved in increasing the value of the wages of the South Australian worker to the detriment of relativity and it was one of the moves that created great problems for industry in this State.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will check the page in *Hansard*, but I disagree violently with the honourable member in relation to whatever was done being with the agreement of the craft unions involved or in fact of the Trades and Labor Council of that time. The honourable member is probably talking about over-award service payments and, if he is, I remind him that it may not have been the responsibility of the State Government to determine exactly the amounts involved then, but it may have been the wishes of the craft unions which brought the lower-paid workers up to their level.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That this vote be reduced by \$100.

This is, of course, a vote of no confidence in the Government but, more importantly, it is a vote of no confidence in the Minister of Labour and Industry. I have three specific charges against the Minister. The first is that the Minister has continually acted in a manner that is unbecoming to a Minister and a disgrace to the ethics of Parliament. He has in fact breached Parliamentary practice. The second charge is that the Minister has proved to be totally indecisive and unreliable in the statements he makes, even here in Parliament. The third charge is that the Minister is showing himself to be incompetent in carrying out his Ministerial duties. In addition, the Minister does not have the confidence and respect of either employees or employers which, for a Minister of Labour and Industry, is disastrous.

Mr. Wells: The best Minister for 30 years, and everyone recognises that, including the employers.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Chairman, in this Chamber I believe there is no provision for interjections from the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat? That is a reflection on the Chair, and I assure the honourable member that I will not stand for that on any occasion. I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw it. I am sorry; I did not intend to reflect on the Chair. My first accusation is that the Minister has continually acted in a manner that is unbecoming to a Minister and a disgrace to the ethics of Parliament.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. That is in breach of Standing Order 153.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I realise that the Government does not like this attack—it realises the Minister is vulnerable. However, members should at least listen to the facts I bring before the Committee. The first case I take up in proof of this issue is the case of Mr. and Mrs. Bailey. I refer to the way it was raised in this House and the correspondence that was sent to the Minister. First, I read a short extract from a letter sent to the Minister by Mrs. Bailey. I raised it because of the claim that the Minister made in this place yesterday. The last two paragraphs read:

The reason that we did not or could not leave was because Angus had us under a constant threat of ruining Gavin, which is being done now. Mr. Alan Beggs, on Mr. Jim Dunford's advice, took our story to Mr. Dean Brown, who seems to be interested in our complaints of the kind of treatment that we have had to put up with.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that, when the Chair calls him to order, he must resume his seat. Is this letter concerning a debate in another place?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, it is concerning the letter sent to the Minister in this place; it does not relate to a debate in another place. This is a letter from Mrs. Bailey to the Minister. It continues:

Can you advise if there is any way that Gavin can clear his name of the accusations that Angus has made and what are your thoughts concerning having the story written up in the papers if we can find a reporter to do it? I read out those two paragraphs because of the accusations made by the Minister yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will now read to the Committee, if members opposite will accord me the courtesy—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Chair has the duty to decide whether interjections are out of order or not. At times I have called to order members from both sides of the Chamber. The Chair will decide these matters. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The following letter dated October 3, 1976, was sent to me by Mr. Bailey:

Dear Mr. Brown, two weeks ago Mr. Wells, the member for Florey, raised in Parliament matters relating to my employment by Mr. R. H. Angus of Angaston. I write to you so that the record of events can be corrected. If possible, I would appreciate if this letter could be read in Parliament so that the Parliamentary record also clearly states the true facts. My sole purpose in raising this matter with you was to stress the need for a pastoral award for farm managers. After seeking a legal opinion from the solicitor of the A.W.U. I did not wish you to

investigate further my dismissal by Mr. Angas. Incidentally, I confirm your statement that you had only had the statement and letter for about two weeks.

I was surprised and upset by the manner in which this matter was raised in Parliament by Mr. Wells. At no time did I want this information used in such an unfortunate manner. Mr. Wells obtained his information from a private letter my wife wrote to the Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Wright. Neither my wife nor I ever gave permission for the information from this private letter to be used publicly, without our consent of any material so used. Some of the information has been taken out of context and the wrong impression has thus been given. I am amazed that Mr. Wells should have attacked you, as I had previously referred the matter to his Party and they had suggested I also speak to you. Surely the least that could have been done would have been to check any accusations with me.

My complaint has not been about the wages paid to me. I am concerned that farm managers are often required to work without a suitable agreement or award. This then leads to potential exploitation and conflict between the manager and the employer. I hope you and other members of Parliament will continue to assist the adoption of a suitable award. My request is that the matters raised in my letters be investigated but not again be raised publicly.

Yours faithfully,

Gavin W. Bailey.

I have raised this issue in Parliament because a letter sent to the Minister of Labour and Industry was passed on to a back-bencher by that Minister. That is a gross breach of Parliamentary privilege and a gross breach of his responsibilities as Minister of Labour and Industry. Mr. Bailey indicates clearly that, if any information was to be used, it was obviously to be checked with him first. The Minister, in passing the letter on to a back-bencher, did not check to see in what circumstances Mr. Bailey agreed to its being used. The Minister did not check any of the facts to be raised by his back-bencher with Mr. Bailey, and that clearly indicates that the Minister has acted in a manner unbecoming of any member of Parliament, let alone a Minister. The second issue that I raise in this regard deals with the Minister's behaviour at the end of the deadlock conference on the Long Service Leave Bill, when the Minister left that conference and went down and spoke outside this place to—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. The matter that the honourable member now wants to raise has been raised previously in Parliament by, I think, the member for Light, or it may have been the member for Kavel. Irrespective of who the member was, one member on the Opposition side raised this, on the day it occurred, and I am wondering whether it is competent for the matter to be discussed again.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The opportunity is there for the honourable member to raise at any time the question of incompetence of the Minister, and the honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I again refer to this issue. On that occasion, the Minister, instead of carrying out his Parliamentary responsibility—

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra knows that to interject when out of his seat is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On that occasion, the Minister left the deadlock conference and, instead of adopting and obeying previous Parliamentary procedure of waiting until we met before reporting any of the events at the deadlock conference, immediately went to the front door of Parliament House and spoke to the union officials and workers involved. That clearly indicates, as the Minister

admitted on that occasion, that he again breached Parliamentary practice and privilege. I also wish to raise other issues briefly. There is the claim by Mr. Heidt that the Minister threatened him across the desk. That claim has not been dealt with adequately yet.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why don't you raise that outside this place?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You are taking the same refuge—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I still challenge him to say it outside.

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable Minister. The honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister's behaviour in that sort of threat is the very point that I am making, namely, that the Minister, on this and other occasions that I will mention shortly, has physically threatened, "Do what I say or else." I come now to the statement made by Mr. Heidt and I will quote from a report in the *Advertiser* of what Mr. Heidt claimed the Minister said to him across his desk. The report of what Mr. Heidt said is:

I denied the things that they said and I was pointed at by Mr. Jack Wright, who stood up from his chair leaning over his desk and said, "If it's the last thing I do, I'll get you."

That is the very sort of threat we have had here this evening. I would not have accepted that statement from Mr. Heidt unless I heard it from other sources and, when I did hear it from other sources, I could imagine that it did happen to Mr. Heidt, because recently a person reported to me (and I do not intend to say who it was, because of the victimisation that would follow if I did) that a similar threat was made to that person across the desk by the Minister of Labour and Industry. That sort of behaviour is totally unbecoming of any Minister or any member of Parliament. Any member who physically threatens people simply to impose his policies, will and dogma on people is not fit to be a Minister in any Parliament.

Finally, I mention that this evening I have spoken to a person who has received from the Minister of Labour and Industry a letter threatening that, unless all persons receiving benefit through unemployment relief schemes are members of the union under the Government's policy of absolute preference to unionists, the councils will receive no benefits from the State Government. Again, this is indicative of this sort of threat. The letter was written in a threatening manner—"Do this or else, from Jack Wright, Minister of Labour and Industry."

Mr. Harrison: You ought to be on the stage.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I think he believes all this; that's the worst part about him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park is out of order, as is the honourable Minister.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: From those five specific cases, it is beyond doubt that the Minister's behaviour has continued to be unbecoming of a Minister and of the ethics of Parliament. The second accusation is that the Minister has proved to be totally indecisive and unreliable in his statements publicly and in this place. The first issue I take up is that regarding bread baking. We had the laughable occasion when the Minister issued, I think late one morning, a press statement to the media. At about 4.30 p.m., I happened to walk past the interviewing room in this place and saw that the press representatives were writing down a



complete reversal of the policy that had been announced only four hours earlier. That is the sort of incredible statement that the Minister makes. He makes one statement about extending baking hours and within four hours he retracts that, and within a week he confirms that retraction. How can we ever believe anything the Minister says? Obviously we cannot.

I can cite another case. On September 15, the Minister offered to obtain for the member for Light the annual financial statements of the Federated Rubber and Allied Workers Union (page 1043 of *Hansard*). On September 23, eight days later (page 1191 of *Hansard*) the Minister completely reversed that statement, and said that in no circumstances would he obtain those statements for the member for Light. That is typical of many other examples I could cite about the Minister. All members know that the Minister is indecisive: what he says one day bears no relationship to what he says later. He does not know what he is doing and is incompetent to carry out his duties.

Then there is the third and by far the most important example. The Minister has shown himself completely incompetent in carrying out his Ministerial duties. That is the worst sort of accusation anyone can bring against a Minister. In addition, the Minister does not have the confidence and respect of the employers or employees. For a Minister of Labour and Industry, that is a disastrous position to be in. I will quickly detail the various issues which show that the Minister has proved to be totally incompetent. The first example was his performance earlier this evening in this Chamber; it was disgraceful for any Minister, and anyone present in the Chamber shortly after 7.30 p.m. must agree that that lends more support to my motion than would any further statement from me.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What are you talking about?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister's inability to stand up and answer appropriate questions, as directed by the Chair earlier. The next example is the failure of the Minister to protect employees in this State who have worked according to the law, within their award, and who have been victimised and threatened by trade unions. The Minister should have been the first person to stand up and protect those people and to uphold the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. But, as I proved to this House in another debate, the Minister failed to do so. He has done nothing, not even issued a statement to protect those people, let alone take what action he could or provide legal assistance to make sure that that intimidation did not continue. Further, the Minister has failed to uphold the law for which he is responsible. I refer again to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

There was the case of Mr. Werner Lachs, a person employed by a Government department, who was unjustly and illegally dismissed by that department. I raised that matter here and the Minister did not try to defend that person or take action against the Government, which had contravened the Act.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You want me to take action against the Government!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. If the Minister was reasonable, upheld the law and carried out his responsibility, he would make sure that his own Government did not breach that law. In the case of Mr. Lachs it was found by the Industrial Court that he was illegally dismissed, and the court instructed that he be reinstated. That is not the only case. Another example is the numerous illegal strikes carried on in this State and the fact that the Minister has taken no action to stop those strikes.

I am sure the Minister would be the first person to act in the case of an illegal lock-out. That is the sort of mentality and bias we have in our Minister, but he will take no action if we have an illegal strike.

In fact, it was the Minister who said in a written answer in this Chamber that almost every strike in this State under a State award was an illegal strike, and this included the Medibank strike. Despite the fact that I brought this to his attention, the Minister still failed to take any action. Further evidence of the complete incompetence of the Minister is the fact that the Premier will not give him the responsibility for the Unit for Industrial Democracy. If ever there was a section of the Government that should be under the control of the Minister for Labour and Industry (and it was originally within his department) it would be this unit.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It was never in my department.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That unit appears in the telephone directory under the name of the Department of Labour and Industry. It may not have been there when the Minister took over the portfolio, but this is proving the very point, because when he became Minister it was removed from his responsibility. Why? For no other reason than that the Premier (his own Leader) realised that the Minister was incompetent and incapable of administering that unit. What greater damnation can any Minister have than not to have the confidence even of his own Leader? There was the incredible case of the Minister telling us in this place what was happening concerning the flow-on of the Federal wage indexation case in the Industrial Court. At the very same time as when he stood here claiming that the Government's case that he was putting was identical to that of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Employers' Federation, an employee from his own department was in court putting a totally different case. That is clearly documented in the press and in *Hansard*. What further sign of incompetence can we have than a Minister who does not know what is going on in the court regarding such an important issue? He did not know what case was being put by the employers and what his own case was. What greater damnation could any Minister have?

Another example involves the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill and the failure of the Government and the Minister to carry out a promise, and the Minister's inability to debate the Bill I introduced in this Chamber, even though he had at least a week to prepare his remarks and, in addition, three or four weeks before that when the Bill had been considered in another place. It was incredible to see the Minister of Labour and Industry (who had previously claimed he was going to correct the anomalies in that Act) unable and unwilling to debate that Bill in this Chamber, despite having a department of officers to help prepare his speech. That is the final damnation that can be directed against any Minister.

I could go on and speak about other issues, including the Minister's policy of compulsory unionism and how that is a breach of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the fundamental principles of democracy. I believe the evidence I have produced clearly indicates that the Minister is incapable and incompetent to carry out his Ministerial duties and that he does not even have the respect of employers or employees. Many employers and employees have come to me and requested that I take up their case for them—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Name one.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I could name numerous people. The reason I raise this is that those people say when they

come to me that they are not willing to go to the Minister because they regard him as somewhat of a joke and quite incapable.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You name them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I could name people; in fact I could produce evidence in this House—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You name them, or remain a liar.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —which would make you and other members of your Party so embarrassed that I think you would resign.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have called "Order!" on three occasions, and the honourable member for Davenport has made no move to sit down. I would like the honourable Minister to withdraw the word "liar".

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I withdraw, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the honourable member for Davenport that the Chair has control over the proceedings in this Chamber. Although I spoke three times, the honourable member did not make one move to sit down. If the honourable member ignores the Chair in the future, action will be taken. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I apologise for not sitting down when you spoke, Mr. Chairman. Many employers and employees have come to me because they claim that the Minister does not have their respect or confidence; that is a sad position for a Minister of Labour and Industry to be in. The Minister's behaviour, indecisiveness and incompetence mean that he can take one course only: he should resign, because he is no longer capable or fit to continue as Minister of Labour and Industry. This State will suffer until the Minister resigns. It has been my unfortunate privilege in the last 12 months to sit opposite a Minister who is far more incompetent than are his colleagues. It is an unfortunate reflection on the standard of this Parliament that he should be so incompetent.

The Hon. J. D. Wright (Minister of Labour and Industry): One of the good things about the honourable member's speech is that it reminded me of the occasion some months ago when the honourable member congratulated me in this House on being the most competent Chairman that he had ever served under on a Select Committee; no-one can deny that. We all know that the honourable member, who lives in the land of fantasy, is considered by most Government members and most trade union officials to be the perfect clown. The honourable member has certainly exhibited a peculiar change of face. Of course, at the time he congratulated me he was trying neither to belittle me nor to praise me but to belittle the Minister of Mines and Energy, whom he also declared to be incompetent.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is interjecting out of his seat. Every member knows the Standing Orders. I assure the honourable member that I will not at any stage allow such behaviour in the future from either side of the Chamber. I will warn the next member who offends in this way. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The member for Davenport could not prove that either I or the Minister of Mines and Energy was incompetent. Every time the honourable

member attacks someone he uses the term "incompetent"; he becomes personal and attacks at that level. Actually, the honourable member has never really forgiven me since I beat him on a television programme. He has not backed up for any more television contests, either. The honourable member has never been able to live with the hiding he took on channel 2, when 80 per cent of South Australians said that he was incompetent.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair does not allow the use of the term "he" or "you" when reference is made to an honourable member. The Minister should use the term "member opposite".

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I was referring to the member for Davenport, who has built up great jealousy and hatred for me because of the tremendous hiding he got on television. We cannot rely on anything the honourable member says, because he says the first thing that comes off the top of his head. He does not give facts or figures to substantiate what he is saying. Indeed, I do not think he is getting much support from Liberal Party members. I will not deal with some of the things that the honourable member has said, because he did not have the courage to name people: all he says is, "This person said that" or "That company said that."

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! During the speech of the honourable member for Davenport—

Mr. Chapman: The Minister interjected throughout.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra for the second time. During the speech of the member for Davenport I called the Minister and Government members to order. If the Minister does not receive the courtesy of this Chamber, I intend to warn members who offend. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The member for Davenport does not rely on facts; he relies on fiction and his own imagination. Because some of his accusations are so wild, there is no opportunity of refuting them. I turn now to the honourable member's attack in connection with the Angas v. Bailey issue at Angaston. The honourable member said that I was not entitled to pass on the letter in this connection or to make it public or to pass it on to another member. The honourable member said that the letter was the private property of the Minister, and that it could not even be discussed with officers. He said that it was a shocking thing to pass it on to a member of the Government Party. When the member for Kavel and the member for Davenport spoke yesterday, I did not have the letter with me and I had to rely on my memory.

Yesterday, I offered to table the letter, but no-one took up the offer. I shall let members judge for themselves whether or not this letter is the private property of the Minister or whether it is the property of whoever I wanted to give it to. I could do whatever I wanted with this letter, if members consider these passages. I will read the whole of the relevant paragraph so that it is not out of context, and let us recall that the member for Davenport repeatedly quotes out of context. There are two pertinent paragraphs in connection with the question of whether this correspondence is public property. I will read them both when I am ready.

Mr. Chapman: What about reading the lot?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has been warned twice and, if he does not cease interjecting, I will deal with him.

Mr. Wells: Chuck him out!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: So that we have this matter in its proper context, I will read certain paragraphs from Mrs. Bailey's letter, in which she discusses actions of her husband's employer, at Angaston, who was practically crucifying his workers. Mrs. Bailey writes:

I hardly think that it is fair or right that Angus—she did not even put "Mr." before his name—

should be able to do as he is to Gavin, including carrying out his threat to ruin him for getting work. We cannot afford to fight him financially. It is a matter of rich man against poor man.

This is the wife of a man who had just been sacked, for writing to me, by one of the richest men in the Angaston district. That is why the defence is there: the Liberal Party is defending the Liberals and the rich people of the Angaston district. However, if it had been an ordinary farmer in the South-East or a small grazier, it would not have mattered one iota; but, because it was one of the elite squatters in the State, the Liberal Party flew to his defence. There is no question about that. Mrs. Bailey's letter continues:

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable the Minister resume his seat. I have already warned honourable members, and during the speech made by the member for Davenport, I warned the Minister twice. However, I do not intend to warn any more members. The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The letter continues:

The letter that I have copied out for you is the poor man's reward for six years service while the rich man goes on quite pleased with himself.

The remainder of this page of the letter asks, in bold print:

We would like to see this story and more written up in the papers as an example of what can happen when a man has no protection from either unions or awards in this year of 1976.

Surely that is making the letter as public as I want to make it. This lady is putting to me that I should do whatever I want to do with the letter, and I would be guilty of incompetence and misconduct if this matter had not been blown up and explained to the public of the State. I could go on and certainly waste the Committee's time by relating others matters contained in the letter. There was another letter and, if the Committee wants to hear it, I will read it. The letter was received from Mr. Bailey, but most of the matters contained in it have already been related here, and I do not want to bore the Committee with them. However, I want to clear my name by releasing this letter. The final page of Mrs. Bailey's letter asks me:

Can you advise if there is any way that Gavin can clear his name of the accusations that Angus—

again no courtesy title—that is what she thought of that man—

has made? What are your thoughts concerning having the story written up in the papers, if we can find a reporter to do it?

I accuse the member for Davenport of trying to deceive the Committee, because he did not read the first paragraph of the letter: he read only what he wanted to read. It is not I who should be indicted for being incompetent and dishonest in this Chamber but the member for Davenport, who is totally incompetent and totally dishonest. I think that we have dealt sufficiently with the accusations of incompetence by the member for Davenport about the Bailey incident, which, I think, we have cleared up once and for all. There is little doubt now about my having the right to release the letter or to discuss it with members of my

Party, or the press, or to go on television or radio, or wherever else I liked to go. Mrs. Bailey gave me the right to do whatever I wanted to do with her letter. She wanted publicity and something for her husband that he had not had for six years, namely, protection for the first time so that she could feel that her husband was safe. He lived under threat for six years.

If the letter's contents are true (and I have no reason to doubt them), Mr. Bailey, his wife and family must have lived under stress. The latest document I have received is addressed to the Land Agents Board, is dated September 20, and contains strong accusations about the Opposition's mate, the great Mr. Angus and some of the great agents up there. Opposition members should not carry this on too far, because I know who will win out in the end. If the Opposition wants me to make all these allegations and accusations public, I shall do so. I say to the Opposition that it might not receive public support if all the facts were known.

