

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 October 1978

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 1340 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material were presented by Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison and Dean Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Eastick, Hudson, Mathwin, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Virgo.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

Petitions signed by 165 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences were presented by Messrs. Arnold and Max Brown.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: STATE DUTIES

Petitions signed by 191 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible were presented by Messrs. Eastick, Tonkin, and Venning.

Petitions received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

A petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

PETITION: WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

A petition signed by 76 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the hearing loss sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974, was presented by Mr. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to

amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships was presented by Mr. Harrison.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

SOUTH ROAD

In reply to Mr. **DRURY** (10 August).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: It is proposed to install "cat's eye" delineators on South Road between Seacombe Road and the southern end of the Reynella by-pass. It is expected that this work will be carried out in the current financial year as resources become available.

ISLINGTON CROSSING

In reply to the **Hon. J. C. BANNON** (12 September).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: It is expected that the overpass construction at the Islington crossing will be deferred one year. However, it is possible that service relocation could commence as scheduled during this financial year. Because of this relatively short delay to the project, it is not proposed to temporarily widen the crossing.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARIANS

In reply to Mrs. **ADAMSON** (27 September, Appropriation Bill).

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON**: The salaries of Parliamentary Librarians in Australia are as follows:

	Per annum
	\$
Commonwealth Parliamentary Librarian . . .	30 361
New South Wales Parliamentary Librarian . .	28 539
Victorian Parliamentary Librarian	25 809
Queensland Parliamentary Librarian	22 364
South Australian Parliamentary Librarian . .	18 061
Tasmanian Parliamentary Librarian	14 994
Western Australian Parliamentary Librarian	12 100

NOARLUNGA CENTRE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Noarlunga Centre Community College.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The honourable member for Davenport twice has raised a query in the House regarding a mention in the Auditor-General's Report of

matters referred by the Auditor-General to the Committee of Management of the Frozen Food Factory, and has asked me to table the material. The Government does not propose to do this for two reasons: first, communications between the Auditor-General and his officers and the Committee of Management and officers of the Frozen Food Factory are part written and part verbal. It would certainly not be possible to table verbal communications. The Government believes it is not proper to table queries that are made during the course of the Auditor-General's investigation of Government departments when the Auditor-General is seeking information and has a series of arrangements with the department concerned, either for changes or for rectification of departmental accounts during the year. Many queries are put to Government departments during the year by the Auditor-General and, when the Auditor-General believes that those matters should be reported to Parliament, he has a statutory duty to do so, and that he has done. Secondly, a further investigation is taking place of the Frozen Food Factory, and the Government does not propose to pre-empt the resulting report, which will be made public when it is available and which will deal with all matters.

QUESTION TIME

MR. MUIRHEAD

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what investigations were carried out by the South Australian Government in Australia and the United Kingdom before the appointment of counsel assisting the South Australian Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, and what criteria were applied that resulted in the appointment of Mr. Dennis Muirhead, to the exclusion of South Australian legal practitioners? I have been informed from London that Mr. Muirhead practises in conjunction with two associates. The practice has been in existence for only three or four years, and is primarily concerned with serious criminal cases, including the defence of people charged with drug offences. I am further informed that Mr. Muirhead's is not recognised as being one of the leading firms in dealing with such matters, and that there are other firms with far greater experience and other lawyers more highly qualified and with greater experience in such matters.

Considerable surprise was expressed that no South Australian legal practitioner was considered sufficiently qualified and experienced to assist the South Australian Royal Commission, and this view was supported today by Mr. Mullighan, the President of the South Australian Law Society, when he indicated that there are practitioners in South Australia who could have carried out the task.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has carefully left out a certain lacuna in his explanation and that lacuna is that it is true that in Great Britain and in New York there would be counsel who were more experienced in drug areas than is Mr. Muirhead. They, however, are counsel who have no knowledge of South Australia or of its conditions. Mr. Muirhead had knowledge of South Australia both as counsel and as a member of the South Australian Bar, and I find it extraordinary that it should be suggested that, as he is an admitted practitioner of South Australia, somehow or other he is not a South Australian counsel being employed in the case.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: And a member of the Law Society.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. None of the more experienced and senior counsel in England had any such knowledge of conditions in this country. What we were seeking was counsel who had extensive experience, and the honourable member has already, on the basis of information given to him in the House, pointed to the fact that Mr. Muirhead, in his own words, "was highly qualified". So he is.

Mr. Tonkin: There are other South Australians resident in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are other South Australians resident in South Australia, none of whom we have any knowledge of who have the kind of experience Mr. Muirhead has in this particular area in countries that have already suffered the drug scourge. If the honourable member can tell me who they are, I should be grateful to know, but I was unable to obtain any information that there were such persons here.

There are certainly people in South Australia who have had experience of drug cases in this country, but not the experience of the administration of the law in relation to these matters under the changing circumstances that have occurred in Great Britain and the United States of America. Mr. Muirhead was widely known to members of the legal profession in South Australia as someone who, in England, had particularly interested himself in this area of the law and who had been involved not only in practice in relation to these matters but also in various organisations, not only of lawyers but of interested persons who were involved in public policy and support services in relation to the scourge of drugs in that country.

He was by far the best-qualified person in both of these areas. The honourable member's attempts to denigrate responsible counsel in this way is of a piece of the kind of smear with which the Opposition seems to busy itself instead of getting on with constructive policies for South Australia.

TAXI PLATES

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board has considered, or is likely to consider, making any change in the present taxi plate system? I understand that the present system, which has operated for many years, provides for a white taxi plate for inner city areas and a green plate for suburban areas. I believe that until recently a taxi with a city plate could not stand in suburban ranks, but can now do so, yet taxis with suburban green plates cannot use stands in the inner city area. It has been pointed out that this is unfair to green plate proprietors. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether the board is likely to consider instituting a one-plate system, similar to systems operating effectively in other capital cities in Australia.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the Chairman of the board. The matter of issuing plates is not as simple as the honourable member has suggested, as there is a high price on the sale of taxi plates. They are a valuable asset, and I suspect that perhaps the person who made this inquiry of the honourable member may be trying to cash in on this. This matter has been constantly under review and surveillance by the board, but I shall be pleased to obtain full details for the honourable member.

MR. MUIRHEAD

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what instructions Mr. Muirhead has given the State Government regarding

the method of payment of moneys due to him? Is taxation deducted and does the Government pay moneys direct to Mr. Muirhead or into a bank account in the Bahamas, a well-known tax haven for British citizens, nominated by him and of which he or his firm is the beneficiary? I understand that Mr. Dennis Muirhead has openly stated that he has a tax-evasion scheme for the money he is receiving from the State Government, operating through the Bahamas. South Australian taxpayers are concerned to know whether the State Government may be paying the moneys due in fees and expenses to Mr. Muirhead into an Australian or London bank account or by direct remittance to a bank in the Bahamas. They wish to know whether Australian income tax is payable, or has been paid, on these funds, and whether Reserve Bank exchange control approval has been obtained. Is the State Government aiding and abetting in a tax-avoidance scheme?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked about five questions there, and Question Time is not intended for that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no knowledge of that matter at all. Unless the honourable member can point to anything that was unlawful or an impropriety contrary to the rules or ethics of the legal profession, I do not propose to inquire, either. I have never heard anything quite so low as the Opposition is getting at the moment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He ought to be made to produce the proof.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He had a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier to order.