The infamous member for Davenport made certain other accusations about my conduct in the Chamber, particularly concerning a conference on a Bill that, in my view, involved one of the most explosive situations ever witnessed on the steps of Parliament House. About 700 members of the building industry union outside the House were going to come inside the building; there is no question about that. If the member for Davenport had one scrap of the decency possessed by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, a member in another place, he would admit the truth. Mr. Laidlaw told members of my Party that, if it had not been for Jack Wright that day having enough guts to go outside and tell the crowd what was going on, they were coming inside. If I erred in some way and infringed some tradition or law, I was wrong; but, if I saved members the embarrassment of people stampeding all through the building and creating a nuisance of themselves (which was likely to occur that day, because we must remember that these workers had been fighting the issue for over 15 years, and there was plenty of heat in the debate outside), I make no apology. If I resolved that electrifying situation, I do not apologise to members or to the public of South Australia, and certainly not to the smug member for Davenport.

I now turn to statements made under privilege by two persons. I refer first, to that made by the baker, Mr. Heidt, of Morphett Vale. He made a statement in the South Australian Industrial Commission, where he was being fined. The member for Davenport forgot to tell the House that this man had been breaking the law. That is the sort of man to whom the member for Davenport had to go to find support: a lawbreaker.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, but of course it wasn't the sort of law you like.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is right. I am not saying whether or not I like the law. However, the fact is that that man was breaking the law.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did that give you the right to threaten him?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not threaten him. I will refer to that matter in a moment, and I will also deal with the member for Davenport. My predecessor, the Hon. D. H. McKee had given Mr. Heidt a dispensation to bake bread outside normal baking hours, and Mr. Heidt had given an assurance that he would respect that dispensation and honour his obligations under his bond. However, he did not do so or obey the law. Indeed, he has probably broken the law about 15 times. That is the sort of individual on whom we find the member

for Davenport placing reliance. Not only has Mr. Heidt broken the law in relation to his baking business but also, one sees in the press, he is wife bashing. I do not know on what sort of people we in this House are to rely. Are we to rely on people who break the law and who condemn me? By God, one would have to sink fairly low to do that. Members opposite will be going to Yatala to find people to accuse me of being incompetent or to tell lies about me. It seems that Opposition members are depending on lawbreakers for support.

Mr. Heidt made the statement, under protection in the Industrial Court, that I threatened him in my office. I have made public statements refuting that allegation and, indeed, can call three officers, including a girl, who were at the conference and who will refute any suggestion that I threatened Mr. Heidt. I am a kindly man, and do not in any circumstances stand over or threaten people. In fact, I try to encourage them. That is why I was such a successful trade union official. I have written to Mr. Heidt telling him that, unless he apologises publicly to me for his wrongful statement made in the Industrial Court, he will not get back his dispensation. Immediately Mr. Heidt honours his obligations and tells the truth, instead of hiding behind the Industrial Court, the better it will be. He did the sort of thing that the member for Davenport did tonight when he hid behind the protection of this Parliament when saying that I had made certain allegations.

I put Mr. Heidt and the member for Davenport in the same category, and I challenge the member for Davenport to repeat outside this Chamber the statements he has made here regarding Mr. Heidt. It is all right to say these things in coward's castle. The honourable member can do what he likes, but he will have a writ served on him tomorrow. So will Mr. Heidt if he makes statements like that publicly. However, he has kept himself under the protection of the Industrial Court so far. That deals with Mr. Heidt.

The next point is an interesting one, and in this respect I thought the member for Davenport was at his excellent best. I thought he reached an all-time high, saying, "I have received some complaints from people whom I will not name." He said, "I have received complaints from employers and employees, but I will not name them." When I heard him say that, I wrote "anonymous", and that is what the member for Davenport is. It is wrong for him to make accusations about me or about any member of the Party to which I belong, and not give me an opportunity to refute them. All the things that I have listed so far I have been able to refute and correct. On this occasion, the member for Davenport made accusations that were not true. I do not believe that anyone has been to see him and said that I am incompetent, or that I will not talk to them or help them with their problems. This is a figment, and nothing more, of the honourable member's imagination.

Two other matters with which I wish to deal, the first of which is the statement by the member for Davenport that the Premier knew that I was incompetent and therefore took from me the responsibility for the Unit for Industrial Democracy. The honourable member said that the Premier knew I was incompetent before I was given an opportunity to direct that unit, because it was taken from my portfolio on the day on which I was appointed. What sort of a statement is that? How can we sit here day after day and listen to that sort of tripe?

The Unit for Industrial Democracy has never been under my direction, so how could the Premier know that I could not direct it? I make no secret of the fact that I

contested this matter with the Premier. I said that I would like to have a go at it, in reply to which the Premier said, "No. I think you have too much to do now, and I want to bring it under my control." I would have liked the opportunity to control that unit, but it was taken over by the Premier who was the first one in this State and, indeed, in Australia, to talk about industrial democracy and worker participation. He is the most competent person to do so.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation. I am having trouble hearing the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Premier is the most efficient and suitable Minister to handle that unit, which was not taken from me because it was never within my portfolio. I now refer to Mr. Werner Lachs, whom the member for Davenport accused me of not protecting. However, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act protects him, just as it protects any other trade unionist or non-unionist in South Australia. I think most of that Act was drafted by the Australian Labor Party when in Government so, in a way, I was protecting Mr. Lachs. Like any other employee who has been wrongfully dismissed, Mr. Lachs had a right under, I think, section 15e of the Act to appeal. I do not have to tell the member for Davenport that he is fabricating when trying to accuse me of being incompetent. Mr. Lachs took that action and was successful, so how could I be accused of letting him down?

The member for Davenport referred to only one other matter which is worthy of a reply and which related to workmen's compensation. He accused the Government of not proceeding with this legislation. I have consistently said in this Chamber and outside, as the honourable member well knows, that the Act will be amended this session. However, an attempt was made in another place to take business out of the Government's hands. The member for Davenport was not sufficiently thoughtful to introduce that sort of legislation. Indeed, he had to leave it to another place to do so. So, let us not kid ourselves that this is his legislation, because it was introduced in another place. Workmen's compensation legislation will be amended in this session of Parliament, and the Bill will be introduced within two weeks. Again, we have another fabrication by the member for Davenport, who has accused me of incompetence in relation to this legislation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If I had any doubts at all concerning the competence and fitness of the Minister to be a Minister of the Crown in this Parliament, they have been dispelled. I have no doubt whatever that he is an unfit person to occupy the office of Minister of Labour and Industry in this Parliament, as a result of his ramblings. It is not surprising that he is embarrassed about any recollection of the events in relation to his behaviour after a conference in this Parliament. His ignorance of Standing Orders was again obvious when he sought to take a point of order this evening to curtail the debate, and his unwillingness to have the matter again ventilated by this Committee shows what an embarrassment the matter is to him, and so it should be. As is the Minister's usual habit, the Minister has been completely unrepentant in the past and is completely full of bravado. It did not matter to him what the rules of this Chamber are, because if he has a set of rules they are his own, and he makes them up as he goes along. This matter was raised during the last session and a motion was moved in this Chamber.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. Under Standing Orders it is not proper for any member to refer to another member as "you" or "he". I ask you, Sir, to request the Deputy Leader to refer to the Minister as the "honourable Minister" or "the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In upholding the point of order I ask the member for Kavel not to address the Minister as "you" or "he", but to refer to him as the honourable Minister.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am only too willing to comply with the point raised, which in no way detracts from the gravity of the matter I am discussing. The honourable Minister was the subject of a motion moved in this Chamber in February, 1976, and the Minister's churlish demeanour and behaviour were well to the fore on that occasion. The motion moved on February 18 was as follows:

That this House deplore the action of the Minister of Labour and Industry in releasing details of the conference on the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Bill held between the two Houses of Parliament while a manager acting for the House of Assembly before the results of the conference had been reported to this House.

Because the Government would not allow time for that motion to be debated, there was a resultant motion of no confidence in the Speaker. No wonder the Minister does not want that sorry record reopened. Nevertheless, it indicates clearly the attitude of the Minister to his responsibilities in this State. True, the Minister did apologise, but that apology must have been the source of acute embarrassment to the Government, because the press references to the matter were not flattering to the Minister. On February 20, 1976, an *Advertiser* editorial headed "The Minister's mistake" stated, amongst other things:

The Minister, in fact, appears to have taken the whole matter too lightly.

Obviously, he took it lightly again tonight. He suggested that there could have been some sort of stampede through Parliament House by an irate group on the front steps. The editorial continued:

He was firmly and properly rebuked by the Speaker (Mr. Connelly) who deplored his action and described it as injudicious, highly improper, and not in keeping with the best Parliamentary traditions. An apology to the House, it might have been thought, was the least that could have been expected after that, but apologies, it seems, form no part of Mr. Wright's repertoire.

We have had ample evidence of that trait in the Minister's makeup again this evening in his reply to the member for Davenport. The Minister spoke about defeating the member for Davenport in a television debate. That reference served only to remind me of one boy stealing another boy's apple. Certainly, people who saw that debate would be divided in their opinions as would apply to any debate, but to advance that argument in rebuttal of the charges made, is childish. I inform the honourable Minister that the member for Davenport has the unanimous support of all members of the Liberal Party.

The Minister suggested that Liberal members were not showing much interest in this motion. However, I assure him that the member for Davenport was speaking for all members of the Liberal Party. The Minister referred to the member for Davenport having no courage. How much courage had the Minister in repeating the vile accusations of the member for Florey? The obvious hatred for sections of the community by members opposite came to

the fore. Reference was made again to the elitist "squatocracy", and that the Liberal Party jumped to the defence of these rich people because they were typical Liberal supporters. Has the Minister examined the evidence presented to this Chamber? Obviously, if he had, he would know that we are acting in Mr. Bailey's defence equally as we are acting for Mr. Angas.

The Minister made a big point of the fact that Mrs. Bailey referred to "Angas". However, if the Minister had any perspicacity and any insight whatever he would know that that point is not valid. If an unknown person wrote to the Minister suggesting that a murder had been committed, would he enter this Chamber saying that Joe Blow is a murderer merely on the basis of a letter from someone he did not know and about which he had not checked the facts? Would he make that accusation and say that he had not checked the facts? That is a similar but valid analogy. The Minister received a letter from an unknown woman making scandalous charges, yet he made no attempt to check their authenticity by contact with the woman concerned, her husband to whom the charges related, or the person who was accused in the letter. Yet the Minister has repeated these allegations in this Chamber after they have been proved conclusively to be utter nonsense.

Of even greater concern to me is the obvious hatred that shows. The member for Florey made sweeping comments concerning so-called wealthy, money-hungry, slave-driving members of the "squatocracy", and we heard the same comments this evening. I do not know much about Mr. Angas's personal affairs, but I do know from earlier contacts with him in my office over a period that, if honourable members opposite were aware of what is happening to some of these so-called wealthy members of the "squatocracy", and were in a similar situation they would be quickly out of business. I know just what the impact of land tax, council rates, and capital taxes has been on some of these people. Some people think that, because somebody has a piece of land (leaving aside Mr. Angas, for the moment) and a wellknown name, there is something wrong with him and he is to be hated. What sort of a fair-minded approach is that from Australians? I think we saw tonight, and I was appalled at, the recurrence from the Minister of the outburst to which this House had been subjected by the member for Florey with no recognition of the facts. That is what appals me.

I recount, for passing interest, that today I gave a talk to a group at lunch-time on the relationship between country and city, and suggested to this group that there were tensions which, unfortunately, built up between city and country people on occasions, and one of the things I suggested to them was that this image of a wealthy rural community because it possessed land, caused tension in the community, and indeed it does. On the other hand, country people often feel tensions with the city folk, because they see improving conditions in the Public Service—17½ per cent holiday pay loading, and long service leave and—while the average income for every primary producer in Australia is \$4 000 a year. There are some members of this so-called wealthy "squatocracy" who find it difficult to make ends meet, and there is the poor old cow cocky who is earning \$4 000 a year, with no leave. That is the other side of the coin.

The one thing I deplore in the community is this sort of class hatred, which some members of the Labor Party want to stir up. We saw it exhibited again tonight, and a fortnight ago. In this society, I think the Australian is basically fair-minded; he will look at both sides of the coin and

come up with a reasonably fair conclusion, but some members opposite are so filled with hate and so blinkered that they will not take even the elementary step of checking their facts before they burst out with this vile effusion and venting of their spleen in this way in this House. We saw it again from the Minister this evening. If ever I needed more evidence of his unfitness to occupy his office, I saw it tonight.

That sort of exhibition displays a singular lack of moral courage. Perhaps the Minister is willing to engage in some other forms of courage but that sort of exercise displays an alarming absence of moral courage and acceptance of the principle of what is fair and right; checking the facts to find out what they are. I do not doubt that the Minister and others will try to get a statutory declaration from Mr. Bailey. I understand Mr. Bailey has refused to sign it. They will stir up the mud, but in this exercise we are protecting Mr. Bailey as much as we are protecting Mr. Angas and, if the Minister wants to check that out, let him talk to Gavin Bailey. It was the Hon. Mr. Dunford who introduced him to the member for Davenport in the first instance, and then he introduced him to me and, after this thing broke in Parliament, Bailey was so disgusted that he telephoned me.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is becoming a big joke.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think these matters that are being ventilated are rather serious, but I would not expect any other attitude from the Government. When the Government is touched on the raw, it either tries to bluster or make a joke of it, so the Deputy Premier is running true to form. I believe the Minister has been grossly irresponsible in his performance here this evening.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: No.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That was one of the most vicious attacks I have ever heard in this place. We have referred to the Minister's performance and his embarrassment and the embarrassment of the Government when he disclosed the result of that conference, and we also well recall the Minister's arrogance, his attitude, and his bluster when confronted with the fact that he was in grave breach of privilege in this House.

Members opposite try to laugh it off as a big joke—what does it matter whether we have rules to run this place? It does not matter to the Minister, who will make his own decisions. What sort of a way is that to run a department? We would not have objected if the Minister had got his officers to investigate the complaints but, to take a letter, an unsubstantiated account, and hand it to a Party committee and stir it up is disgraceful.

We well recall the baking hours fiasco and the Minister's announcement: we remember the Government's announcement, which is well documented in press reports. The Government announced that by a Cabinet decision on the Monday (it was announced, I think, on the Thursday) it was going to allow weekend baking. I refer to a press report of July 29 of this year, as follows:

The South Australian Government yesterday retreated from a Cabinet decision to allow weekend baking in South Australia. The Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Wright) announced during the morning that the Industrial Code would be amended to extend baking hours from 6 p.m. on Fridays to noon on Saturdays. Five hours later, after deputations from the Bread Carters Union, the Baking Trades Federation and the Bread Manufacturers Association, Mr. Wright told a press conference the Government would re-examine its decision. Mr. Wright invited the media to his office at 10.30 a.m. yesterday to announce the decision made by the Cabinet on Monday. Copies of his statement were circulated, but Mr. Wright became involved in a 1½-hour protest deputation from the

Bread Manufacturers Association and did not appear for interviews. His statement said officers of the Department of Labour and Industry had found difficulties in administering the existing laws. Consumers were denied freedom of choice of bread and the time it could be bought and the anomaly had to be corrected. Existing special provisions for long weekends would not be affected and there would be no restrictions on bread deliveries. At his afternoon Press conference, Mr. Wright acknowledged that the unions did not like his plan and saw it as a move to reintroduce six-day baking.

That again led to what must have been an embarrassing editorial for the Government. I quote another report of July 29:

State Cabinet approved the new proposals on Monday. But, uncharacteristically, it seems not to have done its homework before acting. As soon as the news was out yesterday, both the bread manufacturers and the unions concerned descended on the hapless Mr. Wright who, presumably after considerable pressure had been applied, announced later in the day that the Government's plans would be "re-examined." The fact that citizens generally might welcome the moves, and even be prepared to pay a little more for fresh bread at weekends, now seems to be of no consequence. The counter-arguments are that workers want their weekends free and that most people now have deep-freezers in which bread can be kept reasonably fresh for days and weeks at a time. So much, apparently, for a brave if illfated attempt to make life easier for the South Australian consumer.

The Premier sought to spring to the defence of his Minister in this situation. The press report stated:

Dunstan: Bread plan can work. Labour and Industry Minister (Mr. Wright) said today he had not backed down on the weekend baking issue. And the Premier said he thought the proposal to extend baking hours in the metropolitan area to noon on Saturday would work.

No wonder the Premier insisted on taking under his own more experienced wing the section dealing with worker participation in industry! The Minister has acknowledged that he fought hard to get administration of the section, but the Premier wisely thought that he would handle it. That section is an embarrassment to the Premier: heaven knows what would have happened if it was with the Minister of Labour and Industry. Workmen's compensation legislation has also been referred to, and on February 3 this year the member for Mitcham asked a succinct Question on Notice.

Mr. Millhouse: My questions always are succinct.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I expected that interjection. Nevertheless, what I said was meant as a compliment. The question and the reply were as follows:

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to reduce payments of compensation made pursuant to the Workmen's Compensation Act and, if so—

- (a) when;
- (b) what reductions are to be proposed; and
- (c) for what reasons?

2. If no such legislation is to be introduced, why not?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

- (a) this session;
- (b) the exclusion of overtime from the computation of average weekly earnings;
- (c) to ensure that overtime is not included in workmen's compensation weekly payments.

2. Not applicable.

We know the fiasco that resulted in the withdrawal of the Bill, and the withdrawal was not at the behest of the Opposition. According to the reply to the question, we were to have the legislation. It was to correct an anomaly that has been acknowledged by members on this side. A fair Bill was introduced in another place and it did little more than correct that anomaly. However, the Minister says that he wants the honour and glory of putting the legislation

through. Long-suffering people in every sector are waiting for the measure, and the Minister has not kept to his time table. We do not know the Minister's difficulties (maybe they are on South Terrace) about introducing the legislation, but he has not kept to his time table.

If the matters were not so serious, we could take the whole thing as a joke. Earlier today the Leader referred to the Government's record. The Minister has stated that employers must open their books. We do not seem to have had much follow through on that, but, if we are to reach the Utopian situation of industrial harmony in the State, the workers must see the books! A newspaper report on the matter states:

The Labour and Industry Minister (Mr. Wright) wants companies to open their books to their workers. He said today that there would be very little improvement in industrial relations until this was done.

The track record of this Minister has been appalling, and one of the most infamous chapters in the saga has been written here this evening by the Minister himself. The Opposition is unanimous in its belief that the Minister is making a thorough botch of his job, and this bravado and arrogance will not be sufficient to carry him through. The Government would be well advised to replace him. If the Premier concludes that he has no-one stronger to put in the Ministry and if he keeps the Minister on the team, the Minister may take note of comments that have been made not only here but also in the media, seek to mend his ways, learn from experience, become more familiar with the Standing Orders of this place, and perhaps improve his performance. However, the record is appalling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister's politics and my politics are far apart. Having said that, I say that I do not believe that he has deserved what he has just had from the member for Kavel. Perhaps from my position here I can sometimes get a more balanced view of the debate than can members in the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. When I heard the member for Davenport having a go and then heard the Minister replying, I thought that this was the best that I had heard from either Party during this Budget debate and I was pleased that the member for Davenport had learnt from my example of last evening and that at last someone in the Liberal Party had had enough intestinal fortitude to take on the Government or a Minister on a specific issue. Although I do not agree with the Minister, his reply matched what the member for Davenport had said.

Since then we have had an exaggerated and unwarranted attack on the Minister by the member for Kavel. I speak in this debate because of one extraordinary thing that the Minister said, and it springs from one of his virtues; that is that he is, in my experience, fairly honest and straightforward. However, as a member of a political Party and a member of a Government, he may live to regret admitting that he wished to keep the unit for industrial democracy under his control but that the Premier would not let him do so. I admire his frankness but what he said was a little indiscreet, because there must have been a reason why the Premier did not want him to keep the unit. We now know that the Premier took it away from him when he was elected and I remind the member for Kavel (if he happens to be listening outside the Chamber, or if he comes back) that it is not for the Premier to decide who the Minister will be: in the Labor Party there is an elective system and the member for Adelaide was elected by Caucus to the Ministry.

From what the Minister said, it is fairly obvious that once it was known he was to be the new Minister he lost this particular part of the portfolio. Whether that was a good or bad thing I do not know, but it is perfectly obvious that the Premier did not want him to have it. We can all make up our minds as to why that was so. Although I intend to support this motion, I do not regard the Minister of Labour and Industry as a bad Minister, compared with the general run of Ministers in the present Government. I have found the Minister honest and straightforward. Strangely enough, I have found him far more sympathetic to the views that I hold than many of his colleagues, and I sympathise with him over the bread-baking situation. It was perfectly obvious that the Minister wanted to relax the absurd restrictions that we have on the weekend baking of bread. He did his best and was apparently able to persuade at least a majority of his Cabinet and Caucus to that point of view, and then it came to grief. That was bad luck, but at least he tried and I was right behind him in that effort. I would like to see all the restrictions removed in this area; I think the present situation is absolutely idiotic. I would like the Minister to try that again: to have restrictions relaxed; he will certainly have my support if he tries. The fact that I support the motion does not mean that I do not hold the Minister, as a man, in quite high regard.

Mr. GUNN: I strongly support the motion so ably moved by the member for Davenport. I also condemn the activities of the member for Florey and the Minister of Labour and Industry in conceiving together a plan in an attempt to publicly discredit the member for Davenport. It is obvious that the Government has been smarting under the consistent well-documented attacks which the honourable member has made on it. He has been a thorn in its side for a long time and it is obvious that the Government is concerned about the way in which he has been able to show weaknesses in its activities. The Government has obviously heard the same comments that members on this side have heard about the member for Davenport—that people admire him, respect his ability and are aware that in future he will play a prominent role in politics in this State. He obviously has a good future ahead of him, and that is why the Government decided to seize on any opportunity available to try publicly to discredit the member for Davenport.

It took the opportunity to use a letter that was sent to the Minister of Labour and Industry in his capacity not as a member of the Labor Party but as a Minister of the Crown, whose duty it is to administer certain Acts that are under his control. One would have expected that when a complaint of this nature was sent to a Minister he would refer it to his departmental officers to conduct an inquiry, but nobody went to the trouble of interviewing either Mr. Angas or Mr. and Mrs. Bailey. The Minister stands condemned on that count alone. Surely, when a matter has reached the stage it has unfortunately reached now, the Minister's officers should have carried out an investigation, because we saw the member for Florey in this House a week or so ago make a vicious attack on the credibility and character of a person who was not in a position to reply because of the privilege enjoyed by members of this House. We then saw the Minister again attack that person using as a basis one letter, without even taking the trouble to ascertain whether the facts were as stated in that letter.

The member for Davenport has gone to the trouble of making inquiries, obtaining information that completely destroys, in many respects, the credibility of the Minister and the statements of the member for Florey. The result of that unfortunate statement by the member for Florey



is that Mr. Angas's credibility and his standing in the community have been greatly damaged. Unfortunately, I believe that Mr. Bailey's standing in the community, his credibility and his name have been endangered, and I am concerned that his future employment prospects may also have been endangered by the scurrilous attack made in this House.

It is high time that the Minister lifted himself above this sort of attack, because one would have expected that when a person accepts the oath of office of a Minister he would discharge it in a way that is designed to assist the community, and not to lower that office to the gutter. However, the Minister has used gutter tactics in a most deplorable and disgraceful fashion. By handing that correspondence to the member for Florey, the Minister used him as a hatchet man. The Minister was not game to take on the member for Davenport in a political confrontation: he did not have the ability. His colleagues obviously knew that in such a confrontation he would be completely destroyed, so they had to use a back-door method: they had to employ the services of the member for Florey in a disgraceful fashion. The Minister is no longer fit to carry out the duties of a Minister of the Crown.

The Premier displayed his lack of confidence in the Minister a few hours after the Minister's appointment, because the first statement the Minister made in an interview on television was that he wanted to involve himself in, and that he had grandiose schemes in relation to, worker participation. Realising the potential danger in these suggestions and in this policy for the Government, the Premier had to relieve him of that responsibility. In the interests of the people of this State and in the interests of labour relations, the Premier ought to relieve the Minister of his Ministerial obligations now, and he would then restore some credibility to the Government and he would, I hope, undo some of the great damage that has been done to this House, because it has been used for vicious political purposes with no relation to fact, logic, common sense or honesty. The house has been used as a vehicle to smear people and to try to damage the member for Davenport.

All the charges that have been made against the honourable member have been rejected and thrown back at the Minister and his colleagues. All members of the Government who oppose this motion will be equally as guilty as the member for Florey and the Minister. I sincerely hope that, if the Government wants to show itself to be responsible, Government members will support the motion. The member for Davenport is in the right, and the Minister stands condemned. The Minister ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I moved this motion to show no confidence in the Minister on three grounds: first, his incompetence; secondly, his unbecoming behaviour on numerous occasions, which I cited; and, thirdly, his inconsistent and unreliable statements in this place and elsewhere. Despite the huff and puff we have had from the Minister this evening and despite the red herrings, particularly the Bailey case, that he tried to drag across the path to protect himself, he has failed to dent the case at all. At no stage did the Minister touch on the final letter, the most important letter of all, from Mr. Bailey. He had no answer to it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I haven't got it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: You have not got it? I read it to the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cautioned the Minister concerning the way in which honourable members should

be addressed, and I hope the member for Davenport will heed the warning, too. Honourable members and Ministers should not be referred to by the term "you".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The most important piece of evidence in relation to Mr. Bailey was the last letter I read to the Committee. The Minister said that he did not have a copy of it, but I have read it out in full. The letter clearly states Mr. Bailey's position. It is not written by Mr. Angas or anyone else. It is Mr. Bailey who clearly states that the Minister has breached his powers in the eyes of Mr. Bailey. It states the grounds on which Mr. Bailey brought up the matter through his wife with the Minister.

The Minister has not satisfactorily answered the other points raised. His defence this evening has been pathetic, particularly since he was trying to save his position as Minister in this House. The public realises the embarrassment he has caused to the Government. The member for Kavel read several editorials that should have greatly embarrassed the Government. The evidence presented this evening by the Liberal Party indicates that the Minister has been incompetent and has failed to carry out his responsibilities.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandeppeer, Venning, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Gunn and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Jennings.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negated.

Line passed.

Minister of Labour and Industry, Miscellaneous, \$83 400.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister explain the reason for the new item involving a \$50 000 allocation to the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: An acoustics laboratory was established some years ago in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Adelaide. It is the only laboratory of its type in Australia: in fact, it is said to be on a par with one of the best acoustics facilities in the United States of America, namely, Purdue University at West La Fayette, Indiana. It was established for the primary function of teaching, but the university undertakes occasional consulting to industry on problems that require specialised expertise.

The Professor of Mechanical Engineering and the Director of the Acoustics Laboratory sought Government funds for a limited period so that they may undertake some basic research into problems concerning noise control in industry, for which specialised expertise is required. If funds were available for other than teaching purposes it would enable specialised courses for people in industry to be undertaken

and it would also be possible to expand the capacity of the laboratory to provide comprehensive acoustic test facilities for industry.

South Australia has established, at Amdel, research facilities that are used by the mining industry throughout Australia. Because of the existence of the acoustics laboratory at the University of Adelaide, we have the same opportunity to undertake basic research on industrial noise problems for Australian industry. The National Acoustics Laboratory (which is the only other facility in Australia) concentrates its research on the effects of noise on people. The acoustics laboratory at the University of Adelaide has developed, in the Mechanical Engineering Department, the research facility for dealing with means of controlling noise at its source.

Cabinet has approved of a grant of \$150 000 being made over a period of three years to enable the acoustics laboratory to undertake basic research on means of controlling noise in industry and to establish a consultancy service to industry.

Mr. CUMBE: I was delighted to hear what the Minister has just said and to learn that this work is being done at the University of Adelaide. When this facility is finally established, will personnel from the Minister's department be able to undertake special courses to enable them to administer the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act provisions relating to hearing and acoustic problems in industry? Also, will there be an opportunity for people in industry, either in management or in trade union activities, to attend or to obtain advice from that facility? I believe that, with money being provided for implementing such an excellent idea, such a service should be available.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his suggestions, some of which had not been thought of. I think it best that I obtain for him a full report on the activities and what we intend to do. I will consider the honourable member's suggestions.

Line passed.

Agriculture and Fisheries, \$10 911 000.

Mr. BOUNDY: Regarding "Advisory Board of Agriculture, Annual Congress and Women's Agricultural Bureau Council expenses", the vote and actual payments for last year were almost the same and were both over \$9 000, whereas the proposed allocation this year is \$20 000. Having had experience with at least one of these organisations, and knowing its value to agriculture generally in the State, I have always believed that insufficient funds have been provided for the effective work of these organisations. Can the Minister of Works explain the increased allocation? Does it mean that the work of these advisory bodies is to be increased? As I see no reference to rural youth, will the Minister say whether rural youth comes under this item?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): As I do not have the information from the department, I will obtain it as soon as possible.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information on the Nuriootpa Agricultural Research Centre, particularly on funds to be made available for the vine improvement programme. The Governor's Speech states that the Government intended to enter more intensively into this programme, whereas evidence has come to me since from people connected with the programme which indicates to me that the Government, if anything, is reducing funds for the programme. That concerns people in the Barossa

Valley, where there is an urgent need for vine improvement. A statement was issued that the department intended to provide more resources for this area, yet I received a disturbing report about a week ago to the effect that the Government was spending less in this area. Will the Minister obtain a full report on the programme involved in this extension service so that the people concerned in the vine improvement programme will know exactly where they are going in the next 12 months?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. VANDEPEER: There seems to be a new item involving an allocation of \$59 000 for the Chief Economist and economists. In the past, the department's economists have given advice. Will the Minister ascertain whether there is to be an extension of that service or a new departure in that area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the vote for extension services, under which would come administration of the rural youth organisation. I note that this year's vote of \$310 000 for "Chief Extension Officer," etc., is higher than the vote of \$288 711 for 1975-76, and I hope that the Government intends to increase the number of extension officers. It has concerned the rural youth organisation in South Australia that the Government has allowed it to run down. Will the Minister say why the Government has allowed this to occur and whether it is intended that this vote will result in an influx of extension officers to cater for rural youth?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. BLACKER: I note that \$82 000 was voted for and \$61 962 actually spent on the purchase of boats and engines last financial year, and that \$107 000 is allocated this year. Is this for the purchase of a new vessel for the Fisheries Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although it is intended to purchase a new vessel for the department, I do not know whether this allocation relates to that purchase. I understand that the new vessel, which was formerly a tuna boat, will cost about \$330 000. This purchase was approved by Cabinet in the last two or three weeks.

Mr. BLACKER: I note that the vote of \$253 500 for the item "Chief Fisheries Officer, research, advisory, technical and general staff" is higher than the sum of \$134 894 actually spent last year. Does this involve an upgrading of the department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The only information I have is that this is to pay the salaries of Mr. Olsen and his staff. This allocation previously came under the Fisheries Department and now relates to a branch of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department.

Mr. RODDA: I move:

That the vote be reduced by \$100.

In 1967, the then Labor Government appointed a Select Committee to examine the broad spectrum of the fishing industry and, as a result of that committee's deliberations, legislation was introduced. Things seemed to work well, and in 1973 the Director of the department was promoted sideways, as a result of which disenchantment seemed to arise in the industry. Questions by Opposition

members regarding the appointment of a new Director came to nothing. Unfortunately, this position continued for two years, and last year a Bill was introduced to combine the activities of the fishing industry with those coming under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department. Those in the fishing industry thought that their industry would no longer be a Cinderella industry or a "tail end Charlie" to agriculture. Thereafter, however, much dissatisfaction has occurred in the industry.

It is considered that the agriculture and fishing industries are as different as chalk and cheese, although both are important. When one examines the vote, one sees that of the nearly \$11 000 000 total allocation, the various activities involving fisheries are to receive only about \$483 000. I acknowledge that the salaries of the officers involved in those activities are included in the general salaries vote of \$1 600 000, but the Cinderella role seems to apply to the whole fisheries vote.

We in South Australia have the prawn, lobster and abalone fisheries, and at this stage I do not want to develop an argument about the abalone industry, as a motion regarding it is at present before the House. The Minister of Agriculture has come in for much chiding from agriculture and fishing interests generally. Indeed, the member for Eyre, the shadow Minister, will have something to say about the Minister. It has been stated that the Minister has his own way of doing things and that the opinions of the industry are often disregarded. Unfortunately, the advisory committees relating to the prawn and lobster industries have not been called together for two years, and it has been stated that abalone fishermen have no representative voice at all.

Regarding amateur fishing, we are not saying that the people concerned do not have rights. About 8 000 have licences, but there is a problem between professional fishermen and amateur fishermen. Poaching goes on and, even though only A-class and B-class licence holders can sell their fish, a large amount of black-marketing occurs. This is a matter of grave concern, and obviously the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has insufficient officers to police this part of the fishing industry. It has been pointed out that poaching is also rife in the abalone industry.

All these problems sheet home to the Minister, who holds the commission to run his department and his portfolio. I point out to him the dissatisfaction in the industry concerning these matters. My Party's policy follows the guidelines set down by the 1967 Select Committee, keeping the fishing industry activities, because of their special characteristics, separate from the Agriculture Department.

I refer to the fiasco in the Spencer Gulf last year involving a clash between A-class and B-class licence fishermen. Amateur fishermen were involved, and there was much dissatisfaction. I attended a Whyalla meeting, as did the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart. As a result of that meeting fishermen met with the Minister but obtained no satisfaction whatever. Therefore, my motion seeks to bring to the notice of the Minister, the Government and the Parliament the concern existing throughout this important industry, which is worth about \$20 000 000 a year to the State. Much discussion is centred on the Law of the Sea conference. The great wealth of our fisheries can be utilised, and I ask the Minister urgently to take up this matter with his colleague.

Mr. GUNN: I strongly support the motion. I do not want to delay the Committee, because I know the Deputy Premier is frowning; it is past his bed time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Get on with what you have to say. Don't worry about my bloody welfare; I'll look after that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Eyre will resume his seat. I do not think there is anything in the Bill concerning the Deputy Premier. I hope the honourable member will adhere to the line.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're getting smart.

Mr. GUNN: No-one is getting smart.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Get on with what you've got to say.

Mr. GUNN: I am doing that, and I will do it in my own way. I will not be told by the Minister. Surely that is my right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want the honourable member to adhere to the line, and interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister of Agriculture has displayed an attitude that is certainly not in keeping with the best interests of the agricultural industry in South Australia. If any Minister has deliberately set out to antagonise agriculturists, it has been the current Minister of Agriculture. In the short time he has occupied this important position he has made a number of comments which have not been factual and which have caused much anxiety to producers and their representatives.

Agriculture makes a great contribution to the economy of South Australia and the estimated gross value of primary production, excluding mining, in this State (these figures have been compiled by the Australian Bureau of Statistics) amounts to \$670 000 000 this financial year, last year amounting to \$736 000 000, and nearly \$800 000 000 the previous year. The Agriculture Department had a responsibility to advise and assist this important sector of our economy.

Liberal Party members believe that the welfare of the people of South Australia can be properly served only if our agricultural industries are assisted and encouraged in a proper manner. In the time this Government has been in office it has consistently reduced the percentage of funds that is made available to the Agriculture Department. South Australia spends a smaller percentage of its Revenue Budget on the Agriculture Department than does any other State, including Tasmania. This situation is not good and should be rectified.

South Australia has already wasted about \$15 000 000 on the Monarto project. That sum would have been far more wisely spent if it had been used to build new headquarters for the Agriculture Department. That has not taken place. There are many other matters in which this Government has failed. I refer to some of the comments that have been made by the Minister of Agriculture and instance how he has deliberately attacked South Australian agriculturists. In the *News* of April 6, 1976, a public notice under the heading "In the public interest" stated:

The decision . . . to restore the superphosphate bounty . . . will only restore the old image of farmers as a feather-bedded sector living on Government handouts. That is what the Minister said. The notice continued:

Comment: The recommendation to restore the bounty was made by the Industries Assistance Commission. Ninety per cent of Government assistance to the wool, meat and grain industries (the major consumers of phosphate) is in the form of interest-bearing loans.

The notice goes on to talk about the amount of money the State Government is willing to spend on beef producers. The Minister criticised those producers who were not willing to avail themselves of those funds. He never took the

trouble to ascertain the real reasons for their action. One was the high interest rate, and the other was the many complications involved in obtaining those funds.

Mr. Nankivell: The Government will not change that system.

Mr. GUNN: That is so. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them statistical tables appearing in the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics*.

Leave granted.

Table No. 8  
RURAL LIQUIDITY  
(Million Dollars)

Year (June)	Deposits with Major Trading Banks	Farmers' Holding of Liquid Assets (a)	Short-term Debt Outstanding (b)	Ratio Short-term Debt: Assets	Usage of Overdraft Limits Available (c)
Average 1961-64 .....	712	898	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1965 .....	791	949	728	.77	.79
1966 .....	801	943	825	.87	.80
1967 .....	833	972	921	.95	.80
1968 .....	764	885	1 074	1.21	.83
1969 .....	814	935	1 083	1.16	.81
1970 .....	756	871	1 137	1.31	.84
1971 .....	729	837	1 115	1.33	.85
1972 .....	793	901	1 026	1.14	.82
1973 .....	1 008	1 135	1 018	.90	.73
1974 .....	1 032	1 150	1 132	.98	.79
1975 .....	1 194	1 295	1 091	.84	.79

(a) Includes only deposits with major trading banks and pastoral finance companies and holdings of Australian Government Securities. (b) Includes only major trading bank overdrafts and advances from pastoral finance companies. (c) Overdraft advances outstanding to available limits. na, not available.

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia, *Statistical Bulletin* (various issues).

Table No. 9  
INDICATORS OF AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT

Year	Sales of New Tractors for Agricultural Purposes	Deliveries of Certain Types of New Agricultural Machinery (a)				Estimates of value of Capital Expenditure by Agricultural Producers
		Ploughs (b)	Seeding Drills and Cultivating Drills	Harvesters (Combine Harvesters) (c)	Fertiliser Spreaders (d)	
	'000	'000	'000	'000	'000	\$m
1964-65 .....	18.3	9.4	5.9	4.7	4.6	n.a.
1965-66 .....	16.6	6.1	4.4	3.2	4.2	n.a.
1966-67 .....	17.5	7.4	5.3	4.4	4.6	n.a.
1967-68 .....	15.8	7.3	6.2	3.5	4.5	n.a.
1968-69 .....	16.4	6.4	5.1	4.0	3.8	n.a.
1969-70 .....	12.0	3.5	2.2	1.5	3.5	n.a.
1970-71 .....	10.6	2.9	1.4	0.8	2.7	407.3
1971-72 .....	11.3	2.8	1.9	1.1	3.3	418.3
1972-73 .....	13.9	3.9	2.9	1.3	4.1	596.7
1973-74 .....	14.0	4.2	4.5	2.1	5.4	643.8
1974-75 .....	n.a.	4.2	3.8	2.8	2.6	n.a.

(a) Deliveries represent: (i) implements and machines sent to agents or dealers by importers and manufacturers or by their State distributors; (ii) direct sales to end users by importers, manufacturers or State distributors. (b) Trailing type chisel ploughs: figures are not available for publication from September quarter 1973. (c) Combine harvesters (drawn): figures after March quarter 1974 not always available. (d) Fertiliser spreaders—other than direct drop and up to and including 30 cwt.: types other than tractor mounted not always available after March quarter 1974. n.a., not available.

Sources: ABS, *Rural Land Use, Agricultural Machinery and Labour*, ref. 10.59; ABS, *New Agricultural Machinery Statistics*, ref. 12.1.

Mr. GUNN: On April 6, 1976, an editorial appeared, referring to the unhelpful approach of the Minister, and dealing with the storemen and packers dispute. A report in the *Advertiser* on April 7 called on the Minister to resign, and various other comments were made accusing the Minister of being ill informed; and in a report on April 5, 1976, under the heading "Back union, Minister tells growers", the following report appeared:

Mr. G. E. Andrews described Mr. Chatterton's stand as "infantile".

That was one of the strongest criticisms levelled against any Minister in this State by a grower organisation. I refer to the proposed abattoir legislation that the Minister talked about introducing. It was originally intended to destroy all small country slaughterhouses by increasing costs, thereby denying local producers a legitimate market outlet. Such

action would not be in the interests of the rural community. It would increase costs to local consumers. I could refer at length to the comments of the Stockowners Association, but I will not do so because of the time factor.

Mr. Chapman: Will you tell us how he is handling his function as Minister under the pressure of the fishermen lately?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Eyre has the floor.

Mr. GUNN: I now refer to the fishing section of the Minister's portfolio. Members on this side support the concept of managed fisheries. It is essential for the welfare of the industry that we have a programme of managed fisheries, but it must be administered with common sense and a proper understanding of the industry. The Minister seems not to understand the fishing industry and will not listen to people who do understand it. Many times he has been approached by fishermen and members, he has given undertakings and he has agreed to give further consideration, but nothing has come of those statements.

The member for Alexandra said a few days ago that the Minister said he did not run his department. That was an amazing statement. As regards the prawn industry, regulations have been operating in this State that prohibit prawn fishermen during their operations taking from the sea any fish other than prawns. This matter has reached the ridiculous stage over the past few weeks where one fisherman was prosecuted for taking fish home to eat with his family. The Minister has done nothing about it. This matter has been strongly attacked by Mr. Bob de Longville, representing the Western Waters Prawn Boat Association. In relation to the abalone industry, of which the member for Victoria has spoken at some length—

Mr. Chapman: How is the Minister going under the pressure of the fishermen.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Twice today I have warned the member for Alexandra, and I cannot continue warning him. He should abide by Standing Orders; otherwise action will be taken.