WATER PROCESS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Works elaborate on a report that appeared this week in the national press on what was described as a revolutionary water treatment process developed in Australia? It was reported that the Federal Government would launch a multi-million dollar joint venture with private industry to develop and market the process, known as Sirotherm, which is claimed to be an efficient and cheap method of removing salt from water. The report states that the process has already proved to be a commercial proposition and has the potential to solve Australia's water shortage and bring in millions of dollars in export income from other water-short areas such as the Middle East and Africa.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member was good enough to advise me that he is interested in this matter, and I have obtained a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The department received two reports from Amdel, one in 1972 and one in 1974, which dealt with desalination in general and which referred to the Sirotherm process. The 1972 report stated:

The Sirotherm process is a unique process which promises to offer considerable cost savings, since low-grade heat, in the form of hot water, is used instead of chemicals to regenerate the specially synthesised resin. This process, in contrast to other desalination processes, is an Australian invention initiated by Dr. D. E. Weiss and is currently being developed by CSIRO, ICIANZ and AMDEL. Once fully developed, the Sirotherm process will have widespread application as a low-cost process for the treatment of low-salinity brackish waters. Bore and surface waters of marginal salinity (1 000 - 3 000 ppm TDS) will be rendered suitable for municipal and industrial use; that is, to be less than 500

ppm TDS. By comparison, sea water is about 25 000 ppm. Sirotherm is a partial demineralisation process but the coupling of sirotherm and conventional ion exchange for the treatment of brackish waters for power house use should be more economical than of ion exchange with high-cost chemical regeneration was used alone. Reverse osmosis also has a role as a roughing technique, but Sirotherm should be advantageous for lower salinity brackish waters.

I emphasise the last statement in the report. The 1974 report contained basically the same information. A small plant constructed for the preparation of plant process water has been operating at the I.C.I. establishment at Osborne for some years. This plant is for the production of boiler feed water from Adelaide tap water, which ranges from 200 ppm to 500 ppm, with Sirotherm being used to remove the bulk of the salinity, and conventional ion exchange being used for final polishing. I understand from the Perth Water Board that a demonstration plant with a capacity of 1 000 000 gallons a day may be designed, manufactured and installed in Perth, Western Australia. The financial arrangements suggested were for the Federal Government to finance the venture with capital funds and the Perth Water Board to meet the operating costs from State funds.

Mr. MUIRHEAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has Mr. Dennis Muirhead indicated to the Government whether he intends to claim the \$60 an hour reading fee, which the Government has agreed to pay, when he is out of Australia, or does the Government not know whether this fee will be charged? In reply to a question in the House, reported in the *Advertiser* of 11 October, it was reported that the Government has agreed to pay \$60 an hour as a reading fee to Mr. Muirhead when he is out of Australia. Is Mr. Muirhead waiting until the completion of the Royal Commission before submitting a detailed claim for the reading fee to which the Government has apparently agreed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware no account has been received from Mr. Muirhead. I would have expected that if he had an account to render, it would have been in respect of this reading long ere this. However, I will check that particular matter.

SEAVIEW ROAD WATER SUPPLY

Mr. KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Works give me a time table for the provision of a reticulated water supply to Seaview Road in the suburb of Yatata Vale in my district? Requests by residents of Seaview Road for the provision of a reticulated water supply date back to 1971. The member for Todd did much work for those residents in her former capacity as member for Tea Tree Gully, and we were both pleased to hear the announcement by the Minister earlier this year that construction would take place in the 1978-79 financial year. Can the Minister provide me with any further information?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to be able to report that the main involved in the scheme has already been laid. However, the scheme requires the construction of a small pumping station and tank. This has been the subject of an Environment Department assessment, which has been completed, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has now been told that, provided certain screening is constructed in relation to the pump house, the scheme is environmentally acceptable and that work will proceed immediately on the construction of the

pump house and tank. Unfortunately, it will take about three months to complete this work and have the scheme operational. I assure the honourable member that, because of the coming summer, I will ask the department to do everything possible to speed up the work so that the residents of this area can have the use and benefit of a facility of this kind as soon as possible.

LIBRARIES

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Education say whether the \$30 900 000 reportedly recommended for development of the South Australian public libraries system includes or is additional to the annually-budgeted sum for the State libraries system, and will he say when he expects a firm Cabinet decision to be made regarding funding for the plan and for amending legislation regarding the subsidies available to local government for the establishment of a first library or replacement of institute libraries?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think I should confer with my colleague, the Minister of Community Development, to whom the administration of the two Acts relating to libraries has now been committed, so that he can bring down a reply for the honourable member.

WEST LAKES SAND

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Deputy Premier say what sum of money was involved in terminating the \$100 000 contract with the earthmoving firm of F. T. and B. I. Thomson and Sons, who had been given a contract to move sand from West Lakes to Brighton, and will he say what value he considers the South Australian people have gained from the expenditure of their money to buy out this contract, now that the Government has apparently given the green light for bulldozers to move into the area? Also, how does the Minister view the reported comments of a Mr. D. Kuhl, who suggested that the validity of the company's beginning the work without Ministerial approval could be challenged? In an *Advertiser* report of 18 February, 1977, the then Minister for the Environment (Hon. D. W. Simmons) announced that the Government had approved the removal of sand from the Tennyson sandhills. One week later, the Deputy Premier moved in over the top of the then Minister and announced that the sand would not be removed. He said that the Government had terminated a \$100 000 contract to have the sand removed. Yesterday, we learnt that, despite protests, the developers would develop the sand dune. Following this final decision, it would seem that there was very little value in the Government's spending taxpayers' money to terminate the original contract.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has made some incorrect assumptions. First, I did not move in over the top of the then Minister for the Environment 12 months ago. That Minister was absent from the State at that time and I, as Acting Premier, took hold of the situation, which had got completely out of hand. The second thing I want to make clear to the honourable member is that the Government does not own the land; it has no control or authority over it, as the honourable member knows. So, why does he say, in this Chamber, that this matter has proceeded without the relevant Minister's authority?