Mr. GUNN: Abalone fishermen have received a raw deal. If there is one section of the industry that has not had a fair go, it is they. Having been involved with discussions with them for a long time, I believe they should be put on a basis comparable with that of fishermen in Tasmania, which has a Labor Government, and the fishermen in Western Australia, which had a Labor Government until about two years ago, where the situation operated in line with what the fishermen want in this State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I notice on the Notice Paper there is a motion before the Chair concerning an Abalone Advisory Committee and also abalone divers. I hope the honourable member will confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. GUNN: In conclusion, there is a general air of despondency among rural producers and people associated with agriculture in this State at the administration of the present Minister. It is obvious that he is not willing to accept advice that he could obtain from experienced and competent officers in his department; he has clearly displayed a lack of confidence in those officers, and it seems the Minister is more interested in allowing those private appointees to his staff to make press statements completely unrelated to the facts. Yesterday, in the press there was a statement referring to the likely increases in the grain production this year now that certain parts of the State had received rain. The figures given were in excess of the greatest amount of grain that had ever been grown in one

year in South Australia. Whoever prepared that statement (it may have been the Minister himself) could not add up a column of figures, because they were complete nonsense.

I had discussions today with a person who had recently retired from that department, and he said, "That is about what you would expect, because that is how the department is now being administered." One could talk about why certain people have been appointed to the department, and I understand that more appointments of that nature will be made to the department soon. Those appointments have done nothing to improve harmony within the department. One could refer to the administration of Samcor and how large amounts were spent without having even written contracts—all evidence that damns the Minister and proves he is not competent to administer the affairs of that department. Members on this side assure the people of South Australia that, after the next election, when there will be a change of Government, common sense will prevail and decisions will be made based on the best interests of the people involved.

Mr. BLACKER: I support this motion, because I believe we have seen a "downgrading" of the Fisheries Department, not in numbers but in effectiveness, and a downgrading of the respect in which the department is held by fishermen. I fear that this lack of respect for the department by the fishermen is of great detriment to the fishermen and the industry. Various aspects of the industry have been referred to—abalone, lobster, prawn and Ministerial permits, abalone permits and Ministerial permits; there is no set policy of what will happen to abalone divers. Nobody really knows what the situation is: in the future of this industry, what will fishermen do with their vessels and equipment? Will they be wiped out at a minute's notice? The lobster industry is facing a situation of too many fishermen in the industry and there is room for improvement in management. Tuna fishermen are too great in number, and purseine fishermen, a new industry that could come into being, is an industry that is floundering for want of some guidance.

I say that because we and the Fisheries Department know that oversea vessels are operating off our shores, and take out many more tonnes of fish than the South Australian fishing industry could ever take out. There is an international market, and fisheries there are being exploited right off our coast, and yet South Australian fisheries expertise cannot capitalise on this. One fisherman said that he did not believe the South Australian fishermen took 10 per cent of the catch taken in South Australian waters. That is a remarkable figure, and it is hard to accept it. Nevertheless, the long-liners, the purseiners and the mother ships of other countries operating in our waters must be studied, and we must examine this new form of fishery.

Much respect for the department has been lost because, basically, there were many ambitious people in the department each trying to fill that vacancy that nobody seemed to want to fill—the Director of Fisheries. Whilst the position is vacant and so many men are vying for it, that is causing friction. About six or eight years ago the South Australian Fisheries Department was regarded with respect by the whole Australian fishing industry, but that is not so today. Without a concerted attempt to collate the efforts of fishermen and the department, the degrading situation will continue. I support what the member for Victoria and the member for Eyre have said on this motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not know whether I should reply to this vote of no confidence in the Government that has been launched by the

shadow Minister of Fisheries, supported by the shadow Minister of Primary Industry, and backed up by the rural rump of the Liberal Party, namely, the Country Party. I do not think that there is anything to answer, and I do not want to go into the points that have been raised. I simply say that the Government believes that the Minister is very intelligent, able—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Unbalanced!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a compliment, coming from the honourable member, because he would be a good judge. The Minister is an able and competent administrator. The Government has every confidence in him, and I have no desire to say more than that.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran (teller), Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Becker and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Jennings.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The motion therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests and Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous, \$445 000.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the provision of \$125 000 for subsidy towards the purchase of equipment by voluntary associations. What associations receive the money and how is it expected to be spent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is a Government contribution to the Bush Fires Equipment Subsidies Fund and is a matching contribution to contributions by insurance companies. The additional funds are to provide for subsidy on expected increased costs of equipment and vehicles at the rate of 50 per cent.

Mr. VENNING: The reasons given by the Minister for the provision of the money probably are well founded, but for agriculture and the "Miscellaneous" side of it the total amount of \$445 000 proposed this year is less than the actual payment last year and, as the amount provided for subsidies to voluntary associations has been increased from \$65 000 to \$125 000, less money is expected to be spent under "Miscellaneous" this year. It indicates to me a lack of concern by this Government toward one of the primary industries of Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member examined the first item, the Dairy Cattle Fund, he would realise that \$88 000 is repaid in that case, that it is not this year, and that is the difference in the fund.

Mr. BOUNDY: I refer to the provision of \$3 000 for the E.F.S. radio survey; what is embodied in that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is provision for the cost of surveys by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to provide effective installations of radio equipment for E.F.S. units.

Line passed.

Environment, \$7 043 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: I refer to a question I asked the Minister earlier in relation to non-returnable bottles, which I believe are being used in South Australia now. In the Minister's reply he said that he was not aware that these bottles were being used. I understand these bottles are under the name of Canada Dry and are being filled by the Passiona Bottling Company. I believe that for the past four weeks the parent company in Melbourne has been sending the product to South Australia through Mount Gambier, and that bottles are being filled in Adelaide at the company's Adelaide plant under this name. If the legislation has not been proclaimed and the bottles have not been prescribed, there is no way that I can see under the legislation that the Minister can take any action.

If this is the case then, obviously, other companies will follow suit. What action will the Minister take? If no action is taken, the value of the legislation, and the amendment we agreed to, will be a complete and utter waste of time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): The Environment Division is responsible for this matter, and I am indebted to the member for telling me that this has happened. I believe that the amending legislation brought down last February intended to stop proliferation of these bottles in South Australia, and I have asked the relevant officer to check on the report of the honourable member. I hope appropriate action will be taken soon. A meeting will be held tomorrow between representatives of the department, the Environment Division, and the Director, and the beverage industry to straighten out some of the points in relation to the new legislation. No doubt this matter will be discussed. The department intends to use the Environment Division to police that legislation.

Mr. EVANS: I estimate that the total expenditure by the Environment Department for motor vehicles is more than \$280 000. I know that that department controls the State Planning, National Parks and Wildlife, the museum, the administrative division of the department, the Botanic Garden, and the Coast Protection Board, but, when Ministers have said that this Government was conscious of the need to reduce expenditure in order to help to control inflation, it amazes me that we are considering this sort of expenditure. The National Parks and Wildlife Division needs vehicles to cover long distances, some of them four-wheel drive vehicles, but its expenditure totals \$181 100. Is this situation being caused by more people needing new vehicles, or are we supplying Government vehicles in lieu of privately owned vehicles for which owners have been paid a kilometre rate?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: We are not replacing privately owned vehicles with departmental vehicles. It is Government policy to change vehicles every two years or after a certain mileage has been covered. It is particularly necessary to change vehicles frequently if they are used by the Coast Protection Board, the National Parks and Wildlife Division, or the Environment Division, because such vehicles are subject to heavy wear and tear. If vehicles used in such circumstances are not changed frequently, a ranger in a remote area could find himself in real trouble if his vehicle broke down. The figures show the total cost of the new vehicles. The proceeds from the sale of existing vehicles go into the Revenue Estimates, so we are not talking about net sums: we are talking about the cost of the new vehicles. The allocation of \$10 100 for purchase of motor vehicles for the Administrative Division relates

to the normal replacement of one vehicle, plus two additional vehicles for use by Deputy Directors and *ad hoc* use by administrative staff. A new Deputy Director has been appointed by the Public Service Board, and he will need a vehicle. Regarding the allocation of \$23 000 for purchase of motor vehicles for the Botanic Garden, I point out that we have five existing vehicles that need replacing, plus an additional vehicle for the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden—a small Suzuki. In the past, vehicles were purchased through board funds but, since the board became a division of the department on January 1 this year, the vehicles are handled through a separate line.

Regarding the allocation of \$8 000 for purchase of motor vehicles for the Coast Protection Board, I point out that the officers of this division are very active. On one occasion the Chief Executive Engineer was in the South-East on one day and on Yorke Peninsula the next day inspecting jetties. The allocation provides for the replacement of two vehicles. Regarding the allocation of \$17 200 for purchase of motor vehicles for the Environment Division, I point out that there has been a considerable increase in the staff of the division because of increased responsibilities associated with environmental impact statements. As a result, we have replaced three vehicles in the normal course of operations. The department was set up only in 1972 and now, after four years, we are coming to the time for the second replacement of the vehicles. Two additional vehicles will cater for the increased staff.

Regarding the allocation of \$181 100 for purchase of motor vehicles for the National Parks and Wildlife Division, I point out that the 1976-77 allocation relates to the replacement of 26 motor vehicles for the division, plus additional vehicles for Kelly Hill Caves, Naracoorte Caves, Wilpena technical assistants, and the regional superintendent in the northern area. I have announced an expansion in the Wilpena area involving appointing three additional staff members, who will need motor vehicles. A considerable fleet is necessary to supervise and manage national parks. We now have 183 parks under the control of the division. The parks range up to 78 000 ha in the Flinders Range and one is still to be dedicated; for example, the Coffin Bay Conservation Park covers 31 700 ha and is in fairly rough country. I am sure the member for Frome and the member for Eyre will appreciate that the wear and tear on the vehicles is considerable.

Mr. WOTTON: Regarding the item "Transfer to Botanic Garden Board", will the allocation of \$190 300 cover what needs to be done, particularly at Mount Lofty, or will extra money be provided by the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Of the additional sum, \$10 000 is allocated for the development of the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden. In addition, money will be spent by the Public Buildings Department during the coming year. I hope the garden will be opened in the spring of next year; I am trying to expedite this project. Much development will take place through the Public Buildings Department. I am using the unemployment relief scheme wherever possible to get on with that job.

Mr. MATHWIN: How many jetties has the Coast Protection Board taken over, and how many more jetties will it take over soon?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think that the figure is 48. I know that the number has been determined. The sum of \$250 000 represents a transfer of money previously used by the Marine and Harbors Department to my department in order to repair these jetties. We are

looking at the means of using this money in the first instance to put these jetties in the best possible shape before local government begins to accept its 20 per cent of the responsibility under the agreement.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister say whether the line "Maintenance of recreational jetties" covers shark-proof enclosures? I understand that the Coast Protection Board is involved to some extent in assisting in the financing of these enclosures.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Additional facilities such as shark-proof enclosures will be let out from capital funds at the department's disposal. This allocation is purely a maintenance allocation, and does not involve capital construction.

Mr. BOUNDY: Is \$250 000 the total vote for the maintenance of jetties for all purposes? Are there any jetties that local government has taken over for which the Coast Protection Board allocates funds to local government for maintenance, or is there another fund that provides funds additional to these for the maintenance of jetties? It seems to me that \$250 000 is a small sum for the kind of maintenance needed on jetties throughout the State.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: On the contrary, I have seen the schedule of work required to be done on these recreational jetties to put all those under my control in top-class order. To keep them in that order for several years would take about two years expenditure at this rate. About \$500 000 should be enough. Barring storm damage, which should be looked at separately, the allocation should be sufficient to put them in good order.

Mr. ARNOLD: Regarding the Administrative Division line, can the Minister explain just how this department operates? The Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Planning are involved. This appears to be the one department, the Environment Department, which, to all intents and purposes, seems to have two Ministers.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McRae): Order! The question, since it comes under this line, should be directed to the honourable Minister for the Environment.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Members will realise that, under the previous Minister for the Environment, the Planning Division was part of his responsibility, so that the two departments to some extent, although the policy control of that department is now properly in the hands of the Minister for Planning, are still situated close together and, in many respects, share the joint services they had under the previous Ministerial structure. For example, a library that contains a large proportion of planning material and environmental matter is a common departmental library. Other functions within the administration are used to service both sections. From the point of view of general administration, they still remain under me, because that is convenient. Policy determination and administrative planning are under the control of my colleague. There are considerable economies in this arrangement. If it becomes desirable in future to move the Planning Division physically away from the Environment Department, it will mean that we will have to duplicate the library. I am trying to ensure that the library remains under my control, because it contains much environmental material.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the \$300 000 allocation to "Transfer to Planning and Development Fund", I assume that this money has been paid into the State Planning Authority at the rate of \$300 each allotment in recent years, and at the rate of \$100 earlier on. As I see the Minister for Planning shaking his head, can he say where



the money for the right to subdivide less than 20 allotments in one parcel is paid into the State Planning Authority, how much is held in that fund at present, and how much has been paid out of the fund? How much money is held in the Planning and Development Fund at present before the \$300 000 is passed over?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I rule that the honourable Minister for the Environment is the Minister responsible for this line and the Minister to whom the question should be directed and by whom the answer should be given.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The responsibility is divided between the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Planning. The State Planning Office and the State Planning Authority come under my responsibility. In addition to that point of order, I point out that the Chair has never previously ruled who should answer questions. There have been occasions frequently, including in this debate, when the responsible Minister has not been in the Chamber, and some other Minister has answered on his behalf. As I am the responsible Minister for these functions, I am the Minister able to give the answer. In addition, any member has the right to get up and speak in the debate. There is no way in which the Chair can refuse me the right to get up and say something.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I thank the honourable Minister for Planning for the information that he has supplied. In view of that, I do not think I need to rule on the point of order that he has taken. I simply indicate that I accept that he may answer the question that has been asked.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member refers to pages 116 and 117 of the Auditor-General's Report, he will see details of the Planning and Development Fund and whence the fund's receipts come. The balance of the fund at June 30, 1976, was \$2 105 195. During the year there were receipts in the form of loans from the State Treasury and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Board. There was also a contribution last year of \$300 000 from Consolidated Revenue, a contribution that is being repeated again this year. Contributions from landowners for reserves totalled \$1 179 910, which, quite correctly, is paid into the fund as a consequence of the Planning and Development Act, without having to be handled administratively through the Budget. So, the contributions made by landowners do not come into the Budget at all.

Mr. GUNN: I refer to the allocation for the State Planning Authority. I am not sure to which Minister I should refer this question, although it is probably the Minister for Planning.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question should be directed first to the honourable Minister for the Environment and, in the event that he chooses not to answer the question and the honourable Minister for Planning indicates to me that he is able to do so, he will be the Minister to answer it.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you for your guidance. It certainly highlights that a degree of chaos seems to exist at present, since two Ministers seem to be involved with the department. In saying that, I am complaining not about the department but about the Government. Regarding the State Planning Authority, the Minister's predecessor (Hon. G. R. Broomhill), when he was Minister, gave an undertaking to the Stockowners Association of South Australia that rural landholders would be given representation on the State Planning

Authority. Having had discussions with that organisation and other people, and having examined correspondence that passed between the Minister and that organisation, I then asked a Question on Notice, the answer to which was obviously prepared by the Minister's department and which was contrary to the undertaking that the former Minister had given.

I now ask the Minister whether the Government is willing to honour the undertaking given to this organisation to put rural producers on the State Planning Authority. We have always seemed to get the answer from the Government over the last few months that these people already have one representative, Mr. Willsden, on the authority. However, that is not strictly correct. Although he has certainly improved the State Planning Authority, he is only one person. The decisions taken by the State Planning Authority greatly affect landholders in this State. One could go on forever talking about its decisions, how illogical they are, and how they are made without a proper consideration or a real knowledge of the problems that will flow therefrom. I hope the Minister is able to agree to the suggestions that have been made, especially if he wants the State Planning Authority to carry out its functions in a responsible manner and to have the confidence of people in rural areas, who are perturbed at the wide-ranging powers that that organisation has, and if he wants to prevent any future misunderstanding that might be created.

Local government is concerned about this department. I have been told that other Government departments are sick and tired of its attitude and of how they are being completely overruled by the department. This is a deplorable situation, which clearly indicates that the structuring of the State Planning Authority ought to be altered. I should appreciate the Minister's giving his comments on that proposal.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not aware of any undertaking that was given by the former Minister on this matter. If the honourable member has a specific reference to that undertaking, I should be interested to see it. Since I have been Minister in this area, I have had discussions with representatives of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, the Stockowners Association and other people interested in rural affairs. The issue was discussed with those representatives. It was pointed out that, if the State Planning Authority became a representative authority, the extent of membership would become large indeed, and we would have many people representing a special interest but concerned to listen to all the material relating to anything that had to come before the authority.

It seemed to me that this was not an appropriate way in which to proceed. I suggested to them that a more effective way in which to proceed in this area that would give them an effective voice would be to establish a primary producers' advisory committee. The State Planning Authority is able to establish committees. It has, for example an Extractive Industries Committee, which has operated effectively in relation to extractive industries for a long time. Agreement has now been reached with the State Planning Authority, and nominations have been received from a number of primary-producing organisations, certainly the Stockowners Association, United Farmers and Graziers, the dairymen's association, and the winegrowers' association. I will need to check the full details for the honourable member.

This primary producers' advisory committee will be a committee of the authority and will have all matters concerning rural affairs referred to it for recommendation. The committee system is a means of avoiding continually

expanding the size of the authority and making it quite unwieldy and not an effective operating body. After discussions with them, the various primary producer organisations have agreed to proceed on this basis and have made nominations. I hope that the primary producers' advisory committee or the rural affairs committee (I am not sure what it will be called) will be appointed soon.

Mr. BOUNDY: I refer to the provision for national parks and wildlife. The Minister for the Environment will recall that in an earlier debate he said that the fencing of national parks would be undertaken, and that attention would be paid to additional water points, windmills, and so on. I presume that this is the line under which those matters would come. Is this work to be done on a day-labour basis by National Parks and Wildlife Division staff, or is it to be let out on contract? Indeed, can the work be offered on contract to adjoining land-holders to whom, if they are suffering financial stringency, a contract job of this nature may be of considerable assistance?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: First, fences are not dealt with in the Budget, as they have already been dealt with in the Loan Estimates. About \$91 000 has been allocated this year. I was on the West Coast only last week, and the ranger told me that in one area some fencing is to be done. He intends to get the local council to do that work. Failing that, a service club such as Apex might be willing to do it, and that has happened in that area. At the opening of the Eyre Highway, I met a deputation from United Farmers and Graziers and discussed the possibility of realigning the dog-proof fence using the services of people temporarily unemployed. There is no firm policy on this. The ranger at Streaky Bay is responsible for an area probably larger than the District of Eyre, and obviously he calls in outside labour to carry out fencing jobs and the like. It is intended to let contracts to local authorities or service clubs if they can do the work.

Mr. VENNING: Regarding the item "Transfer to Coast Protection Fund", I seek information about the activities of the Coast Protection Board in the Port Broughton area.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I cannot tell the honourable member what the position is at Port Broughton, but I will find out what is being done and let him know. In the year I have been Minister, it has been my impression that any worthwhile project advanced by a council has received serious consideration by the board, and in most cases help has been given. If application has been made by the Port Broughton council, I am sure that the board has given help or is considering the matter, although difficulties might arise if the local authority is required to make a contribution.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am concerned about the provision of shark nets on metropolitan beaches. The Minister recently said that a council could approach the board to pay a percentage of the cost of such facility, but I believe that the board would contribute only about one-third of the cost of such a facility. This is a ridiculously small contribution when the Environment Department is responsible for all the costs involving national parks, etc. Our beaches can be regarded as a national park; they are used by the local community and visitors, and it is unfair that local ratepayers must bear the brunt of providing such facilities costing between \$100 000 and \$130 000. It is grossly unfair that the board should contribute only one-third of the cost of such projects. What is the policy on this matter? What percentage of the cost is it intended the board should contribute, especially when local beaches should be under the full responsibility of the

board, which has taken over control of areas within nearly 300 metres of the beach? The board can dictate regulations but it reneges on its responsibilities in regard to paying bills.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I never cease to be amazed by the member for Glenelg. With his local government knowledge, one would think he would be the last one to suggest that local government should abrogate its responsibilities in this area. The board makes payments and subsidies in accordance with the legislation. Contributions of up to 80 per cent of the total cost are made by the board. It is easy to complain about the niggardliness of the board, suggesting that it pays only one-third of the cost, but the honourable member has not given one example. I have signed approvals, and a common contribution by the board is about 75 per cent of the total cost.

Mr. Mathwin: What about shark nets? How much did you pay in Port Lincoln?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I do not have the exact details concerning Port Lincoln, but I will find out for the honourable member. It is grossly misrepresenting the position to suggest that the board is providing only a minority of the cost of most of the works carried out on the coast. I assure the honourable member that that is not so, that the subsidies are very generous and that, generally speaking, local government much appreciates the contribution the State is making towards facilities that are of value not only to local and overseas visitors but also to the local ratepayers, who are also protected by the operations of the Coast Protection Board, and who can enjoy the facilities, which are closer to them than to any other people in the State. I reject the suggestion that the Coast Protection Board imposes an unwarranted burden on local government. If local government wants to do something to boost the attractiveness of its area, it can submit a proposition to the Coast Protection Board. In my experience, it has always been given a very good go by that board.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister has deliberately refused to answer the question I asked him. He deliberately kicked the whole thing around until he lost it. I did not criticise the Coast Protection Board, and he knows it, on the amount of assistance it is giving for beach protection. I well know that it pays up to 80 per cent of the cost. My question, in case the Minister did not hear it, was: what contribution would the board offer to pay to local government to protect the swimmers on the beaches, in the metropolitan area in particular, who derive from all parts of the State and are not just local ratepayers? I know that local ratepayers go swimming on the beaches but, placing this in perspective with national parks and the like, surely the Minister would agree that the area of the foreshore and the beaches could be considered to be a national park. Considering the amount of money that the Minister's department ploughs into national parks, surely he is not serious in suggesting that it would suffice for him to allow a council, with its meagre ability to collect rates from the ratepayers (perhaps subsidised by dog licences and a few other smaller items to get its revenue) to provide two-thirds of the cost of one of these costly protection areas.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The member for Glenelg has made great play of the fact that beaches may be regarded as national parks or reserves. They are also fairly lucrative commercial areas. I do not see that he has any justification for saying that the foreshore at Brighton or Glenelg, for instance, is exactly the same as a national park in the territory of the member for Eyre. As to the contributions that the Coast Protection Board will make, the maximum

percentage of the cost is laid down by the Act. I cannot say what will be an automatic contribution by the Coast Protection Board—every proposal must be dealt with on its merits. To some extent, the finances of the local government body must be considered. If we assume there is a certain metropolitan local government area that is relatively wealthy, it may well come to light with a plan which is quite grandiose, and it would be ridiculous to expect that the Coast Protection Board would find automatically a certain percentage of the cost of that project. However, there may be a struggling council in the country which will be much more modest in its requirements and will come to light with a simpler system, and also it will have a lower rate revenue. All I can say is that, if the honourable member wants to know what the contribution is in respect of any swimming enclosure, I will be glad to get the information for him, but to repeat his suggestion that two-thirds of the cost must be found by the local governing body is nonsense, because most of the cost of these things is found by the Coast Protection Board.

As to how much is found in any particular case is a matter for negotiation between the council and the Coast Protection Board. In my experience, local government has been grateful for the assistance it has been getting and is satisfied with the deal it gets from the Coast Protection Board.

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the department or the Coast Protection Board undertaken any studies as to the most effective provision for safe swimming? Off the Queensland coast there is considerable shark-meshing rather than enclosures, which are somewhat unsightly arrangements. I have been out with some of the contractors working on Government shark-meshing contracts off the Gold Coast and have watched the operations, which seem to be effective and act as a reasonable deterrent in keeping sharks away from the swimming beaches. What research has taken place in South Australia into the most effective means of controlling this problem?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I could not be specific about what research has been carried out by the Coast Protection Board. The whole staff of the board consists of nine persons, including the typistes, and the board has about 4 000 kilometres of the State's coastline to look after. I do not think it has too much time to go in for research; it is flat out dealing with applications from councils. Some research has obviously been carried out into forms of coast protection, in the sense of protecting the coastline against the ravages of the sea, but what has been done in the area of providing shark-proof swimming pools I do not know. To the extent that they have assisted in such enclosures, they have developed some expertise, but there is not enough manpower in a division of that size to have a separate research staff to look into the best way of providing shark-proof enclosures. It is for the local government body to come up with a proposition, and in some cases the Coast Protection Board has engaged outside consultants to provide a scheme, as it has done at Wallaroo; but there is just no spare capacity in that division or in my department to be able to set up research teams to look into the matter.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister for Planning stated that he was not aware of the correspondence regarding the composition of the State Planning Authority, and he ought to check the records. He has said that he is about to establish advisory committees, but his point about it not being practical to give landholders representation on the authority

does not hold water. Many other organisations have been given representation, and the people (the landholders) most affected by the authority are denied it. I have had correspondence with Mr. Edwards, who for some time was Assistant Secretary of the Stockowners Association and who was responsible for matters relating to the State Planning Authority. The people on the authority really do not make decisions through the eyes of the rural producers, and I appeal to the Minister to review his decision, in view of the undertakings previously given.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): It is for the honourable member to verify whether such undertakings were given. I do not recall them. The State Planning Authority must cover a wide diversity of subjects and it is not possible to create an authority that gets bigger and bigger because everyone must be represented. By and large, apart from Government appointments, no-one other than the Chamber of Commerce and Industry makes a direct nomination for appointment to the authority. The basic planning process of publishing a draft plan and considering objections from people is a fundamental part of any planning process. Inevitably, any area will have local interests that must be satisfied as regards the development plan for the area, and State-wide interests also must be satisfied. If those interests conflict, a compromise must be achieved, and a planning process is designed to achieve that.

Perhaps the authority needs to give more publicity to the draft plan when it is first exhibited so that there will be less misunderstanding. The Riverland case has resulted in amendments to the plan, and I understand that they are broadly satisfactory to people in the Riverland. The mayors of Waikerie and Renmark have expressed satisfaction with the co-operation that has been achieved between local government and the authority. It would be wrong to judge only in relation to local reaction to a draft development plan, when initially there may not have been effective communication and there may have been a lack of understanding.

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask the Minister whether any assistance given to councils for shark protection nets along the beaches will be determined on the rate revenue of the councils concerned. When the Minister said that councils on the foreshore derived benefit, surely he was not trying to say that the councils received extra revenue from such things as the kiosks along the beaches. The rents charged for kiosks are reasonable and councils regard those places as facilities to be provided at a reasonable rate. I point out that I did not criticise the Coast Protection Board. It has been co-operative and reasonable in the way it has carried out the work and in the charge made to councils. The determination of any assistance to any council for the provision of shark nets on beaches would be determined by the rate revenue of that council. I asked a question of the Minister that I thought he would make some attempt to answer: he is obviously stalling.

[Midnight]

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member resume his seat? Under Standing Orders it is the prerogative of the Minister whether he answers a question or not.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Rate revenue as such is not the determinate of the share councils have to pay for these projects. It depends on the need, the worthwhileness, the general design, and overall cost. There is not unlimited

money in the Coast Protection Fund, and the board must take a responsible attitude about what it allocates in a specific area. Section 32 (1) of the Act provides:

Where a council proposes to carry out works for the protection, restoration or development of any part of the coast and seeks a grant from the board under this section, it shall apply to the board for its approval of the proposed works.

Mr. Mathwin: I remember putting that amendment in myself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Subsection (3) also provides:

The amount of the grant shall be determined by the board subject to the following provisions:

And, as amended last year, it provides that in any other case except storm repairs the grant may cover up to four-fifths of the costs to be incurred by the council.

That is the limit of the contribution the board can make under the legislation, but in many cases it pays four-fifths of the cost. At Wallaroo it paid 80 per cent of the cost, because it thought the project was worth while and the design reasonable. There is no way I can get a guaranteed 80 per cent of any project to be met by the board. The board does not consider fees from beach kiosks when determining what the council's contribution will be.

Mr. MATHWIN: What do the consultants fees of \$42 000 entail? Is that the consultant fees for the Morphettville bus depot, or for the new North-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will obtain a report for the honourable member of any moneys spent on consultant studies on the Morphettville bus depot.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was only part of the question I asked the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Standing Order 156 provides:

If the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall have twice warned any member then speaking that his speech is irrelevant to the question being discussed, or that he is guilty of undue repetition . . .

I want the honourable member to ensure that from now on he does not indulge in irrelevancies.

Mr. MATHWIN: I asked the Minister whether the \$42 000 was in part for the bus depot. I know the bus depot cost \$14 000. I wanted to know whether that \$14 000 was included in the \$42 000, and what the other part of the \$42 000 was to be set aside for.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I gave the honourable member an undertaking that I would obtain a report on whatever he requested. When I read *Hansard* I will be pleased to give him a full report. He is now referring to the balance of the \$42 000, which appears in the right-hand column of this document: that column is headed "Proposed". That is the allocation for this present year, and is not money that has been spent but money that the Environment Department can use to call in consultants for whatever project it thinks appropriate.

Mr. MATHWIN: Last year payment to consultants to the State Planning Office for services was \$27 500: this year the allocation is \$70 000. Has the Minister information on that item?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Salaries and wages for the executive engineer and other staff of the Coast Protection Board last year was \$102 020. This year the proposed allocation

is \$111 707. Does that additional cost involve an extra officer or officers?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: That estimate includes provision for all existing staff plus half a year's salary for a Senior Planning Officer.

Mr. BECKER: My question relates to the sandbar that has formed off the Patawalonga mouth. In the past 12 months the Coast Protection Board has authorised the erection of a new groyne, known as the northern groyne. Complaints are now being made that the sandbar is still there, and some boats cannot run into the entrance to the Patawalonga because of the positioning of the northern groyne. How can we satisfy these people, and how can we get rid of the sandbar? Have the engineers had an opportunity, since the establishment of the northern groyne, to study further the area to ascertain whether the project has been effective? Will the sandbar eventually be eliminated?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from the engineers on the efficacy of the recent works, which cost a large sum.

Mr. MATHWIN: What is the reason for the reduced allocation to the Coast Protection Fund?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The allocation was reduced because of the Government's desire not to over-budget. A considerable credit balance of \$815 000 was in the fund at June 30. It was considered that the allocation plus the borrowing powers would meet the requirements. I assure the honourable member that, in the event of an unforeseen disaster, the Government would consider providing extra money.

Mr. VENNING: At Port Pirie a jetty has been built over the Solomontown beach to an area of reclaimed swamp. The new electoral boundaries protrude into this area and, unfortunately, the member representing the area is not able to ask a question. Can the Minister say whether there is provision for developing that part of Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Money for works to be carried out at Port Pirie will come from the general Coast Protection Fund. I will get a report for the honourable member on the cost of any such works.

Line passed.

Minister for the Environment, Miscellaneous, \$24 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister obtain a report on the type of environment offences that were committed, and were any people charged with such offences?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The actual payment of \$1 000 was for rewards to boys who reported to police the operations of some juvenile girls who were setting fire to parts of the Belair National Park. Cabinet approved the granting of rewards for information leading to the conviction of people responsible for those deplorable firebug attacks. I think three girls were charged as a result.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say whether any tree planting has been undertaken along the foreshores?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's question relates to the actual payments in 1975-76 of \$7 680, but the honourable member may ask questions only about the provision of \$10 000 for 1976-77.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Government intend to use this allocation to implement a tree-planting programme throughout the State generally, or is most of the allocation for national parks? Will any part of the allocation be spent on tree planting along the coast?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The tree-planting programme covers the distribution of trees and shrubs to schools; some are in coastal areas, and some are not. In addition, trees are distributed to the general public. Next Friday morning some trees will be planted in Gilbertson Gully at Seacliff Park.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. ALLEN: My question relates to the payment of rewards for information in respect of environment offences. Is there a set scale of rewards or does someone determine the amount from time to time?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Last year, when the fire-bug outbreak was at its worst Cabinet agreed to make available a \$1 000 reward for information leading to the conviction of people who lit fires in national parks. The \$750 allocation for this year is a token sum to ensure that we are still willing to pay rewards.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$9 208 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Marine say whether additional staff will be employed when the new container terminal is operating?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say how many additional staff will be appointed, if additional staff is to be appointed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister explain the \$10 700 allocation for the maintenance of Meyer Recreation Ground?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The oval near Glanville is used considerably not only by the department but also by many sporting bodies. It belongs to the department and was named after Carl Meyer, a former Chairman of the Harbors Board.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister any information on the item "Materials, services, machinery hire, general expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance of ports", for which \$2 174 456 has been allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It provides for an increased maintenance programme, taking some account of the inflationary trend. If there is any specific information the honourable member wants, I will obtain it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not for salaries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say how many additional staff have had to be appointed, and what response there has been to people obtaining boating licences and registration permits?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member, because it is interesting to note that so many boats have been registered. I thought that there were not the number of pleasure craft in South Australia that evidently there were. I think that more than 25 000 pleasure craft have been registered. We have already licensed between 25 000 and 26 000 operators, whereas we expect that a total of about 60 000 people will require licences.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Many more than you thought when the Bill was introduced?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I recall Mr. White contacting me and saying, "We have reached this number, which I did not think we would reach." There are many more licensed operators than there are registered craft. Although only about 25 000 have applied, we expect that there will be a sudden influx as the weather improves and as people start to take up this form of recreation. We have increased the number of inspectors from two to eight, and these are involved in checking licences and registrations. I think there has been an increase of two or three in the administrative staff. I have tried to keep expansion in this area to a minimum, because licences are a once-a-time thing, and once registration is in train it will not impose a great burden on the department.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Regarding the \$5 000 allocation for oversea visits of officers, can the Minister say who is going overseas and for what purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The provision is for a departmental officer to attend the conference of the International Association of Ports and Harbors to be held in Houston, Texas, in April, 1977. Although I do not know the name of the officer concerned, I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the bulk-handling facilities at Port Lincoln, a \$11 000 000 project. Can the Minister say what sum will need to be spent to complete the facilities and when he expects them to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that the facilities will be completed towards the end of this year. I hope that it will be operating by the end of the year. A minor structural failure has been experienced. Although we have had consultants working on it, there has been a difference of opinion regarding how to solve the problem, which is not serious. It is a box girder type of construction, which has caused problems elsewhere in the past. As far as I know, this problem has been solved. The department and I are concerned not so much about the completion of the facility and its mechanical aspects but about its operational side.

In the last day or two I received a letter (and I have discussed this matter with the member for Flinders) from the Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation at Port Lincoln, Mr. Max Glenn, concerning conditions that that union requires the department to meet before the actual operation of the new plant. I do not think those problems are insoluble, and I hope that the facility will be operating towards the latter part of the year.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I should like to ask a general question about the staffing of the department. My question relates to the somewhat changed circumstances in the port at Port Adelaide. I am not critical of this, as it is natural that changes should occur; fewer passenger ships are coming to Port Adelaide because of the move to air transport in the passenger field. Also, in looking at the freight tonnages coming into and going out of Port Adelaide, I note that they increased during the late 1974 and early 1975 export boom, after a 25 per cent reduction in tariffs. I gather, from looking at the figures, that this seems to be levelling out. I get the impression from the combined figures that the number of ships coming into Port Adelaide has been greatly reduced. What is the Government's overall policy? Is there a change of emphasis for the staff involved? Also, I understand that some of the facilities, particularly some of the wharves on the west bank, are in urgent need of upgrading. Will the Minister outline the department's policy regarding the direction it intends to follow?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The most important change in the department that has taken place recently is that a far greater emphasis will be placed on the commercial aspect of its operations.

Mr. Dean Brown: What do you mean by "commercial"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will develop that matter for the honourable member. In view of the almost completed container terminal, it is my view (a view which the Director shares) that we must place far greater emphasis on the commercial aspect than has been placed on it in the past. In other words, we cannot wait for shipping to come to us; we must get out and sell the facility. In order to do this, the Public Service Board, after some negotiations, has agreed to advertise the position of a commercial manager, who will be responsible for heading a branch in the department that will be solely responsible for the commercial use and promotion of the port.

This does not apply just to the container terminal; many other facilities at the port, such as roll-on roll-off facilities, can be used. I hope that, as a result of this and of the contacts made by the Director with shipping interests, exporters, importers, and so on throughout the length and breadth of Australia, we will be able to broaden our contacts, thereby promoting the use of the port. This will involve a concerted effort on the part of the department, or the Director, for the first time to orient and place emphasis on promotion of the commercial aspects of the department. After all, it is a commercial activity.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you go out and look for business?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certainly. As the member for Torrens will realise, shipping interests are normally based overseas. Decisions regarding shipping are not made in this country; we must go abroad to get those decisions made. I ascertained this particularly in the negotiations I have had with people who will be involved in the operation of the container terminal. The Government intends to develop this aspect as much as possible in order to ensure that the facility, which is an expensive one (as are all port facilities), is used fully. I think the first of a series of meetings is to be held tomorrow to establish how we should go about this and what part the new commercial manager or agent will play in the development of this new emphasis.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the company that is responsible for leasing the new terminal also responsible for marketing? From what the Minister said, I understood that the new marketing manager would be responsible for general marketing. I wonder to what extent the people who lease this property have an inherent interest in ensuring that as much shipping as possible comes to Port Adelaide, or whether, because of the type of leasing arrangement involved, the leasing conditions will not be affected by the number of ships coming to the port.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The container crane will be a common-user crane, as will the berth. It is naturally in the interests of those operating the terminal for them to get as much business as possible. They have shipping interests, and that is the important thing about getting people who have such interests to operate the scheme rather than the Government's trying to do so. They will naturally do their best to attract business to the project. However, the commercial manager will act in addition to that type of activity. We will be doing our best to attract any trade, no matter where it comes from, to this area. We will not have a special regard for the people who lease the terminal. However, they may

receive some benefit as a result of our activities, but those activities will also benefit the facility generally.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the line "Director". Since this line was discussed last year, the then Director, Mr. Sainsbury, has retired. I take this opportunity of paying a compliment to him for the work he did. South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, which had much to do with the setting up of terminals throughout the State, greatly respected that Government officer. Although his recommendations were not always agreed to by the company, Mr. Sainsbury's thinking was always sound.

Dr. EASTICK: I understand that decisions in relation to the container terminal have been delayed. I refer to difficulties in inspecting goods to be exported, and the double-handling associated with inspection and transportation. In some instances arrangement has been reached with Commonwealth authorities for certain inspections to be undertaken by State officers. Are such aspects prominent in planning the terminal? Competitive prices are important, and double-handling increases the cost of export commodities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a considered reply for the honourable member. It is better that I confer with my departmental officers to find out what services will be provided. Although I am not aware of any discussions that have taken place on this matter, I will find out for the honourable member and let him know.

Line passed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$15 000—passed.

Transport, \$6 876 000.

Mr. RUSSACK: As the item "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries" is about 30 per cent less than was allocated last year, can the Minister say whether the reduction was due to streamlining of administration or to a reduction in purchases?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Log books were provided in the last financial year and, as that was a first-off operation, it caused unusually high expenditure.

Mr. GUNN: I refer to the item "Director-General of Transport". I commend those responsible for the organisation of the opening of the Eyre Highway last week. This significant occasion was a most important event in the history of this State but was marred when the Minister of Transport, in opening the highway, said that Western Australia was noted for "Sin, sand, sore eyes, sawdust, and Sir Charles Court". That statement was an insult to the people of Western Australia, and I took strong exception to it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keneally): Order! The honourable member cannot continue in that vein unless he can link up his remarks with one of the items.

Mr. GUNN: I will raise the matter at a more appropriate time.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the item "Compulsory blood tests—Private doctors' fees at country Government hospitals". This matter has been aired in this Chamber and in another place, and I regret the emphasis that was placed on it in another place. Certain aspects take time to resolve, and I have correspondence relating to this matter dating back to May, 1974. A doctor in my area contacted me and I wrote to the Minister who promptly replied in a letter dated July 19, 1974, as follows:

I refer to your letter of May 30, 1974, with which you enclosed a copy of correspondence you have received from Dr. W. F. Seith, concerning blood alcohol tests under the Road Traffic Act in the Kadina/Moonta/Wallaroo area. I am in agreement that there are inconsistencies in this regard.

The list of those hospitals which are designated under the Act for the purposes of compulsory blood tests, was recommended by the *ad hoc* committee—alcohol in relation to road traffic accidents. However, at the time of determining its list, the committee stated that this particular aspect should be reviewed in the light of experience gained after the blood test provisions of the Act had been in operation for a reasonable time. I am now of the opinion that the time is right for the list of designated hospitals to be reviewed. I have therefore called the members of the committee together with a view to reporting to me in due course on this matter. I am confident that the committee will provide a satisfactory solution to this problem.

I then wrote again to the Minister on January 7, 1975, after being contacted by the transport officer of the local St. John Ambulance, who at that time was a senior member of the board of Kadina Hospital. Again, I received a prompt answer from the Minister, in a letter dated January 17, 1975, in which the Minister said:

I refer to your letter dated January 7, 1975, regarding the compulsory blood alcohol testing of drivers in terms of the Road Traffic Act and requesting that the Kadina Community Hospital become an approved hospital for taking of these tests. In reply, I advise that the *ad hoc* committee, which was reconvened to report to me on their observation on the first year of operation of the legislation and to make any suggestions that they may have on the future operation of this legislation, has not submitted a report to me to date. However, I do know that the Chairman of the committee is at present collating information which includes the extension of approved hospitals. I anticipate that the report will be submitted to me shortly, and as soon as I have received it and studied it I will communicate with you again. In the meantime, I have forwarded a copy of your letter to the Chairman of the committee.