Mr. Wotton: I didn't say that. I am just asking—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked his question and was heard in silence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member phrased his question in such a way as would give the impression that my authority was required before anything could happen on the land. In that respect, he is wrong, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Wotton: You read the *Bulletin*.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Murray to order. The honourable member has already asked his question, and I have already spoken to him.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In his explanation, I think he also gave the impression that sand was removed from this site, but no sand was moved away from the site at all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I listened and I know what the honourable member wanted to convey to the House, but he is certainly not going to get away with that type of tactic. I had absolutely no control or authority over the actions of the people who owned that land, or in what they did. As the honourable member knows, I could do absolutely nothing to prevent this, except purchase the land.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is the second time the honourable member for Glenelg has interjected, and I call him to order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member, even in his position, would not urge the Government to pay the price that was asked by the developer for this piece of land. I am pleased to see that the honourable member agrees with that, because I think the price asked was about \$1 500 000. The Government has had a report prepared on the importance of this sand deposit, and it showed quite clearly that this was not a natural dune but was man-made. It has no bearing at all on the frontal dune system, and the story that the sea would wash in because this dune has been levelled is absolute rubbish and the honourable member knows it, yet he has the temerity to stand in this place and suggest that I should have done something about stopping the developer levelling this site. I could have done nothing.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the contract?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I bought it out, and I ask what else I should have done. I will tell the honourable member why I did buy it out. Last year a stalemate situation developed when we entered into a contract with the owners of the land to purchase, I think, 50 000 tonnes of sand for beach replenishment purposes. The contractor involved in the removal of this sand was effectively stopped from doing so by protesters. We live in a democracy and we believe in democracy, so nothing was done to prevent these protesters from having their say and doing what they did. It was quite obvious to the Government at that time that no sand would be moved from that site. We had entered into the contract quite legitimately because this was considered to be a valuable source of sand for beach replenishment purposes, but it was quite apparent, even to the dumbest of individuals, that we would not get anywhere with it, so the obvious thing to do was to terminate the contract as quickly as possible.

From memory the cost to the Government was \$30 000, but if we had let it go on, as the honourable member seems to suggest we should have done, it would have cost the Government \$100 000. I stepped in, in the absence of the then Minister, and took action which was perfectly correct. In the present situation not one grain of sand has been moved from the area. Earlier this year I called the spokesmen for the protesters into my office and told them that the Government had informed R.D.C., the owner of

the land, that we would purchase no sand from that company if we were to be involved in buying sand removed from this site, but that, if it was able to deliver sand where we wanted it, we would pay for it and use it. The alternative was simply to level the site and develop on it. It appears (and the developers have certainly not been in touch with me) that they decided on the latter course. That is their business and there is absolutely nothing that I, as Minister for the Environment, could have done to prevent it, other than paying \$1 500 000 for the purchase of the land, and the Government was certainly not in a position to do that, nor did it intend to do it.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I do not intend to do so any more.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INDUSTRY INCENTIVE SCHEME

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a further statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the course of the debate on the Estimates the honourable member for Davenport, in relation to the industrial incentive scheme, said this:

When the scheme was first announced by the Government (the Deputy Premier made the announcement) it was stated that in the current financial year \$2 000 000 was being allocated. The Budget line shows only \$1 900 000.

The member for Davenport then said that there were some other payments to come out of that, so it was very much less than \$2 000 000. In reply, I said:

I do not recollect the statement by the Deputy Premier concerning the expenditure of \$2 000 000, and I should like to know the circumstances and the context in which the comment was uttered.

The member for Davenport interjected:

He said it on television.

I replied:

I am so used to the honourable member's misquoting, quoting out of context, and distorting, that I would rely upon him for absolutely nothing in that regard.

That was a perfectly justified statement in the circumstances. I was away at the time that this announcement was made, but I have inquired of the Deputy Premier and of my staff as to what occurred. I have examined the press release that was made, and that figure was not contained in the press release. The Deputy Premier did not go on television on this announcement. He had laryngitis on that day, as he has today. He did not hold the press conference, which was conducted by Dr. Barry Hughes on behalf of the Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order, and the honourable Minister is out of order, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Dr. Barry Hughes released the press statement, which contains no such figure as the honourable member has referred to.

ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. WILSON: Considering that the South Australian Government is facing a period of financial stringency, as evidenced by the reduction in expenditure concerning education and hospitals as announced in the Budget, does the Premier not consider that the costs so far incurred by the South Australian Royal Commission into the Non-

medical Use of Drugs are excessive or, at the very least, of great concern to the community? Leaving aside the question of fees for counsel, I refer the Premier to his reply to a Question on Notice by the member for Mitcham concerning research projects and research papers as commenced by the Royal Commission. The total expenditure for those research projects comes to \$114 298.74. The following are a few examples in this connection:

Research project	\$
Study of criminal statistics in South Australia	11 124
Effects of <i>cannabis</i>	3 625
Trends in psychotropic drug dispensing	2 162
Legal regulation of drugs	6 100
Pharmacology of drugs	9 623
Drug dispensing in hospitals	2 102

Finally, and I accept that there are more details in the reply than I can give here at present, a project entitled "Extent of drug use survey" cost the community \$59 605.59.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I do not believe that the expenditure in this area is undue or improper. The honourable member talks about our expenditure on education, but I point out to him that this State overall has the highest resource use per pupil of any State, and that position is being maintained.

The Government in South Australia is justifiably proud of the schools system in this State, which has had enormous improvements. Those improvements ought to be very evident to the honourable member in his own district. The position is that the State Government, given present financial stringencies, was not able to continue to expand education expenditure at the previous rate, but to suggest, as is implied in the honourable member's question, that the expenditure on the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs has nothing to do with children in South Australia would be very wrong. Indeed, one of the greatest problems that has occurred overseas in the development of the scourge of particularly hard drug usage has been amongst young people, and the mine of misinformation that has occurred in South Australia in this area clouds public judgment as to the best way to cope with this scourge for the future.

It was necessary for us to have a complete investigation to get the facts, so that rational and sensible discussion could take place, not on misinformation, not on emotional nonsense, but on the basis of the facts relating to drugs, their nature, and drug usage. The honourable member ought to have seen the kind of survey that has recently been taken, for instance, by some television stations about the nature of certain drugs. It has been put forward, just as it has been the basis quite evidently from the material already published by the Royal Commission, that many people think, and indeed many legislators thought in the past, that marijuana was a narcotic, an addictive drug, whereas in fact it happens to be neither.

It was necessary for us to provide that information. We embarked on this exercise knowing that it would be by far the most expensive exercise in a Royal Commission that this State had ever undertaken, because the investigation had to be world wide, not just related to South Australia, not confined to facts within this State, but related to matters right around the world. In these circumstances, to assemble all that information was going to cost us a lot of money, but we believed that, if we were to do the right thing in this area, it was worth spending that money for the sake of ensuring that this society did not go the way of some others in the drug scourge.

I do not believe that it is wrong for us to endeavour to

protect South Australian society on that basis, and it is absurd to suggest that, because in fact the Royal Commission has cost a bit more than we originally thought it would cost, even knowing that it would be expensive, the way then to act was that, before it had completed its work, we should simply wind it up and throw down the drain the money we had already spent. In those circumstances, what was the Government to do? The honourable member says we are now facing a period of greater financial stringency than we were when the Royal Commission was set up. Are we simply to cut it back and say, "There is to be no more work done"? A great deal of valuable work has been done, and it will be of great use to the community to have it completed.