To my knowledge, I have received no further information from the Minister. Has the committee made any recommendation of further appointments of people in designated hospitals in country areas who will carry out blood tests after road accidents? This is important. The letter from the doctor stated that in the Kadina area there was a unique situation where perhaps, from one accident, victims could be sent to three different hospitals, but only those who went to Wallaroo Hospital would have to go through a blood alcohol test. Has there been any recommendation from the committee, and will more hospitals in the country be designated for this purpose?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There has been a review; I cannot provide the honourable member with the details off the cuff but I will certainly get them for him.

Mr. RUSSACK: For "Contribution towards transport research projects", \$100 000 is proposed. Last year, of \$100 000 voted \$99 900 was spent. Will the Minister provide information concerning the research projects covered by this money? The Auditor-General's Report contains a comprehensive list of studies that are being carried out. Could the Minister give me some information on the central city underground link research and say what specific research projects are funded by this \$100 000?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Many projects are current at the moment, some coming under Revenue and some under Loan. I think probably the information the honourable member seeks can be best provided by my giving him a comprehensive list of those projects currently being undertaken and perhaps I can show whether they are Loan or Revenue projects; it does not matter very much. I think the honourable member is simply seeking to know what the projects are. I can provide him with that information.

Mr. RUSSACK: I thank the Minister. Apart from those projects that are being looked into, has the Minister any information about any results that are available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That can be included in the report for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer now to the line "Additions to road safety centre". Are these addition to the road safety centre at Oaklands or to the one at Elizabeth? The amount proposed is \$18 000. What is the nature of the additions and at which centre are they being carried out?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information on the line "Over-sea visits of Minister". I see there is a proposed allocation of \$12 000. I am not criticising any visit the Minister may make, but what kind of visit is the Minister expecting to make? Is he expecting to go to America, Canada, or the United Kingdom? When he gets there, will he appreciate that in those countries freeways are being built which provide a by-pass for traffic around towns so that it does not choke the cities with heavy transports, a position we now have in Adelaide? Surely it would be of advantage to the State if the Minister on his next visit overseas looked at freeways in advanced countries and noted their advantages.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No decision has yet been made about my next visit.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The lines I am about to refer to are 00 10 and line 25 01, which deal with the Government Motor Garage. The matter concerns a decision of the taxi board, and I mention it under both these lines because the Government Motor Garage has been involved in the inspection of the lights on taxis. A constituent has raised the matter of the installation of a light on top of a taxi, and I have taken this matter up with the board.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: To which item is the honourable member referring?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It comes under item 25 01, because the Government Motor Garage has been involved in the inspection, and it comes under item 00 15 or item 00 10, because the Minister is involved in the administration of this to the extent that he has an appointee on the board.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board is a self-sufficient organisation, not included in the Budget.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The inspection of the light with which this person is concerned has been carried out at the Government Motor Garage, and the board has laid down instructions for the type of light and the fitting of it. There is obviously dissatisfaction among taxi drivers as to how the light is fitted on the vehicle.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order. This has nothing to do with the Government Motor Garage. It is a matter between the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board and the operators. The board has its own inspection authority and has laid down that the lights to which the honourable member has referred should be fitted. The matter is germane to the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board but the Government Motor Garage has no association with the matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. If the honourable member gets the call, he will not be able to pursue that issue.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I take a point of order. This person went to the Government Motor Garage for the inspection. Representatives of the board and of the Government Motor Garage were present for the inspection.



The matter has been going on for some time and the person concerned has told me the dates on which he has been there.

Mr. RUSSACK: Successful publicity campaigns have been conducted concerning road safety, and I ask whether, in the allocation of \$165 000 for projects, displays, campaigns and publicity for road safety, any special campaign is contemplated for the Christmas period and, if it is, what type of campaign it will be.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Safety Council, as part of its normal operation, conducts campaigns at Christmas and Easter, as well as in other potentially explosive situations. That is provided for here. I cannot give the details, but that campaign will be launched and I am sure the honourable member will be pleased with it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the provision for additions to the Road Safety Centre. Is that the centre at Marion and, if it is, is it to be named the Geoffrey Thomas Virgo Safety Centre?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the existing centre, the Marion centre, on Oaklands Road. An amount of \$18 000 is provided for extensions to the new centres and an addition to the storage shed. The policy of this Government, notwithstanding the merits of the case, is that it is undesirable that members currently serving ought to be honoured in the way the honourable member has suggested.

Mr. RUSSACK: There is an increase in the amount provided for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Road Safety Council of South Australia. Is this for vehicles to be used at the Road Safety Centre and will the vehicles be replacement vehicles or additional vehicles?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are replacement and additional vehicles.

Mr. RUSSACK: How many new vehicles will there be?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get that information.

Mr. MATHWIN: Last year \$1 010 168 was spent on operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries for the Motor Registration Division, and an amount of \$1 302 700 is provided this year. Is this provision for decentralising operations throughout South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is brought about mainly by the increased postage costs as a result of the present Federal Government's policy. That is mainly the reason for it.

Mr. RUSSACK: It was not the present Federal Government that increased postal charges. Is this decentralisation proving successful? Can the Minister say whether the establishment of these offices is proving to be an advantage?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a great demand for an office to be established in the honourable member's district. These offices are successful, they are desired by country areas, and one will be established in the honourable member's district, if he still represents the area of Kadina after the next election.

Line passed.

Highways, \$15 249 000.

Mr. GUNN: I raise the matter of expenses in connection with official openings. The official opening of the Eyre Highway was an event that attracted attention from all over Australia. The official opening, at which the Western Australian Minister was most complimentary about the people of South Australia and passed on his good wishes to the Government, the people and the Premier, was spoilt by the South Australian Minister when he deliberately set out

to insult the people of Western Australia and the Western Australian Minister in an uncalled for and what could only be described as a larrikan outburst. I believe the Minister ought to apologise publicly to the people of Western Australia for the manner in which he described them. In his prepared speech he referred to Western Australia as a State of "sin, sand, sawdust, sore eyes and Sir Charles Court". He went on to describe South Australia as a State noted for its "drinking, dining, dancing and Don Dunstan".

Mr. Harrison: What's wrong with that?

Mr. GUNN: There is plenty wrong with Don Dunstan. If the people of this State had a Premier as capable and as popular as Sir Charles Court they would be better off. On an occasion such as this it is in poor taste that the people of Western Australia should have to suffer such an uncalled for outburst, and many people present commented unfavourably about the remarks made by the South Australian Minister. The Western Australian Minister was not particularly pleased about the comments, and many people in South Australia informed the Minister that they wished to be dissociated from his comments. I believe the Minister ought to apologise publicly to the people of Western Australia.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer also to expenses in connection with official openings. Last year \$2 000 was allocated and only \$18 spent, \$12 000 being proposed this year. Will there be other official openings involving the Highways Department in the coming year? I take this opportunity to express appreciation, as the only Opposition member who had the privilege of travelling all the way to the opening of the Eyre Highway, at the invitation of the Government. It was a pleasant occasion, the arrangements were well carried out, and I appreciated being able to participate in that historic occasion. There was evidence on that day of the traffic that will be carried by this highway. I am sure that all those people who were there were amazed at the number of caravanners and people travelling in private cars and on other means of transport who assembled to see the opening of that highway. Referring to what the member for Eyre said, I confess I was embarrassed. I hope the Minister did not mean what he said.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister considered building toll roads, which are used to great advantage in other parts of the world?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This line does not deal with the making of roads.

Mr. MATHWIN: But it is an administrative matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's question relates to construction. Can he nominate an appropriate line?

Mr. MATHWIN: The item "Road charges—operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries" could relate to road construction but it could also relate to making the Anzac Highway a toll road.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Construction of highways coming under the Highways Department, is not included in this line, which deals with the payment of salaries.

Mr. VENNING: Submissions have been made to me that the number of places where compulsory blood tests can be done is limited. It would be far better if this service could be more widely available. Can the service be extended, and why has it not already been extended?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In connection with the Road Traffic Board, we have set up a committee consisting principally of medical practitioners, who are continually extending the scope of the scheme. Being conscious of the problem, they are moving as rapidly as possible toward

solving it. They desire that the scheme should have State-wide application, but they want to ensure that the person tested receives reasonable treatment.

Line passed.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$64 563 000.

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister give details of the functions of Local Government Examination Committees?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: Has an appointment been made following the untimely death of Mr. Keith Hockridge, who was a member of the Local Government Advisory Commission? Is the commission being used in areas where amalgamations are pending, and can the Minister comment on the possibility of councils amalgamating?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall ask the Chairman of the commission, Judge Ward, for the information, which I shall bring down for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: Is the scholarship for which \$5 000 has been allocated the Roy Guérin Memorial Scholarship?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the scholarship that we launched. We decided to perpetuate the name of Mr. Roy Guérin by naming the scholarship after him.

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the scholarship be awarded in the same manner, and will it provide for studies at the same place—Canberra?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yesterday, in reply to a question from me, the Minister referred me to a reply he gave concerning the new Volvo buses. He told me that I would find 80 per cent of the information in a reply that he gave to the member for Torrens, but there was no relevant information in that reply. Is there not any indication as to when some of these buses will be commissioned?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We hope that some buses will be commissioned this year, but until they are built I cannot give any further information.

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister say whether there was a loss of \$12 400 000 in connection with the running of the Bus and Tram Division? I understand that the Rail Division includes the metropolitan and non-metropolitan services. Can the Minister say how much of the \$49 430 000 will be paid by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It will be in the proportion of 75 to 25.

Mr. EVANS: The sum of \$8 800 000 was paid last year towards deficits and, if the actual deficit this year is \$12 400 000, that is a substantial increase on last year's deficit. In 1968, the railway deficit was less than \$5 000 000, whereas the overall deficit this year is \$50 000 000. If the Bus and Tram Division follows this trend, we will have a \$50 000 000 deficit in this section of public transport within the next five years. Can the Minister say whether the \$12 400 000 deficit is in the actual operations and whether he can see any way in which action might be taken to resist the trend towards a larger deficit in the Bus and Tram Division?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: True, the difference between receipts and payments was \$12 400 000 brought about principally by two factors; first, additional bus services that the Bus and Tram Division now operates compared to two years ago and, secondly, the increased cost of operation

brought about by increased wages and similar charges and costs of operation, bearing in mind that the Government has in the interests of society decided not to increase fares commensurate with increased costs. I do not subscribe to the word "deficit" as many people do, because I believe that the provision of transport is a necessary service that should not be costed out in the harsh way in which it is. The term "deficit" in this connection could also be applied to educating our children or providing a Police Force or fire service.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister considered information he has received from the Stirling council regarding the problem that exists in the cost of bus transport, whereby the public transport service finishes at Aldgate, whereas the private contractors who attempt to run at a profit serve outlying districts?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is one of the many anomalies resulting from the Bus and Tram Division's taking over the unprofitable lines operated by the private sector. However, when we establish our new depot at Crafers (and the honourable member knows of our plans, because he has been privy to our proposals), we will introduce what can best be described as a bus and tram division type service, and I think that the problems to which he has referred will in the main be solved.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the item "Purchase of land for public park and recreation areas, etc." with a \$300 000 allocation, can the Minister say whether provision is made on that line for the acquisition of the Alberton Oval? Has the Government tried to settle the dispute about the oval? This is a serious issue for metropolitan councils. The South Australian National Football League is now considering Sunday football matches and, in order to justify the cost of Football Park and to try to obtain income, perhaps Australian rules matches will have to be played on Saturdays and Sundays, to the detriment of suburban ovals. If that is the case, the councils that control ovals will find that their ratepayers will have to pay a larger share of upkeep and maintenance charges. Therefore, it is important that the dispute over the Alberton Oval be settled once and for all. This is such an important issue in relation to the future of Australian Rules Football and to the club that, if the council will not come to the aid of the party, I will recommend to my Party and to Parliament that Alberton Oval be acquired for use as a recreation area. With the threat of the league's wanting football to be played on Sundays, many other councils will find themselves in a difficult situation in negotiating further leases with the league.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government did everything possible to try to resolve the dispute at Alberton Oval, short of riding rough-shod over the Port Adelaide council, which is what the honourable member is now suggesting it should do. However, the Government is not willing to take over from the council, which we believe should be autonomous.

Mr. EVANS: I am sure the Minister is aware of the property owned by Mr. F. P. Smith of Coromandel Valley. My question relates to the item, "Purchase of land for public parks and recreation areas". The Minister for the Environment told me today that the Parks Advisory Committee has received an application for financial assistance from the Meadows District Council, to purchase land owned by Mr. F. P. Smith for open-space purposes. The Minister will probably recall the case and the fact that it will be necessary to revoke an order for open space

because of certain things that happened regarding valuations. Mr. Smith, who is over 80 years of age, wants to sell the land, and the council, which wants to buy it, needs assistance. The Minister said that the application would be considered by the committee. Will he do all in his power to try to expedite this matter, as I believe that an elderly man is suffering much mental trauma that he should not be suffering?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. ALLISON: I refer to the item, "Subsidies to country town bus services". Is this allocation of \$185 000 available to municipal country town bus services only, or will private enterprise be able to apply for subsidies too?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It will be available only to municipal services.

Mr. RUSSACK: The allocation of \$185 000 to which the member for Mount Gambier has just referred involves a steep increase. Did last year's allocation cover only part of that financial year, and is this allocation for the 1976-77 financial year?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot ask questions about last year's allocation. However, he can ask about the \$185 000 allocation for 1976-77.

Mr. RUSSACK: Is that allocation for a complete year, and is there an extension for subsidies for other country areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is for a complete year.

The Hon. Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information on the item, "Claims in relation to bus accident at Tumut Ponds", for which \$15 000 is allocated. I assume that this is the accident that involved members of the Brighton Senior Citizens' Club. Will this year's provision be the final allocation for this accident, or will there still be more to come?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the sum set aside for next year.

Line passed.

Community Welfare, \$22 600 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the allocation for child welfare treatment centres. Judging by the sum being allocated, there seems to have been a considerable increase in the number of staff involved. What exactly does this increase represent? All members share my concern and that of the community regarding the reports that have been made about institutions concerned with rehabilitation. I should like to know what the increase represents from the \$2 087 564 actually paid last year to the \$2 669 300 allocation for 1976-77.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): This relates to the salaries and wages of the total staff employed at McNally Training Centre, Brookway Park, Vaughan House, Elizabeth Grace Hostel, Glandore Community Unit, Lochiel Park youth project centre, Norwood project centre, and the southern suburbs project team. The sum allows for expected salary increases during the year.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the Minister has clarified that matter. However, it becomes rather more serious when one considers this increase and one wonders whether there is sufficient staff at McNally and other institutions. I refer to a letter sent to me by a constituent on October 3, 1976. It is as follows:

Dear Dr. Tonkin,

With reference to the latest abscondings from the McNally Training Centre. I think it should be brought to the public's notice of the poor administration of that

institution. I would like to point out the changes Mr. Meldrum, the supervisor, has instigated since he took over there. He has seen fit to move the old experienced staff around like pawns in a chess game, causing many of them to either leave or take on the "couldn't care less" attitude.

As for the abscondings, Mr. Meldrum moved staff from the security section who had up to 15 years' experience, and replaced them with comparative newcomers, one being an acting senior, who only completed 12 months in the job at McNally this month. How on earth more abscondings do not take place, God only knows.

Only last week, a new female staff member was attacked by a boy with a knife in a threatening manner and, true to form, very little happened to the boy,—only the "lollipop" treatment. I am sure if you were to jump up and down a little bit harder, other staff at this centre would come forward with their feelings, before more innocent members of the public get killed or robbed.

I have referred to that letter because of my interest and concern in the treatment of juvenile offenders.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you followed the advice given by members of your Party and checked the letter?

Dr. TONKIN: I have no way of checking it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is just an ordinary letter that you have received?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader has the floor. The Minister will have his opportunity.

Dr. TONKIN: I am familiar with the situation at McNally, and I hope to make a visit to that institution soon. I have brought the letter to the Minister's attention in conjunction with a report on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser*. When these two matters are considered together the reason for my concern becomes apparent. The allegations made in the letter and in the press report must be investigated. True, a departmental investigation is being undertaken, but, in the interests of the McNally staff and the staff of other institutions, there should be an independent inquiry perhaps conducted by a magistrate or a judge. Its findings should be made public in the interests of staff and the public. The *Advertiser* report by industrial reporter Bill Rust states:

A motion of no confidence in the management of the McNally Training Centre was passed yesterday by 15 members of the staff. The employees are residential care workers who staff the centre's security section. Their attack was a sequel to the escape at the weekend of three youths—

We have heard their history before. The report continues:

The security section staff, members of the Public Service Association, met yesterday afternoon and adopted three resolutions.

The following three resolutions are important:

That the staff has no confidence in the present management at McNally in the way it handles staff, in its administration of treatment programmes and in the application of so-called security procedures laid down for the centre.

That the Minister of Community Welfare (Mr. Payne), or any member of the department, should not make public comment on incidents at McNally until full investigation and report is made by qualified people.

That the Public Service Association seek ways of clarifying the role of the security section and to determine the criteria for placement, release, staffing, treatment and security.

Mr. Lennox said: "The staff clearly indicated that they were not being consulted in matters which vitally affect their personal welfare and their work. They also said worker participation was just not practised at McNally in the things that count."

Mr. Lennox, from the P.S.A., made one or two other comments about the Government that may or may not be justified, I do not know. However, these abscondings have been a source of great worry to the department and the Minister. I appreciate that, but they are also of

great concern to the community. It is time for a public inquiry to be instituted. There has always been a degree of confidentiality about proceedings at McNally, and this is proper just as there is confidentiality about the proceedings of the Juvenile Court.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader cannot comment on the Juvenile Court. I hope he will not refer to it again at any stage.

Dr. TONKIN: I take your point, Mr. Chairman. Through rehabilitation institutions such as McNally and Vaughan House we try to give young people a chance to fit usefully into society, but at the same time society faces certain risks, and deserves protection. The balance is hard to keep. The staff of such institutions deserve all the support they can get. I refer to the difficulty of providing young people in their custody with a degree of freedom in relation to the stage they have reached, yet there is still a need at McNally for a maximum security centre. The situation is difficult. A public inquiry is needed to indicate to the public what is being intended, what the aims are, and what difficulties are being experienced, so that the community can better understand what is being done by the Government in looking after young people.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There is no need for an inquiry as suggested by the Leader. An inquiry is in progress into the institutions referred to by the Leader. That inquiry, as the Leader should have known, is already headed by the senior judge of the Juvenile Court.

Dr. Tonkin: Is it a public inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader was heard in silence.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The speciousness of the arguments advanced is clear. Also, a departmental inquiry is taking place. The Leader referred to recent incidents at McNally, but I do not intend to comment on that matter out of fairness to the staff and employees concerned, as they are now subject to a departmental inquiry. I will make no further comment until the inquiry is completed, nor do I intend to comment on what is reported in the press. The press in Australia is free to print what it wishes and, apparently, it has done so in this case. We are here to consider the lines and, as I have explained, there are increases in allocations in certain lines because of the need to provide additional staff and because of the possibility of wage increases during the year.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the inquiry that is headed by the Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court be public? Will its findings be made public?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Sometimes the Leader amazes me because, although I know he is genuinely concerned in these matters, he speaks as if he does not know anything about these matters. I am sure the Leader knows that the inquiry to which I have referred is headed by Dr. Richard Nies and the terms of reference specifically refer to security at McNally and other centres. Surely that would seem to answer the kind of question the Leader is now putting to me.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister obviously has not understood my question: is it an open public inquiry?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The inquiry is being conducted by a community welfare advisory committee. The Minister has the power, under the Act, to set up advisory committees with certain terms of reference. In this case, the terms of reference were made public some time ago. The inquiry has been in progress since June 30 of this

year, and surely that is long enough for the Leader at least to have grasped the main elements in the matter. I am sure he understands what is involved in a community welfare advisory committee, its powers, the way in which information will be gathered, the resources of the department that may be made available to it (secretarial and other services), and all these things that are being used by the committee.

As I said only yesterday, members of that committee have already been to McNally, both before and after the incidents referred to. A further inspection has been made by some members of that committee, including Judge Newman. If there is any need for the latest information to be made available to that committee, it is clear that it will be available. First, the report of that committee, as is required by the Act, is made to me as the Minister and, when that report is to hand, it is my job to consider it. At that time a decision on whether it will be made public will be up to me and the Government; that is when it will be considered.

Dr. TONKIN: What I have been trying to get the Minister to say and what he has studiously avoided saying is that the committee of inquiry is not a committee open to the public, and its findings will not necessarily be made public.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to child care treatment centres, over which there still seems to be some misunderstanding. When we dealt with the Miscellaneous line under the Education Department, I found there was a line "Childhood services programme", for which \$13 250 000 was proposed for this year. Can the Minister tell me under which section it comes in his portfolio? I do not see any place under the line here, and I do not think it would come under "Residential care centres" or "Treatment centres". How is the Minister administering this area in this dual situation?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is under the Education Department line.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It will be useful if I point out that the area raised by the member for Mallee cuts across three portfolios—Health, Education, and Community Welfare. At present the funding, in the main, is through the Childhood Services Council. Most of the salaries for the people involved in those places come from Commonwealth funds. So the reason why nothing concrete appears under my vote is that essentially it has already been covered by the Minister of Education. I hope that helps to clear the air. There is no intention of avoiding discussing the matter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As I understand it, it does not come under the Minister of Education; it comes under the Minister of Community Welfare. That is what I have been told. In the Commonwealth, it is in Senator Guilfoyle's department, not Senator Carrick's. It is confusing. When I have raised this matter with the Minister of Education, he has pointed out to me that it is under the Minister of Community Welfare because child minding centres are under his control. The funds seem to be provided under the Education Department, but I raise the matter because, if it is the responsibility of the Minister of Community Welfare, questions should be directed to him.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information from the Minister on the rate of turnover of staff in the departments associated with juvenile centres, such as McNally and Vaughan House, and I refer to "Child welfare treatment centres". I suspect that these include Vaughan House,

McNally, and Windarna. Can the Minister say whether there is a greater than normal turnover of staff in these centres? In essence, I am seeking to determine whether the work gets beyond those staff members, whether their frustrations lead to their seeking appointments elsewhere, and whether their knowledge of a problem in that area is such that they cannot continue in that type of employment. The obvious concern in the mind of Mr. Beerworth has been subsequently expressed in the report in Thursday's *Advertiser* on the Juvenile Court report that the Minister tabled yesterday, where it is stated clearly in Judge Wilson's report—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In the course of the earlier remarks on this line, I ruled that the Juvenile Court came under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General. I hope the honourable member will stick to the line, because I will not allow any discussion concerning the Juvenile Court. The member for Light.

Dr. EASTICK: Those reports refer to activities that impinge on the centres that I have mentioned, and the persons have indicated that there should be a full and open report. I ask whether the staff in the centres are concerned that the people are not being acquainted with all aspects of their involvement, whether in the centres or in the area of the courts that direct people to the centres. Are staff members happy with their lot and about the lot of inmates of the centres?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The item to which the honourable member has referred deals with expenses incurred in normal operation and it is not a staff provision in the ordinary sense. However, I will try to get a report on the information that he has sought about staff turnover. Many people in the residential care field prefer to work on a relatively short-term basis, and the Leader could probably inform other members opposite about this. Often people will move from one State to another, perhaps gaining little advancement, to get more experience. Their turnover is of a voluntary kind and is not affected by any of the circumstances that the honourable member has mentioned. When I became Minister and was appraised of this position and confirmed it with staff members, it gave me some surprise. Social workers and residential care workers have an approach to their careers that is such that the thought of moving about does not concern them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That progress be reported.

I move the motion because it is 2.15 a.m.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Rus-sack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen and Blacker. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for the offer to provide the information and I ask whether he will extend it and try to say whether this fairly constant turnover has had a disconcerting effect on the inmates of the institutions. This type of problem has been identified in the

education field when students have a series of teachers during a period of one or two years. Have such difficulties arisen in the welfare area of which we have been talking?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will try to get sufficiently detailed information to satisfy the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the increased allocation for treatment centres involve an increase in staff? The situation at McNally, where the ratio is one to eight—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: One to eight what?

Mr. MATHWIN: You know what that means. It is no good the Minister trying to be clever. I warn—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: —the Minister—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. He has been here for some time and knows that when the call for order comes from the Chair he should resume his seat. This is not the first time this has occurred today. I trust that, when the Chair calls for order, he will resume his seat.

Mr. MATHWIN: The situation, as the Minister would know, is one staff member to eight inmates. The ratio should be one to five. I have often said this to the Minister. Reports to the Minister could be understating the position. I believe the Minister agrees that, with residential care workers, at meals females are given male support, but the situation still exists where two females operate together at McNally with no male support. I am surprised and disappointed that the Minister has not heeded the warnings I have given to him previously.

In a Ministerial statement yesterday, the Minister referred to a committee set up to look into this matter. I am disappointed that this will not be a public committee; the matter will be gagged, as has been the case on some other occasions. This means there is something to hide. The Minister should have second thoughts on this matter and consider giving a copy of the report, when it becomes available, at least to members on this side of the Chamber. I believe there is a conflict between some sections of the staff at these institutions. It would possibly be better if some of the academics involved got some experience as residential care workers so that they would know what it was all about.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Left, right, left, right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: No, it is a matter of young academics getting practical experience in the institutions. They would then have more thought for the whole matter rather than looking at it from only one angle. Does this item provide for an increase in staff, and what is his opinion about the staff ratios?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was wondering whether the Minister was going to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the Minister's prerogative whether or not he answers the question.

Mr. Mathwin: He can't answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has been warned for the third time and there will be no more warnings.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Last night I raised an issue under "Miscellaneous" in the Education Department section. I was advised that it should come under the Community Welfare provisions, so I now ask the Minister whether he can give details as to the concept in relation to the Campbelltown child care centre. I understand this centre

was set up recently, and I think the building cost was about \$500 000. I understand that the State Government could well find itself, in future, in the position of having to subsidise some of the staff for that centre. Who administers that centre? Who pays the staff costs and how many staff are involved at the centre?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. BOUNDY: Are more children being placed with foster parents? What is the reason for this increased allocation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The costs are based on higher foster subsidy rates applicable for maintenance as from May 1, 1976. So, retrospectivity is involved in the payments to foster parents. There is no special increase in the number of children involved.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: How many family day-care co-ordinators are there, and what are their functions? What is the salary of a family day-care co-ordinator, and what is the total amount of salary paid to all such co-ordinators?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The role of the co-ordinators is to co-ordinate family day care.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say to which officers the item "Overseas visits of officers" relates?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The increase shown is mainly a result of expenses in connection with the Director-General's study trip to Canada, which was not provided for earlier. There has been a press announcement that the Director-General, Mr. Ian Cox, is presently studying in Canada and will be returning to the department on completion of his studies.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Following the Minister's absolutely brilliant reply which showed his—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —sheer stupidity—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that, when the Chair calls "Order", he must resume his seat. During the afternoon he said that he could not hear me, but he surely heard me that time. I hope the honourable member will obey the Chair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the member for Davenport was reflecting on the Minister in his allegation about the stupidity of the Minister. I suggest that, under Standing Orders, that is improper and the honourable member ought to be asked to withdraw the remark.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order. I have already spoken to the honourable member and I hope he will stick to the line in future.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What functions do family day-care co-ordinators perform? How are families chosen for assistance from such co-ordinators, and how many children are involved in the scheme?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It would have been less than intelligent for me to answer the honourable member's earlier question in any way other than the way I did answer it. The function of family day-care co-ordinators is to co-ordinate family day care. I am damned if I know why the honourable member took umbrage at my reply. I shall be delighted to obtain a voluminous report on the matters raised by the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand that the Director-General, Mr. Cox, is away on a study course for 18 months. What

part of his visit relates to the provision of \$13 000? An 18-month study course would cost far more than \$13 000. Is the Director-General on full pay while he is on his study course? Does he have his family with him and, if so, are costs associated with his family included in the cost to the State? Will the cost of accommodation and fares be provided by the Government? Is the cost of the study, perhaps at a university, to be borne by the State?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Actually, the provision of \$13 000 for 1976-77 is \$4 000 less than the sum actually paid in the last financial year for overseas visits of officers. In this case, the main part is taken up by the expenses to which I referred earlier. Mr. Cox is undertaking a master's degree at McAllister University, at Hamilton, Canada, and his family is with him. I will obtain information on the remainder of the questions asked by the honourable member.

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister explain the situation regarding the training of social workers? There has been confusion and uncertainty recently about the implementation of the degree course for social workers. The Institute of Technology has had a three-year diploma course, and recently information has been given that a fourth-year degree is available. How many places are available for students presently studying to undertake the fourth year of study, and how many appointed students are working in the Community Welfare Department? Are bonded studentships being offered, and are bonded students eligible to undertake the fourth-year course? Students are bonded on the basis of a three-year diploma, but are they eligible to extend their studies to embrace the fourth year and so gain a degree before going out to honour their bonds?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As this is an important matter, I will not give an off-the-cuff answer but obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say what is the Government's overall policy on child-care facilities as regards employing more staff and the establishment of additional child-care centres? Because of the unemployment position, more mothers are staying at home to look after their children, rather than going out to work, so that the number of children in the centres has dropped dramatically. Is it Government policy to encourage private centres already established, or will the Government take them over, thus putting their staffs out of work and thereby setting up Government facilities to take care of the children?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Government is not doing anything regarding the commercial child-care centres. Its policy on child care is that it tries, within the funds available, to provide for the need where it exists.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand that the Magill Home comes under "Aged Residential Care Centres".

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say what is the Government's policy on redevelopment of existing homes for the aged in this area? Have any decisions been made in this regard and, if so, what are they as regards Magill and Windana, which may also be used for the aged?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Windana has been transferred to the Health Department to be used as a psychogeriatric centre. The Magill Home, which is a residential care centre for the aged, has had a complete ungrading in two wards to provide for a ward or

infirmity type of accommodation for a certain number of inmates. The upgrading included the provision of additional complete prefabricated blocks installed with plumbing facilities, etc. Some work has either commenced or is about to commence on existing hostel accommodation within the grounds near the office to cater for those people not confined to bed. This is interim-type accommodation, because a proposal to develop a considerable quantity of hostel-type accommodation is being planned and some costing has been done by the Public Buildings Department's architects. However, the costing arrived at was considerably more than what had been estimated; so a reappraisal has been ordered and is currently in progress. At the same time, other buildings in the grounds, formerly nurses' quarters not considered in the original plan, are also being examined so that the most economic method of providing hostel-type accommodation may be arrived at.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Do I understand from what the Minister has said that the Government intends to move away from the infirmity-type accommodation, which has been provided in the past, to hostel-type accommodation or, as some people like to call it, motel-type or semi-individual units? Does this indicate that the Government has had a dramatic change of policy in relation to care of the aged, and is moving away from the infirmity-type accommodation to that which has been supplied by churches and other bodies at places like Resthaven, Aldersgate, and so on? Has there been a major change in Government policy in relation to people who are aged but not infirm and, if there has, why has the Government stepped into this completely new area? In doing so, has it reduced the number of facilities available for infirm care of the aged, which I understand is the area of greatest need at present? I understand that infirmity-type accommodation is needed for the down-and-out people in our society, such as alcoholics, who have no-one to care for them and no financial resources.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member ought to spend a little time speaking to his Leader, who, I am sure, could explain to him that aged people do not fit simply into nice, neat little packages. The kind of accommodation which has been planned and which is now under way at Magill is designed to cater for the full range of needs of aged persons. This will be integrated with the overall plan of even more intensive-type care accommodation as at the Northfield wards. This is part of a plan which has been carefully prepared and which has been under way for more than 12 months. An inter-departmental committee, comprising senior representatives of the Health and Community Welfare Departments, has been set up, and it will be responsible for examining the differing needs that exist and planning for accommodation to meet those needs.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the Minister willing to make available the plan to which he just referred and which has been available for 12 months?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Do you ever listen? I did not say that it had been available for 12 months. I said that it had been under way for 12 months.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister is splitting hairs. When that plan has been completed, will the Minister be prepared to release all the details regarding future care of the aged and on the use of the Magill Home?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As I am sure the honourable member knows, care of the aged is a split responsibility. I have a partial responsibility in this area, as does the

Minister of Health. So, a little thought on the honourable member's part would have indicated that one does not have a plan and then categorises it. In the kind of field of which we have been speaking, one needs to have a continually evolving study of the circumstances obtaining, whether they relate to a study of the people, their distribution throughout the State, and so on. The plan is an on-going and not a static one. I shall be pleased to try to obtain for the honourable member details of aspects of the plan that are capable of being studied.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier) moved:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allison (teller), Arnold, Becker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen and Blacker. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. MATHWIN: Concerning the item "Aged care", is any provision made for day-care centres under this allocation? My district has one of the greatest proportions in Australia of people over the retiring age, and there is a great need for such facilities.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will get a report.

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister say what proportion of the staff of the Aboriginal Affairs Department is Aborigines?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As that is a Commonwealth Department, I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous,  
\$6 410 000.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister obtain information about whether the land which formerly belonged to Colebrook Home and which has been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust is to be used for the development of a caravan park? Concern has been expressed in the community that such a project is intended, as the area is zoned for special purposes and no other organisation could use the land in this way.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will try to obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister say whether any grant or financial assistance has been given to the Association for Totally Dependent Persons in South Australia, a new association? I understand that the longer established Mentally Retarded Totally Dependent Persons organisation may have been receiving financial assistance.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will try to obtain that information.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the item "Payment of portion of rates and taxes for pensioners and others". What is the position applying in relation to elderly citizens homes, cottage homes, and other institutions tenanted by pensioners? I refer to a notice sent to all tenants of Elderly Citizens Homes of S.A. Incorporated, which states:



Dear Tenant,

*Re Maintenance Charges/Rents—Increase*

A review of the costs of the Association indicates what is almost inevitable these days—increases. Last April we asked you for a 25c increase for each independent living unit a week. That increase was a direct consequence of the 6.4 per cent Australian Wage Case decision applicable from February 15, 1976, to the association's salaries and wages. We did not ask for anything further at the time, although all other costs were rising also. We have reached a point in the cost structure where as a prudent board of management, we are forced to increase accommodation charges for all our independent living units by 75c a week. We therefore regret to advise you that, with effect from the first collection day on or after November 1, 1976, all independent living unit accommodation charges will be increased by 75c a week.

My constituent paid a deposit of \$3 000 on a unit five years ago, and was then required to pay \$4 a week. The weekly rate is now about \$7 and will be almost double the original rate as a result of this 75c increase. Increases in such weekly charges seem to come just before increases are made to pensions. This pattern seems to have developed. Had this constituent purchased a small cottage, he would be able to apply for rent and other concessions which are most acceptable. Can the Minister say what benefit pensioners obtain through the State Government in relation to such homes?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The concessions outlined under "Miscellaneous" apply to the persons concerned, whether or not they live in elderly citizens' homes. There is no such thing as a deposit—it was a \$3 000 donation, and the maintenance charges are a matter of negotiation between the board of Elderly Citizens Homes Incorporated and the residents. The rental concession is a Commonwealth allowance and once again it applies to a person irrespective of where he is living, providing he is paying a charge that can be construed as rent.

Mr. BECKER: The position is that those people do not get the benefit of any concessions: they contribute to a maintenance fund, which covers everything. The pensioners who go into these homes could do better. At one time, the cottage homes paid full rates and taxes; they were divided into units and each person was responsible for his own rates, which could be cheaper for him.

Line passed.

Tourism, Recreation and Sport, \$2 770 000.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say whether the Acting Director of the Tourist Bureau is receiving a salary equivalent to that of the Director? If not, is the proposed allocation of \$20 734 substantially more than what is required, because we have not had a Director since July? The allocation tends to suggest that the Acting Director is not being paid the salary of the Director, who would command a salary of about \$40 000 a year.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): The provision for the Director is for nine months, and the salary of the Deputy Director is included in the next line.

Mr. BECKER: There have been 23 applicants, of whom six were interviewed, for the position of Director, but no Director has been appointed. Who authorised the press statement in the *News* of February 20, 1976? If it was not authorised by the Minister's department, why was it not retracted? The report states:

New Director of South Australian Tourist Bureau named. A senior executive of the Australian Tourist Commission, Mr. Beresford, is the new director of the South Australian Tourist Bureau. His appointment was announced today. Mr. Beresford, who is the commission's director of marketing, will replace Mr. Perc Pollnitz who retired recently

after 17½ years in the job. The new director has had a major role in the shaping of Australia's tourism policy. He is currently working in the commission's Melbourne office. Tourism in South Australia has developed into one of the State's biggest revenue raisers. Recent surveys show that people spend \$84 000 000 a year on one-night or more stopovers in South Australia.

The report named the new Director of the Tourist Bureau. Did it emanate from the Minister's office or from Mr. Beresford himself? I do not recall having seen a retraction anywhere about that appointment. Because of Mr. Beresford's qualifications, why was his appointment not confirmed by the Government? What is the Government really looking for in that position? Non-recognition of officers within the bureau will stifle progress in the Public Service.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will try to get from my colleague a report to cover those matters.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the item "Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts", on which \$195 679 was actually spent last year and \$350 000 is proposed for this year. Can the Minister say how that money will be allocated? Will it be provided on a subsidy basis or not? I read a short statement from the District Council of Angaston in a letter written on August 12, 1976, as follows:

*Re: Tourist Bureau Subsidy:* Some years ago, this council and no doubt other councils as well, were given to understand that a dollar for dollar subsidy was to be made available to country tourist offices on the basis of one dollar from the State Government for dollar raised (from whatever source) by the local tourist organisation.

This council is only one of several that have raised the point with me that they need help; others include Tanunda and Lyndoch, all of which have problems in promoting tourism in their areas. Smaller communities have financial problems, and need Government help, because upgrading of caravan parks is necessary. I ask where the money to which I have referred will be spent and whether councils will be helped.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I understand that the reason for this fairly substantial increase is that caravaning is a rapidly growing activity, and there is a need to subsidise councils regarding caravan parks. At Barmera and Wallaroo, subsidies have been given for that purpose but I have not the amounts that were granted.

Mr. EVANS: Although no allocation is made for the plan of development for the tourist industry, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport has stated that his department is studying this document. In reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Hill in another place, the Minister said that the Federal Government was holding this document for further study, but subsequent checking has shown that that was not necessarily the case and that it is up to the Minister to decide. The document was completed last November and paid for this year, but still has not been made available to the industry; will the Minister ask his colleague whether it can be made available to both sides. I also refer to the fact that on Monday I received from the Premier a report that I call the Tattersall report, together with a letter stating:

In the House on August 10, 1976, you asked whether I would release the 1975 report which inquired into the operations of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau. I can now confirm that, as I indicated in my reply on that day, it would not be advisable to release the whole report. There are certain passages which are directly critical of certain individuals and to that extent the report should be considered privileged information. However, I am forwarding you a copy on the understanding that you will treat it as confidential, and that if you wish to speak publicly about any part of it you will first seek my agreement.

I appreciate the Premier's sending me the document but, with the conditions under which he sent it, it would be impossible for an Opposition member to read it, because he may inadvertently refer to something which is in the document but which he may have also known from another source. The Premier could then say that a confidence had been broken. I have asked the Premier to consider blocking out the part of the letter regarding not making such a comment. The Tattersall report should have been available in place of the Corbett committee report on the Tourist Bureau. The Corbett committee stated that it did not investigate the Tourist Bureau because there was already a Government committee investigating it. I consider that the Corbett committee believed that the other report would be available to the public.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will convey those matters to the Premier and the Minister.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the increased provision for tourist advertising and promotion cover this work throughout Australia, or does it also include advertising in other parts of the world? I should also like to know what type of advertising is involved and whether it includes the tourism film of Kangaroo Island. Are any other films to be made for the promotion of tourism, and are they included in the allocation?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I believe that that amount includes all forms of advertising. The increase in cost of about 20 per cent is caused mainly by increased advertising costs, plus some increase in the main markets in the Eastern States.

Mr. EVANS: An amount of \$70 000 is proposed this year for recreation camps. What camps are included, and what amount is expected to go to each camp? Alternatively, will the amount be distributed on the basis of requests and assessments made during the year?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I believe that this is the direct revenue cost of running three camps at Mylor, Parnanga, and the Goolwa conference centre. As I do not know the exact amounts, I will get them for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: Recently, concern was expressed about questions which I put on notice and which were not answered. Will the Minister ascertain whether the department can inform me in writing on most of the issues I raised? They were not difficult or complicated matters in the sense that the replies needed much research. This is a new department and has not had a lot of publicity about its functions. Can those questions be looked at, because I believe many of them can be answered by way of letter to clear up the doubts in people's minds? Last year \$500 was allocated for the Tourist Development Advisory Council, but not spent. This year the amount is increased to \$1 000. Is this council still being formed, and was it not operating last year?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: This council ceased to operate at the end of the year before last, but is now being revived. That is the explanation for the lack of expenditure last year.