HIRE PURCHASE

Mr. DRURY: Can the Attorney-General say what is the procedure by which those with hire-purchase commitments who have taken out unemployment and sickness insurance are able to avail themselves of such insurance? Are finance companies required by law to inform people that commitments will be met? It has been brought to my notice that certain repossession have taken place that need not have taken place, because those concerned had taken out optional unemployment and sickness insurance. Can the Attorney-General explain this?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Many finance companies associated with or owned by insurance companies adopt the practice of requiring persons who apply for consumer loans to take out a policy of insurance covering the repayments in circumstances where the borrower becomes unemployed or sick, or suffers an accident. No-one could object to the general intention of such policies, the intention being to ensure that any persons who, through no fault of their own, become unemployed, sick, or injured as a result of an accident can have the payments on their loans made by the insurance company.

The difficulty, as I understand the honourable member's question, seems to arise in circumstances where all the documents are completed, or at least signed by the applicant, in the one transaction, and where the applicant for a loan in some instances has no understanding, in a legal sense, that he is entering a contract of insurance of that kind at the same time as entering the loan contract. Many of these documents that I have seen are basically on one piece of paper, which comprises all the documentation necessary. Many people believe that the insurance referred to in the paperwork is insurance of another type—for example, third party insurance or comprehensive insurance on a motor vehicle, which is providing security for the loan—and apparently are failing to take advantage of such insurance policies when they become unemployed or sick, or when they suffer an accident.

There is a strong case for requiring finance companies, in circumstances where obviously they are aware that a mortgage insurance policy of the type referred to is in existence, to inform the borrower of his rights to claim under the insurance policy when that finance company is serving on the borrower the various notices under the Consumer Credit Act and the Consumer Transactions Act.

If this were done, it is possible that the policies of these people who have had their cars repossessed, or who have been placed under severe financial strain because of unemployment, sickness, or accident, would be used to make the repayments on the car or other consumer durable involved. I think there is a strong case for attempting to have such finance companies inform

borrowers of their rights. I shall look into the matter to see whether, initially, we can get some co-operative arrangement between the Government and the finance companies to ensure that people are informed of their rights under such insurance policies.

LIBERAL GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier say to which period of Liberal Government in South Australia he referred yesterday when he made the following statement in the House:

If one looks back on appointments made under Liberal Governments in the law area, one can only reflect that the honourable member has different standards in suggesting that there is some impropriety in an instance where someone with the same political persuasion as the Government is appointed to any legal position, but apparently it is perfectly proper for Liberal Governments to appoint Liberals exclusively in that area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not allege that the appointments to the bench were made on a political basis, and I do not allege that now. I do allege, however, that people were kept off the bench because they had political opinions different from those of the Government.

The Hon. J. C. Bannon: Laurie Stanley.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Laurie Stanley was kept off the bench; Harry Alderman was not appointed, and neither was Joe Nelligan appointed. Joe Nelligan and Harry Alderman made perfectly clear what they thought the reasons were.

FITNESS COURSE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier negotiate with the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and the Adelaide City Council in an endeavour to have a running and fitness course created along the Torrens River, beginning near the Torrens weir? In October last year, it was announced that the Government would set up a working party to co-ordinate activities of organisations involved in community physical fitness programmes. Dr. I. Jobling, head of the Department of Human Movement Studies at Murray Park College of Advanced Education, was put in charge of that working party. On 2 October this year the Government announced that a special Government investigation had revealed that South Australians were not as fit as they thought they were, and several recommendations were made. A person by the name of Tony Sedgwick, Director of the Institute for Fitness Research and Training, was put in charge of a committee to investigate implementing the recommendations resulting from the special Government investigation. One of the recommendations was that, to encourage people to walk, jog or ride bicycles to work, new buildings containing showers should be provided.

A Mr. Alan Digance wrote to Dr. Jobling, who was in charge of the initial working party, stating that he had been to Göteborg and looked at running tracks in that city in Sweden when the World Olympics for Veteran Athletics were held there, and that he had also seen running tracks in New Guinea and Sentosa Island. That gentleman said he thought (although Dr. Jobling never answered his letter) that the course on the Torrens bank would be ideal: once a person set out on it, crossing on the King William Road bridge, the university footbridge, or the Frome Road bridge, he would be committed to completing that part of the course, because to get back he

would have to run virtually the same distance, and so he would complete the course. The suggestion is that a small shower block near the Torrens weir would be an ideal location, as well as a beginning point, where people could freshen up. Such a location would, in the main, be closer to people working in the commercial centre of Adelaide who wished to go for a jog in that area instead of around the Victoria Park racecourse.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SOUTHERN BUS SERVICE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport again consider extending the State Transport Authority bus services to the more densely populated coastal area south of Maslin Beach? Premier Roadlines served that area and beyond to the south for many years until on or about 30 June this year, when the company withdrew for sheer economic reasons, particularly following the authority's erosion of the inner-metropolitan and more attractive portion of that service.

Mr. Darlington's service commenced with an S.T.A. licence, advice and co-operation, but with a clear warning about the dismal economics of the venture in a bid to replace the service to the sunset strip area (Moana to Sellick Beach). He, too, failed and ceased operations last Friday 6 October. Although loading reports indicate that patronage is not good, it seems from local pleas that there is a desperate need for a public link to be reinstated, connecting those commuters without any alternative means of transport with the Christies rail link.

Although the Opposition has been critical of the authority's losses and of the Government's refusal to pursue the line of joint ventures with private contractors, it has announced its support for extensions of public services where those people have lived with a private service (as in this case) for many years and where, through no fault of their own, those services (in this case, the service to the south) have been severed. I seek the Minister's undertaking to reconsider the plight of those disadvantaged folk who populate the coastal settlements directly south of Moana.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I find a series of contradictions in the honourable member's question. I think we are all fully aware of the utterances he has made condemning the State Transport Authority for its losses. He said "while patronage is not good", but he did not go into detail about what that meant. What he failed to say was that the statistics show that the loadings averaged five passengers a day. If the service were restored by the S.T.A., as he is suggesting, we would increase its deficit by over \$50 000 a year.

Mr. Venning: That'll make it \$70 000 000.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Rocky River to order for the second time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Rocky River, like the member for Alexandra, does not have to accept any responsibility: they can be completely irresponsible. They can criticise the Government for the cost of providing public transport and say that it is a wicked waste of money, as both of them have done, but when it affects their own little area it is a different matter. People in the area have contacted the honourable member. I know that they have, because they have been to me and said, "We're going to talk to the member for the district." I said, "Go to it for all you're worth," because he can be completely irresponsible in this matter as in every other matter involving him as shadow Minister of Transport.

Mr. Chapman: Is that what you told them?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. His question was heard in silence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The service was provided by Briscoe's.

Mr. Chapman: Premier.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member says "Premier" but, if he will only listen and try to get something into his head, he may learn something. The service was operated by Briscoe's, which, in turn, sold out to Premier, which advised the S.T.A. that it could not make a go of it because the people of the areas just would not use the service. It was taken over by a firm that I think calls itself Prime Tours Travel, which was advised of what the likely result would be but, notwithstanding that, it said that it wanted to give it a go. The S.T.A. said, "If you know where you're going and all the circumstances and want to give it a go, we're not going to stop you. Go to it, and we'll give you a licence," and gave that company a licence.

To the credit of that company it went out and door-knocked the area in an effort to try to whip up support, telling people that, if they wanted a public transport service, they had to support it, and if they did not support it it would collapse. That is exactly what has happened. The local people did not support it, and it collapsed.

For the honourable member to suggest that the cost of operating the S.T.A. should be increased by a sum exceeding \$50 000 a year is completely irresponsible, and the honourable member should know it. Indeed, if ever he aspires to be a Minister, he should adopt a more responsible attitude than he has adopted today.

COUNTRY RAILWAYS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is willing to take back from the Australian National Railways and keep operating the non-metropolitan railways of the State? In the week commencing 18 September the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) attended a conference in Canberra at which transport people from all over Australia were present. On Wednesday of that week the Federal Minister said that the States could have back their non-metropolitan railways. Therefore, in the light of that statement and of the consternation that has been expressed concerning these railways, is the South Australian Government willing to take back these railway services?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe that the Federal Minister delivered an address at the opening of a conference some time in September stating that either South Australia should take its railways back or not interfere or seek to interfere with decisions the Commonwealth wants to make. In other words, what the Minister was saying was that he wants South Australia to violate the terms of the transfer, and that is what the honourable member now suggests should happen.

South Australia did what Tasmania did and what, I suspect, many of the other States wished that they had done when the Whitlam Government was in power; that is, transferred the non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth, because we ought to have a national railway system, just as we have a national airline system, and as we had a national sea-link system. No-one can quarrel about that, not even the honourable member, who has driven his sheep on to the railway line when he could not sell them, and then got compensation. That is a fact of life.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Sir, I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement, which is totally incorrect.

Mr. Gunn: Why don't you get out of the gutter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member for Eyre talks about the gutter, but he ought to talk to his colleague in front of him who is in the sewer all the time. The situation is that a proper—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable Minister want to withdraw that statement about the sheep being pushed on to the railway line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am informed that the member for Rocky River did not drive his sheep on to the line, he just left the gate open so they wandered on to the line. I think it is academic.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: they weren't sheep, they were cattle.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can understand the point of order, because cattle are worth much more than sheep. South Australia entered into a legitimate arrangement with the Commonwealth in relation to the railways transfer. The first thing that Peter Nixon did when he resumed power was to race off to one of those legal eagles in Victoria to ascertain whether he could get out of the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways agreement. I do not know what answer the lawyer gave him, but he did not pursue that line. However, he has done his level best to dismantle the railway services in the non-metropolitan parts of South Australia.

The honourable member should know that there is a plan to dismantle all services, except the main lines, in South Australia over the next 10 years. The honourable member knows that Peter Nixon insists on the closure of the Gladstone-Wilmington line and the Peterborough-Quorn line, and that the South Australian Government is resisting and fighting his attempt to do that. I would have thought that, from a parochial point of view, the honourable member would have supported the Government at least on that issue, but we find that he is still supporting the Canberra octopus of Fraser and Nixon. I think it is a shame that he is neglecting the people of his district.

EMERSON CROSSING

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Transport say whether any consideration was given to a three-way grade separation for the Emerson Crossing? I assume, having heard a news report at lunch time, that it will be a two-grade separation with traffic travelling north and south on South Road receiving a benefit but traffic on Cross Road still requiring to physically cross the railway line. This will reduce by 91 per cent the loss of time associated with movement across the Emerson Crossing. Was any consideration given to a second elevation, or a subway, so that there would be no delay to vehicle or pedestrian traffic at that crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I welcome this question from the new shadow Minister of Transport. The Highways Department considered not only the three-way grade separation but also proposals for putting South Road under and over the crossing, putting Cross Road under and over the line, and at grade separations in various ways. The net result of the investigations indicated that raising South Road over the existing intersection was, on a cost-benefit ratio, the most desirable course. It is a job that at today's prices is estimated to cost \$3 400 000, including acquisitions.

Not only will there be a graded separation for vehicles

travelling north or south but also there will be an at-grade provision for vehicles so travelling, so that public transport and vehicles wishing to turn from right to left from South Road into Cross Road will still be able to do so. The resultant reduction in waiting time is, as the honourable member indicated, quite substantial. The delays will now be concerned only with trains holding up north-south traffic as well as traffic turning east and west. This is an effective 50 per cent reduction in actual operation at the crossing, because at present it is a four-stage crossing: turning right from east to west and north to south, and turning right from north to south.

Mr. Nankivell: Was a railway subway considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, as was taking the railway line above the road. However, much information on this matter is documented and, if either honourable member would like to see the report, I shall be pleased, if copies are available from the Highways Department, to let him study it. It has been sent to councils so that they may evaluate the report because, after all, any decision that is taken will be influenced to a large extent by their attitudes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INDUSTRY INCENTIVE SCHEME

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he may explain matters of a personal nature but that he may not debate them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir. I will certainly simply explain matters of a personal nature. This afternoon in the House, the Premier accused me of misrepresenting facts. If I may, I should like to relate the facts to the House. On Tuesday evening, when debating the various Budget lines and when talking about the industry incentive scheme, I said:

When the scheme was first announced by the Government (the Deputy Premier made the announcement), it was stated that in the current financial year \$2 000 000 was being allocated.

I continued:

If we allow for pay-roll tax rebates at a figure similar to that for last year, \$170 000, we see that the total allocation under the new payment scheme was more like \$1 700 000, and certainly not the \$2 000 000 claimed by the Deputy Premier. Perhaps the Premier can say why the Deputy Premier mentioned \$2 000 000 when the figure is more nearly \$1 700 000 or \$1 800 000.

The Premier then replied:

I do not recollect the statement by the Deputy Premier concerning the expenditure of \$2 000 000, and I should like to know the circumstances and the context in which the comment was uttered.

As the Premier said, I interjected as follows:

He said it on television.

The Premier continued his reply, by saying:

That will leave \$1 400 000 provided this year for a part of the year in respect of the Establishment Grants Scheme.

I reiterate that the Premier said "\$1 400 000". An *Advertiser* report of 8 September 1978 (and, to my recollection, exactly the same statement was made on A.B.C. News) was as follows:

Details of the plan were announced yesterday by the Acting Premier, Mr. Corcoran. About \$2 000 000 will be provided in this year's State Budget to get the scheme started.

Having discussed the matter with journalists, I understand that Dr. Barry Hughes gave a briefing session in which these details were given in the Deputy Premier's name. As the *Advertiser* and the A.B.C. News reported the story in the Deputy Premier's name, he obviously needs to stand by that fact. From the facts that I have presented to the House today, particularly the *Advertiser* report, it indicates clearly that I did not mislead the House and that the point I was making (that is, that the South Australian public had been misled) was, in fact, true.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I support anything that is put in the paper? Is that right?