Mr. BECKER: With regard to subsidies for the development of tourist resorts, can the Minister ascertain what is being done in South Australia to encourage the establishment and proper care and maintenance of areas for people wishing to camp out? We have quite good caravan parks in South Australia and tents can be pitched at some of them. However, in other areas this form of recreation is not available. As many people in the State enjoy this

type of recreation with their families, what encouragement is the department giving and what work is it doing in this area?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: Most other States have regional bureau offices. In Queensland, 71 staff members are employed in the Director-General's office. Cairns has a district office with a staff of 15; at Townsville, it is 10; at Mackay, eight; at Rockhampton, seven; at Alexandra Headland, six; at Brisbane, 47; at Toowoomba, five; at Surfers Paradise, seven; at Coolangatta, six; at Newcastle, four; at Sydney, 26; at Canberra, five; at Melbourne, 25; and at Adelaide, seven. Our commitment, with a potential market in the Eastern States, is only about 12 in total. In Queensland and South Australia the potential market is 1 300 000 people. I believe that in our own State we need to go to a greater degree of regionalisation. We have offices now in some centres. Is there any intention to expand staffing arrangements in this area, and in particular in Queensland and Western Australia, particularly in Western Australia now that the highway is finished? There is an important market in Western Australia if we can attract people from going to the islands in the near Asian area.

Mr. BECKER: Under the provision for the Division of Recreation and Sport, there is an item "Recreation officers, clerical and general staff", \$533 700. I refer to lotteries, with which the Minister's department is concerned.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will have to make clear how he relates lotteries to that line.

Mr. BECKER: I have here a document called *Sportsline* which is put out by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department which says that further information relating to any of the categories mentioned should be directed to the lotteries officer, Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, 25 Grenfell Street, Adelaide. If that lotteries officer is not a clerical officer in the Division of Recreation and Sport, I want to know who is employing him, who is paying him, and why. That is the line I am proceeding under. I understand that the maximum amount one is able to raise with lotteries and raffles has now been increased to \$20 000. I believe that each year five large lotteries are permitted by the Minister and that last year the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron conducted a lottery with the total involved being about \$100 000. The first prize was a yacht.

When the Glenelg Football Club wanted to conduct a large raffle with a house as the first prize (such as in the Art Union lottery) the football club's application was denied. The Minister admitted to the deputation that met him that the application made by the Yacht Squadron had slipped through and that large lotteries are available only for charitable organisations. I have before me notice of a lottery in which one can win a Holden Caprice car. The 505 yachting organisation is running this raffle which consists of 2 500 tickets at \$20 each, and that represents \$50 000. I want to know how this organisation has been able to obtain a lottery licence. The licence number of this lottery is 3 151. How many large lotteries or raffles have been approved in the past 12 months and to whom have they been approved, whether sporting or charitable organisations? What is the Government policy in future in relation to large lotteries?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will try to get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the type of annual licence that allows a lottery to be run with prize money not exceeding \$200. Is it still not acceptable for a political Party to receive such a licence? Not long ago a political organisation was refused a licence, but since then I have seen tickets from another political organisation that suggest that licences are now available to political Parties.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister give details of the item "Overseas visits of officers", for which \$1 000 is allocated?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It relates to a staff member who took leave to go to the Montreal Olympic Games and stayed on to conduct investigations on behalf of the department for a short period in Canada and America.

Mr. BECKER: Has provision been made for handicapped people at recreation camps? What investigations is the department undertaking to offer recreation facilities to handicapped people? How many applications has the department received in connection with junior sports coaching? What is the department's policy on junior sports coaching and is such coaching really open to all and sundry? I should like to see a wider acceptance of training of juniors in international five-a-side basketball and in sailing, including water safety. The Patawalonga could be used far more frequently for training in sailing. Have sailing clubs lodged applications in this connection? The training could be done in conjunction with local schools.

Line passed.

Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous, \$584 000.

Mr. EVANS: I am led to believe that the biggest percentage of the allocation of \$200 000 for the racing industry will go to horse-racing, with the balance going to trotting and to dog-racing. This plan was an alternative to one agreed by Cabinet at one stage in relation to book-makers' fees and off-course totalisators. Can the Minister give further details on this matter?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: This grant has been made to the racing industry because it is important and is facing diminishing returns. In addition, it provides substantial revenue to the State.

Mr. MATHWIN: As the Queensland Government gives more than \$250 000 to surf lifesaving, I am sure that the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia would be delighted to work under the same system in South Australia. That sum makes our grant of \$28 000 seem more than a little paltry. The Western Australian Government's grant was \$35 000 last year, and it also provides a \$15 000 grant for its lotteries fund. Victoria also provides more than is provided in South Australia. Last season, our surf lifesavers took part in 113 rescues. In their 25 seasons of operation they have carried out 1 972 rescues. They reported 57 shark sightings last year.

Every South Australian beach was patrolled for a minimum of 119 hours last season, making a total for all our beaches of 21 352 hours of patrolling last season. The voluntary lifesavers returned 78 lost children to their parents and treated 367 cases with first-aid. Membership has increased, and South Australia has 18 affiliated lifesaving clubs. I appeal to the Minister to do all he can to encourage lifesavers in the excellent job they are doing and stress that it is time the Government saw fit to provide more financial assistance to our lifesavers.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister obtain for me the formula of how the \$200 000 will be split between the three types of racing? I understood that \$200 000 was to go to the South Australian Jockey Club for it to distribute.

I should like to know how much horse-racing, trotting, and dog-racing clubs will receive and whether the formula is based on the betting turnover on-course or off-course. I also understand that there is a trick in the formula which means that the greyhound clubs will be disadvantaged, but I hope that this is not the case.

Mr. EVANS: The Adelaide Convention Bureau allocation is \$24 000, which is the same as last year's allocation. The bureau is not merely tied to the Adelaide City Council area, although that is where it was originally based. Although I am not suggesting that the allocation should be increased substantially, the continuing \$24 000 allocation does not give the impression that the Government is really concerned about conventions being held in South Australia.

The insurance of voluntary workers in recreation is a good scheme. Some sporting clubs, and perhaps recreational groups, nowadays pay a nominal fee to a coach or instructor who, therefore, is not technically a voluntary helper. I appreciate the help I have received from the legal officer at the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, who expressed concern that, in cases where they give their services for a nominal fee and are injured, technically, if they wished to take court action the club could be liable for not having the individual insured for workmen's compensation. Perhaps it can be stated that a voluntary worker is one who receives a certain salary only; a limit could be put on it. I have advised five sporting clubs that have contacted me to become incorporated bodies in order to protect their committees if something goes wrong. It is not cheap to insure a person for workmen's compensation, as it involves not only the risk of a loss of wages but also the risk of serious injury, and much money could be involved. Will the Minister consider extending this to more than voluntary workers and cover a limited field that earns, say, less than \$1 000 a year?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will take up the honourable member's suggestion. He was correct in stating that the Adelaide Convention Bureau received \$24 000, the same as last year, because that is the sum for which it asked.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the allocation for the racing industry, to which I have already referred, I understand that the Minister will obtain the formula for me.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the line "National sporting events—assistance to competitors from South Australia", for which \$70 000 has been allocated. That allocation was announced some time before the Budget was introduced, and at a time when this country's Olympic team was not performing as well overseas as it was expected to perform. Many politicians made much play of the suggestions that the team did not perform as well as was expected, because of a lack of finance. I think the Australian athletes performed extremely well but that, unfortunately, the competition was a little better. The Federal Government has been the subject of much criticism regarding its role in sport and recreation. As this allocation of \$70 000 was used as a means of belting the Federal Government, it is time that the record was put straight.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that there is nothing in this line concerning the Federal Government: it relates to the State Government only. I hope that the honourable member will stick to the line.

Mr. BECKER: The State Government is, belatedly, singling out in its Budget this sum, which is aimed to assist competitors from South Australia. We are not sure how many competitors or organisations will be assisted, although we realise that in the past money has been provided to national sporting associations by the Commonwealth Government to cover the cost of athletes' fares and accommodation. If, say, a basketball championship were held in Melbourne, the Federal basketball association would receive a Commonwealth grant to cover the costs incurred by representatives from all States. It will therefore be difficult to know how the State Government will be able to spend this \$70 000, when money is made available for national sporting events by the Federal Government. We have been assured that \$6 300 000 was spent in 1975-76 on leisure facilities, and that an appropriation of \$11 100 000 is being made by the Commonwealth Government for 1976-77.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already told the honourable member twice that there is nothing in the line concerning the Federal Government. I ask him to stick to the line.

Mr. BECKER: Whether such sporting events are called "national", "Commonwealth" or anything else, they are held on an Australia-wide basis. I believe that the Minister has engaged in cheap politicking in this respect, as the Commonwealth Government makes money available to national sporting associations. The national Government has done this in the past and will continue to do so in the future. Will allocations such as this supplement any assistance that is given by the Federal Government to a national sporting body? It seems that the Minister is not going to answer my question. I ask him to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that the honourable Minister does not have to answer the question. That matter has already been raised earlier this evening.

Mr. BECKER: I would like the position clearly spelt out in regard to the allocation of \$70 000. Under what formula will it be allocated?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The honourable member has given us an apology on behalf of his Federal colleagues. What he has said may be true, but a person who I think should know about the situation told me only 31 hours ago that the reason for the increase from \$20 000 to \$70 000 was that the previous Commonwealth Labor Government had made funds available to enable State teams to compete in national events. That practice was cut out by the present Liberal Government and, as a result, the State Government stepped in and increased its allocation to \$70 000. If the honourable member knows that the Commonwealth Government is honouring the obligation of the previous Government, I am sure that that position will be appreciated by the State.

Line passed.

Hospitals, \$173 000 000.

Dr. TONKIN: There has been an increase from \$63 000 to \$81 400 in the item "Nurses Registration Act Administration—Members of Nurses Board, Examiners, Registrar and Clerical Staff". What is involved in this increase?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will get that information.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Concerning the item "Port Adelaide Casualty Hospital", negotiations are being carried out in the Port Adelaide area, involving the former Labor M.H.R. Dr. Ritchie Gun, in relation to an occupational health clinic which I understand would replace this casualty hospital. What is planned in respect of this project and how will the clinic be financed?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will ask my colleague.

Dr. TONKIN: To what extent is the domiciliary service now operational in the eastern suburbs? As the service works well in the western suburbs, will the Minister obtain a report about its progress in the eastern suburbs?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes.

Line passed.

Public Health, \$7 856 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Several cases have been brought to my attention that should be investigated by Public Health Department officers. I refer to ear-piercing techniques offered at a reduced price. Keeping studs are inserted with plated studs of five (instead of 40) micron gold plating, and they are so thin that they rapidly wear off with the movement in the ears. This matter should be investigated, because it has given rise to a considerable amount of infection.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I agree.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In answer to my Question on Notice last Tuesday about how many requests for dentures were in the department's waiting list, the Minister said that the matter was subject to change at present and that he was unable to give the answer. The Government is embarrassed by the huge waiting list of about three years, and it has sought to dodge the issue, because of its poor administration in this area. As the Minister has failed to get this information in reply to my Question on Notice, will he now obtain the relevant information?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will try.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How much of the \$3 224 000 allocated under "Dental Health" will be spent on school dental therapists?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will get the report.

Line passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$56 760 000—passed.  
Mines, \$6 440 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The allocation for salaries, etc., under "Geological and Geophysical Survey" has increased from about \$1 500 000 to about \$1 600 000. What are the main areas of mineral exploration in South Australia? What moves are under way to increase that exploration? The increase in the allocation takes up no more than the cost of inflation of wages. South Australia is lagging behind the other developing States, and in recent years it has failed to develop; in fact, its progress has declined. Queensland and Western Australia have had major mineral developments, mainly because they have spent money on exploration, largely through private companies. They have found minerals and have been able to develop their mining industry as well as their secondary industry based on those major project developments. The effort in this State is totally inadequate if we wish to develop our present mineral resources. Can the Minister outline some of the major mineral developments in the State?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I will get a report from the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am surprised that the Minister cannot give me at least some information now. I now refer to the Moomba and Cooper Basins. What is the Government's policy now in extending the gas reserves in this State, particularly in the northern part of Lake Eyre? Could the Minister indicate the potential of major new gas and possibly liquid reserves in that area?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! To which item is the honourable member referring?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think we are still on the 00 25 item.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That line concerns wages; there is nothing about the Cooper Basin. If the honourable member can link his remarks with any other line, he can speak to it. His opportunity may come under "Miscellaneous."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is that the right line for geophysical surveys as well?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is obvious that it will be under "Miscellaneous."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the geologists and geophysicists in the department are involved in exploration, so the salaries paid to those people lead to exploration.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will have the opportunity of asking his question under "Miscellaneous".

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information on the item "Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—payment for services". These payments have been the subject of comment by the Auditor-General who, at page 191 of his report, states:

Payments to the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories for services carried out during 1975-76 on behalf of Government departments amounted to \$724 000, an increase of \$244 000 (51 per cent) compared with 1974-75. As mentioned last year, the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories were advanced \$100 000 in 1973-74 towards the cost of future projects. To June 30, 1976, no project costs have been charged against this advance.

Yet we see that \$782 000 is proposed to be advanced to Amdel. The Auditor-General's Report raises a question, and I should like as full a report as the Minister can obtain on what is going on at Amdel and why the Auditor-General has seen fit to draw attention to the fact that the laboratories have not drawn on the \$100 000 made available in 1973-74, and yet the escalation of funds from the Government is dramatic.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Amdel is a jointly financed operation through the Mining Industries Association, the Australian Government and the South Australian Government. We have had great difficulty in getting the Australian Government to increase its allocation to Amdel in either of the last two years. There has been a joint investigation which has produced certain recommendations which are now being considered by the Federal Government. Over the past 18 months or so, with the slump in the mineral industry and in exploration, this has reduced the amount of work available to Amdel from the industry, which of course means that its facilities are not being used to capacity. The State has therefore taken up the slack. The large increase in funding has come because of the State Government's determination to ensure that Amdel continues. For the money we pay Amdel, we get work done. It helps Amdel because, if it is not working to capacity, it has under-employed staff. If we need work done and Amdel does it, it uses its staff. This helps Amdel to cover its costs. There is a problem at present to get work carried out by the Commonwealth instrumentalities. I will examine the honourable member's remarks in conjunction with the Auditor-General's Report and, if necessary, obtain further information.

Line passed.

Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister for Planning Miscellaneous, \$12 173 000.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the information sought previously by the member for Davenport comes under this line.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What is the potential nature of new gas and liquid findings in the Lake Eyre area and also in the Simpson Desert area? Does the Minister have information he can pass on to the Committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I suspect the honourable member is referring to the Pedirka Basin. A few wells were drilled some years ago in that basin. There was little exploration activity after that. Currently, the Western Mining Corporation is in this Basin, or a portion of it. Its main activity at the moment is seismic. There will be exploration, and I will find out for the honourable member when the next exploration well will take place there. We are optimistic about the Pedirka Basin but we do not have enough knowledge to say how justified our optimism is. In part, the optimism is based on the fact that the temperatures at the relevant depth where oil and gas can be found are lower at the Pedirka Basin than at the Cooper Basin, where there is oil and gas, which increases the likelihood of there being liquids, in comparison with the Pedirka Basin. So far as our main exploration is concerned, it must be at the Cooper Basin, because the lean times with regard to the development of additional generating capacity for the Electricity Trust are such that we need to know about these additional gas supplies well ahead of time.

The northern power station, which we hope will come on stream in 1983-84, is being planned now. If energy demand keeps expanding, a further power station will be required three or four years after that. We will not be able to supply that with Leigh Creek coal, and we need to start planning that station in the next year or so. It is certainly unlikely to be based on gas. We need further exploration in the Cooper Basin urgently, to be assured that the Torrens Island station will take us to the end of the century. That is vital for the State.

It is not possible, in the field of power generation, to not plan well ahead of time. Victoria will have power restrictions in 1979 whatever happens, even if it gets a clearance on Newport now. Our lead time ahead is much greater than that of the producers. Naturally, the commercial producers have a higher rate of discount and the private ability to provide exploration money for mines that will not be exploited before the late 1980's or the early 1990's is not great. No-one wants to put private money in if he is not going to get an immediate return. The department hopes that ultimately Pedirka will throw up significant gas fields.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the provision of \$52 250 for the City of Adelaide Development Committee. I understand that the committee is likely to go out of operation, or to be superseded in its main function, by legislation that will be introduced soon. The Minister is providing this year an amount of \$52 250 for a committee that normally would go out of legislative existence at December 31. The provision for the whole of last year was \$43 900. Will the Minister comment on this expenditure, and say whether the committee will go out of existence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that basically the honourable member's assessment is correct, but if the committee goes out of existence, there will be something else there. I do not want to pre-judge what will be introduced here in a few weeks, but there is a need for a provision of this kind. The allocation covers the general operating expenses of the committee, and the amount may not have to be as much as is provided. However, when

the vote was drawn up, we were not able to say that the committee necessarily would fold up at the end of this year. For budgetary purposes, it was assumed that the committee would continue for the whole year and that, if it did not, other commitments would replace commitments for the committee.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: An amount of \$50 000 is provided as a new proposed payment for energy research, and I should like to know what the Minister proposes in regard to this research.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter is before Cabinet at present, and I hope to be able to make a statement soon.

Dr. EASTICK: There is a new commitment of \$50 000 for the Urban Development Co-ordinating Committee. Is this intended or expected to be an on-going committee? Also, I should like to know what the Minister regards as "urban". Do we take the type of development at Whyalla as being urban? Do we take the urban community of some larger towns, as opposed to the metropolitan area, or is it intended that this will apply only within the metropolitan area and not in those other areas, which are growing or which have a significant urban capacity?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The committee has been set up by Cabinet under my chairmanship. It comprises the Chairman of the Land Commission, the General Manager of the Housing Trust, a Treasury representative, a representative of the Monarto Development Commission, a representative of the State Planning Authority, and a representative of transport. Basically, it is a consequence of the Development Corporation and, where urban development is involved, the committee is associated with trying to get an overall co-ordination of the work being undertaken.

Mr. BECKER: In explaining the Budget, the Treasurer stated:

The South Australian Government has made an offer to acquire this equity as the most effective avenue of assisting the producer consortium to achieve an adequate level of exploration and also of obtaining a voice in the management of the Cooper Basin resources.

In these Estimates it is proposed to set aside \$12 000 000 as a contribution to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, \$9 500 000 being to finance the acquisition from the Commonwealth Government and \$2 500 000 being to provide some funds for exploration.

He continued:

The previous Commonwealth Government took an equity interest in the project at the time when some consortium members were seeking to overcome their financing problems. The present Commonwealth Government now appears anxious to divest itself of the equity interest.

Has the Minister received any communication from the present Federal Government that it wishes to divest itself of its interest in the Cooper Basin resources? Can the Minister say why the Commonwealth Government's share has not been made available to the public, rather than to the State Government? Would it not be better that the public, particularly South Australians, be given the opportunity to invest \$9 500 000 in capital and, if they wanted to, to put in \$2 500 000 for drilling and exploration purposes, thereby freeing \$12 000 000 that could be taken off metropolitan land tax and succession duties? That would be far more important to taxpayers in this State than entering into something that I believe should be left to private enterprise. Can the Minister say what effect the latest discovery in the Cooper Basin area will have on the life of the field?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Commonwealth announced, as part of its election policy, that it was to divest itself of certain interests. The Commonwealth Government has indicated a willingness to sell to the South Australian Government. The interest for sale is a production interest in the Cooper Basin. An organisation would have to be established in order to take up that interest. Even if the State established an organisation and offered shares to the public, that would be a form of borrowing that would come under the Loan Council, and we would be in exactly the same financial position as we are today as a consequence.

I point out to the honourable member that the producer interests in the Cooper Basin are greatly fragmented. The original producers, Delhi Santos, in order to gain additional capital, had to have farm-out arrangements. There are now nine separate producers, and problems of getting effective co-ordination are difficult. This Parliament has concerned itself with these problems before in the producers' indenture, and it is something that has led the State to say that this is an area in which we must be actively involved. The gas being used goes to the public utilities, the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company. Whilst the honourable members, and perhaps I, may want to say there are other purely private enterprise activities, gas for ETSA and SAGASCO is a supply of the basic fuel to our public utilities, which are fundamental to us. The latest discovery has not been properly assessed, and will not be until the middle of next year. On a conservative estimate, it adds 110 000 000 cubic feet to proven and probable reserves, which amounts to about a year's supply. It is the first exploration that has been done for three years.

Mr. Coumbe: You would not care to explain why that three year gap occurred?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think the traditional explanation will do, because two years ago the State increased the price of gas by 6c to cover the cost of exploration.

Mr. Coumbe: Why did all the rigs entirely disappear?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The rigs did not entirely disappear: we kept Drilcon there because of the State Government's guarantee to Elders Finance. The extra reserve is not available yet for South Australia as a result of that discovery because the producers have not discovered all the gas to meet the Sydney commitments.

Line passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 8 and title passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It is a source of regret that we have come to the third reading of this Bill at 4.48 a.m. after a long session. We have spent about 36 hours on the Budget, 14 hours less than the Labor Party used when in Opposition and we have had a reasonable discussion. We deplore the fact that the Government saw fit to impose this sort of time table on the sittings of the House. Nevertheless, the Opposition is reasonably satisfied with the time spent on the Budget, but not the time of sitting in the House for that discussion. I support the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.50 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 7, at 2 p.m.