Mr. Dean Brown: It was put in over your name.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member to order.

At 3.16 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill, which amends the principal Act, the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, is to ensure that, so far as is possible each time a general election for the House of Assembly is held, an election to return half of the members of the Legislative Council is also held. A Bill to the same effect was introduced in 1975 but failed to be passed by both Houses of Parliament. Since that time the electorate has given the Government a mandate for this proposal and accordingly this Bill is being introduced in order to fulfil that mandate.

As honourable members will be aware, members of the Legislative Council are at present elected for a minimum term of six years. When successive Houses of Assembly run for their full term, that is, approximately three years, half of the members of the Legislative Council do, in fact, retire at each general election for the House of Assembly. However, if for any reason a House of Assembly does not run its full term, it is possible that an election for half the members of the Legislative Council will not be held to coincide with the relevant Assembly election for the reason that no members of the Legislative Council will have served for the minimum term of six years. In some cases, therefore, a member of the Legislative Council could serve for almost nine years before being required to face the electors.

If this measure is enacted into law, an election for half the members of the Legislative Council will coincide with each general election for the House of Assembly. There would, however, be one set of circumstances in which this principle would not apply. These circumstances would arise if a general election were held before the expiration of three years after an election arising from a double dissolution. Section 41 of the principal Act, which provides for dissolution of both Houses of Parliament in order to resolve any deadlock between the Houses, also provides for a minimum term of three years for half of the

members of the Legislative Council elected as a result of a double dissolution. Section 41, however, cannot be altered except by a Bill passed and approved by referendum. In the Government's view, the expense of a referendum would not be justified in order to authorise such an insignificant departure from the principle sought to be given effect to by this Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 13 of the principal Act by repealing subsection (1) of that section, which provides for the minimum term of six years for members of the Legislative Council. As amended this section will now deal only with casual vacancies. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 14 of the principal Act and provides that half the number of members of the Legislative Council will retire at each general election for members of the House of Assembly. Subsection (2) of this proposed section makes an exception to that provision where the dissolution or expiry of the House of Assembly occurs within the three-year period of the minimum term provided by section 41 of the principal Act for half of the members of the Legislative Council elected at an election occurring as a result of a double dissolution.

Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts section 15 of the principal Act, which sets out an order of retirement of members of the Legislative Council. In effect, the application of this proposed section will result in half the Council retiring upon each general election, the members to retire being those with the longer period of service. Proposed subsection (2) provides that the term of a person appointed to fill a casual vacancy will be determined by the term of the member he replaced. The present section 15 provides that where the members of the Legislative Council have occupied their seats for the same period the order of retirement as between members shall be determined by lot.

This provision would have application only in relation to the election following the election held upon a double dissolution pursuant to section 41 of the principal Act. However, although the application of the provision is limited, the Government considers that it is quite unsatisfactory that the composition of the Legislative Council depend upon a lot. Accordingly, proposed subsection (3) provides that the Electoral Commissioner identify those members of the Legislative Council elected following a double dissolution who would have been elected upon the votes cast if the election had been for 11 vacancies only and that those members occupy their seats for the full term, the other half retiring after the three-year term provided for by section 41.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

INFANTS CONTRACTS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision in relation to contracts entered into by infants; and for related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill implements the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia in its forty-first report, relating to the Contractual Capacity of Infants.

The committee was unable to reach agreement as to any change in general approach to the law but confined itself to certain specific matters, all of which are dealt with in the Bill. The report points out that problems in this area have become less frequent since the reduction in 1971 of the age of majority.

The general principle of the law governing the contractual capacity of infants is that contracts are not enforceable against infants, as the law needs to protect them against exploitation and their own immaturity. There are, however, situations in which contracts may be enforced against infants; a contract of service that is beneficial to the infant is enforceable.

An infant is bound to pay a reasonable price, although not necessarily the contract price, for things which are necessary to him in his position in life and which have been delivered to him. Although an infant is not bound by his contracts, he can generally enforce them against the other party. A contract which is not enforceable against an infant is said to be "voidable" by him at his option. After a person has attained his majority, a voidable contract may become enforceable against him if he ratifies it, or in the case of certain contracts unless he avoids it within a reasonable time. The exact scope of the second class is uncertain but it is generally confined to contracts relating to land, the acquisition of shares in companies and partnership agreements. There seems to be no convincing reason for treating these contracts as different from those contracts that are not enforceable unless there is a positive act of ratification.

In some jurisdictions the Legislature has sought to protect infants or, rather, ex-infants, by prohibiting ratification altogether. There is no doubt that unreasonable pressure will be sometimes brought to bear on persons who have recently attained their majority to ratify contracts made during infancy, but they should require no greater protection than other young adults who are subjected to pressure to enter into contracts. It would in any case be difficult to prevent the parties from entering into a new contract that was substantially the same as the contract made during infancy. Possibly the provisions of the proposed contracts review legislation would be useful in these cases.

The committee saw no reason to preserve the distinction between those contracts which are unenforceable unless ratified on or after attaining majority and those which are enforceable unless disaffirmed. It recommended that ratification should be essential in all cases. By section 5 of the Imperial Act 9 Geo. IVc. 14 (Lord Tenterden's Act), which is in force in South Australia, ratification of an infant's contract must be in writing. The section provides that:

No action shall be maintained whereby to charge any person upon any promise made after full age to pay any debt contracted during infancy or upon any ratification after full age of any promise or simple contract made during infancy, unless such promise or ratification shall be made by some writing signed by the party to be charged therewith'.

The language is rather archaic and the section was no doubt drafted with the complexities of the old system of pleading in mind. In the Bill, the requirement that ratification be in writing is included in the clause relating to ratification generally.

Under the present law, a person who has guaranteed that an infant will carry out his obligations under a contract may escape liability on the ground that the infant has no obligations under the contract, since it is unenforceable against him. An experienced businessman would avoid this unjust result by asking for an indemnity rather than a guarantee or by making the adult a co-

contractor, but private persons may be caught. The committee has recommended that a guarantor should be liable as though the infant were of full age.

A proposed contract may be in the interests of an infant but the other party may hesitate because he cannot be sure that, if a dispute arises, a court will find that the contract is one which should be enforced against the infant. The committee recommends the enactment of a provision enabling a proposed contract to be approved by a court. In such a case the contract will be binding on the infant.

Where a person avoids a contract on the ground of his infancy he cannot recover any money or other property which he has previously transferred under the contract to the other party, unless he has received no benefit at all and the other party has not begun to perform his obligations. While this rule may be appropriate in some cases, it may work injustice where an infant who has quite properly avoided a contract must suffer the loss of valuable property because he has received some trivial benefit.

The Bill follows the committee's recommendation in providing that a court may exercise its discretion in ordering the return of property to an infant. The rules relating to restitution of property by infants who have avoided contracts are not affected.

The last recommendation relates to the position of infants who have a proprietary interest in land. The law relating to infants property was summed up by Mr. Justice Napier (as he then was) in the case of *in re Coombe 1941 S.A.S.R. 197*, as follows:

Apart from statutory authority the real estate of an infant cannot be bound by contract, nor settled by his parent or guardian or by the court, under its general powers in reverence to infants, unless it is a case of salvage, although the court does assume to deal with the interests of an infant in personal estate when it would be for his benefit.

Section 244 of the Real Property Act, 1886-1975, provides that a guardian may represent an infant for the purposes of the Act, and section 245 of the Act provides that, where there is no guardian, the Court may appoint one for this specific purpose. Although, as was pointed out in *Coombe's case*, the point is not free from doubt, it is probable that the effect of these provisions is merely to confer indefeasibility of title on, for instance, a transferee and to authorise the Registrar-General to register the relevant documents. They do not give a purchaser a right to enforce the contract against the land, nor do they prevent the infant from subsequently taking action against the guardian.

The Bill provides that a court may appoint a person to transact any specified business, or business of a specified class, and thereby to incur liabilities on behalf of an infant. This will apply to transactions involving any property, whether real or personal. Thus, where a particular transaction is clearly for an infant's benefit, the court will have a certain means of ensuring that the transaction is effectually carried out, whether or not the transaction involves some dealing in real property.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 is the interpretation section. Clause 4 provides that a contract which is unenforceable against a person because of his infancy shall remain enforceable unless it is ratified in writing by him on or after the day on which he attains his majority. Clause 5 provides that a contract of guarantee in relation to an infant's contract is enforceable against the guarantor as though the infant were of full age.

Clause 6 provides for approval by a court of a proposed contract. Clause 7 provides that, where an infant has avoided a contract on the ground of infancy, a court may order restitution to the infant of any property that has

passed from the infant under the contract. Clause 8 provides for the appointment by a court of an agent to transact business on behalf of an infant.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill follows upon the report of the Royal Commissioner (Her Honour Justice Mitchell) into the dismissal of the former Commissioner of Police. As is well known, the Royal Commissioner found that proper grounds did in fact exist for the dismissal of the former Commissioner. She thought, however, that there would be considerable merit in stating explicitly by Statute the grounds upon which the Commissioner could be dismissed so as to provide an unequivocal basis upon which the validity of a dismissal could, if necessary, be judicially examined. The Government agrees with that view and the present Bill has been prepared to give effect to the relevant recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. The Bill extends to both the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner of Police. It provides for the removal of either of these officers on the ground of incompetence, neglect of duty, misbehaviour, or misconduct or mental or physical incapacity.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a definition of "the Deputy Commissioner" in the principal Act. Clause 3 inserts new section 9b in the principal Act. The new section provides for the removal of the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner on any of the grounds referred to above. It provides that neither the office of Commissioner nor that of Deputy Commissioner shall become vacant except by death, retirement, resignation, or removal under the new provision. Clause 4 amends section 16 to make clear that the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner are members of the Police Force for the purposes of that provision. (Section 16 requires all members of the Police Force to take a specified oath.)

Clause 5 amends section 54 of the principal Act. This provision preserves the common law power of the Crown to dismiss any member of the Police Force. The Royal Commissioner did not think that the Commissioner was to be regarded as a member of the Police Force for the purposes of this provision. However, an amendment is inserted to make clear that this provision is subordinated to the new provisions circumscribing the grounds on which the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner may be removed, from office.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 11 October. Page 1406.)

Schedule.

Education, \$308 005 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister a letter that has been sent to me. I have deleted two names on this letter, because I do not believe it would be fair to reveal them publicly at this stage. The letter comes from a group of school teachers and part of it states:

The enclosed documentation may be of value to you in your attacks on the Dunstan Government for slackness and administration of Government bodies. The woman involved, Miss X, went to China because she liked the idea of a holiday there, and took her mother along.

She travelled the normal tourist routes with no special study tour spent in schools or anywhere else, and no notion of spending her holiday working for the Education Department, and this is common knowledge.

When she returned and learnt of the latest perk becoming very popular among the Education Department hierarchy, of visiting China at Government expense, she decided to change her story and join the graft queue. The administration seems to be remarkably lax with public money in financing jaunts to study an education system that is at least 30 years behind ours in development, and in Miss X's case, would have no bearing whatever on her work.

The slackness of supervision in Guidance Branch is notorious among teachers in schools who have to work a full day every day, and produce results. Guidance officers wander at will around the State in Government cars, and their supervisors rarely know where they are. After all, a supervisor gets his pay, and promotion, too, if he does not make waves, and there is no obligation on him to supply figures of achievement against target as no measurements of this kind apply in this department.

Recently, a guidance officer, Mr. Y, decided to go to China at his own expense, but did not request leave to do so because he knew he could fool his supervisor at Kidman Park regional office. He had been back for one month approximately when other staff drew the attention of his supervisor to his actions and he was hurriedly asked for a leave application which was back-dated and rushed through the system. The supervisor still did not know about a 14-day stint in Melbourne which he has enjoyed at public expense prior to the China trip. It has been estimated that if all guidance officers put in a 40-hour week, the department would have twice the number it needed.

To back up that letter (and I would not have read it if I had not had other documentation), I wish to quote the following memorandum to the Principal Guidance Officer, Mr. K. F. Weir, regarding a study tour of China, June 1978, as follows:

I have recently been fortunate enough to obtain a visa from the Chinese Government which enabled me to make a twenty-two (22) day study tour of China.

As an educational social worker, this tour was of particular interest and benefit to me in my work because of its emphasis on child care and education, and on the organisation of society in China today.

I naturally undertook all travel costs and made most of the trip during my recreation leave. However, it was necessary for me to take seven (7) days extra unpaid leave in order to take part in the tour (which was by no means a holiday!).

I understand that a group from the Physical Education Branch made a similar study tour in May 1978. The Minister of Education was generous enough to grant the teachers one week of leave with pay whilst the public servants were considered to be on duty for one week of the tour.

I believe, further, that the Minister gave backing to the physical education group's request for tax deductions for their travel expenses in the form of a letter to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation.

As I had no idea that such assistance could be available

from the Education Department before undertaking this tour, I made no further request than to apply for a short period of unpaid leave.

However, I should be grateful if you would forward my request for equal consideration with the physical education group, for assistance with the cost of this most beneficial tour.

That memorandum is signed by a Senior Social Worker, and is dated 31 July 1978. A further memorandum was sent to the Deputy Director-General (Schools), Mr. J. Giles, regarding a study tour of China, June 1978, by the Senior Social Worker (who is named). It states:

I understand you were involved in the provision of support to the physical education group's recent tour of China, as a result of which they were able to claim their expenses as tax deductions.

I would be grateful if you could favourably consider the request (in the attached memorandum, from the Senior Social Worker) along similar lines.

That memorandum is signed by Keith F. Weir, Principal Guidance Officer. It has a handwritten statement on the bottom, "D. Personnel" (I presume that means Department of Personnel), which reads:

Does this ring any bells? I'm not at all sure on what I did (if anything) to provide support.

Then initials appear, which I think read, "J.-something-G." I suspect those are the initials of the Deputy Director-General of Education. It is dated 7 August 1978.

Finally, there is a further memorandum to the Principal Guidance Officer, headed "Study Tour of China, June 1978," by senior social worker, Ms. X, which reads:

Please prepare draft letter concerning Ms. X's visit to China to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation for Minister of Education to sign similar to the attached. The draft should give details of dates and the educational value of the visit as it relates to Ms. X's duties in the Guidance and Special Services Branch.

I shall then recommend to the Director-General of Education that he advise the Minister of Education to sign.

That memorandum is signed by the Director of Curriculum and dated 18 September 1978. Incidentally, unless there is any doubt about this, the file number for the entire document, I understand, is ED-46-6-283.

That highlights several factors, and leads to my questions to the Minister. To comment on the evidence presented there, which cannot be disputed, first, I raise objections to these letters and the Government memoranda. They reveal slack supervision of some departmental staff, especially in the Guidance Branch. One Guidance Officer was absent for a month in China and two weeks in Melbourne without the knowledge of his supervisor at the time. Secondly, I believe the use of departmental approval for overseas tourist trips as a means of receiving additional holidays on full pay is an unwarranted technique. In particular, it appears that this perk is used after the trip has been completed. I have no objection to the use of leave with full pay for genuine work purposes. My third objection is to the use of Ministerial approval for such overseas tourist trips as a lurk to dodge taxes.

I think it also pertinent to say that it would seem that supervision in some sections of the Education Department is extremely sloppy and at times, apparently, virtually non-existent. It seems that departmental officers may be misleading the Minister of Education and using his Ministerial authority improperly to evade paying some taxation. Any officer travelling to China is apparently eligible for leave with full pay, even though the officer involved did not seek prior approval for the trip, or submit a full itinerary or report on the trip. Some rather

questionable practices seem to apply on a wide-spread basis within the Education Department.

Such practices seem to have the support of departmental officers, right up to Ministerial level. Did the woman, Miss X, who toured China receive Ministerial approval for a week's leave with pay? On how many occasions has the Minister of Education signed letters to be used for the purpose of making overseas trips by departmental or teaching staff eligible taxation deductions? Did the Minister sign such a letter to be used for taxation purposes? If so, what was the full context of the Minister's letter sent in support of Miss X? What is the professional value to a guidance officer of a visit to China? Did a guidance officer visit China without the knowledge of his supervisor and without prior leave being granted by the Education Department? Did a guidance officer spend a 14-day stint in Melbourne without the knowledge of his supervisor? During the past three years, how many departmental staff have been granted leave with full pay whilst travelling overseas?

The facts revealed in the memoranda and the letter sent to me are especially disturbing, indicating a gross abuse of travel privileges, and certainly the privilege of leave with full pay, by certain officers of the Education Department. It appears that supervision within the department is entirely inadequate; apparently an officer can go overseas for four weeks or to Melbourne for two weeks without being missed by his supervisor. He can do all of that with no approval and no leave form from the department at the time of leaving.

I know that documentation perhaps can now be tabled in this House that might contradict that statement because, as the letter clearly stated, now, apparently, after it was drawn to the attention of the supervisor, this person was required to fill out and to submit some type of leave form. No doubt the Education Department can provide a leave form for the one month's tour to China without pay. I should like the Minister to check whether this officer visited Melbourne for 14 days, and whether it is possible to produce the documentation granting him leave to do so. As I understand it, any departmental officer who travels interstate needs departmental approval to do so. The Minister nods in agreement, so one would hope that that approval was available.

I think the letter I read from the group of teachers clearly states the position. I am sure that a group of people would not have submitted such a letter unless they were certain of their facts, and that can be verified through my tabling most of the memoranda dealing with at least one of the two instances I have related. If the Minister will answer some of these questions at this stage, I shall then consider further questioning of him.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not intend to detain the Committee on this matter. The honourable member uses his normal tactic, on the basis of very selective information, which of course people in this Committee are not able to judge at this stage. Then he makes wild accusations about guidance officers in general, about the hierarchy in my department, about procedures in general for the granting of leave with pay, and so on. If he knew how many applications for leave with pay I knock back every year, he would know that there is very tight control over the granting of leave with pay. In a system which has more than 12 000 teachers, naturally there will be a reasonable number of people on leave from time to time, and there will be circumstances in which leave with pay will be justified.

As to the value of seeing the system in China, I do not know on what basis the honourable member suggests that the system in China is necessarily in all aspects at least 20

years behind ours. He was quoting from the letter, and was careful not necessarily to associate himself with those sentiments. He has been careful not to associate himself with the sentiment that argues that most of the guidance officers in my department are grossly under-employed. I am sure that the Institute of Teachers, which has lobbied me on this matter, would take strenuous issue with the honourable member's attitude on these matters.

As to the questions put to me, while I do not doubt that the raising of this matter is quite legitimate, I would have thought it would be more appropriate to place such questions on notice. I will obtain such information as seems appropriate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say whether it is common practice for leave with full pay to be granted after overseas study trips have actually been completed? On how many occasions has that occurred? When leave with full pay is granted, is it normal practice for a full itinerary and also a report on what was done to be provided? If members of Parliament travel overseas as an officer of the Parliament, they are required to present a report. It is astounding that apparently, as clearly indicated by the first memorandum I read, Miss X, when requesting leave with full pay, supplied no itinerary. The trip was made, and there seemed to be no intention to present a report of the trip. We only have Miss X's word that the trip was of value. It was not stated where she travelled in China, or what she specifically looked at, except that there was emphasis on child-care and education.

I am concerned that the authority of the Minister should be used in seeking taxation deductions for costs involved in an overseas trip. That is abuse of Ministerial authority. If the Minister has given details as outlined in the final memorandum that I read, he is guilty of grossly misusing his position. Obviously, he had been misled, but he must take full and ultimate responsibility. If full details are not insisted on, the Minister must suffer the consequences. I ask the Minister whether a full itinerary of, and report on, such trips overseas, for which leave with full pay is granted, are required, and whether it is the practice to grant leave with full pay after trips have actually been made.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Retrospective granting of leave, whether paid or unpaid, is extremely rare. I could not say how many times it has happened, but it would be very rare indeed. Normally, a person has to justify to the department, and therefore ultimately to me, the grounds on which the request is being made. That would include an itinerary, the reasons for going, and the professional enrichment that would ensue from the trip. These aspects are examined thoroughly before requests for leave with or without pay are granted.

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for making available to me earlier this year a listing of all positions in the department that hold directorates, assistant directorates, or higher status. I asked the questions because of a fear being expressed by some members of the community associated with the education system who believed there seemed to be a proliferation of top-management positions.

Indeed, genuine concern was expressed that there seemed to be a duplication of Directors directly responsible for finance. This was brought about originally by the Public Service Board's circular, dated 7 December 1977, which lists a position of Director (Vacancy No. 1356), whose duties were to be responsible to the Deputy Director-General (Resources) for the management of the administrative, financial and management services functions of the Education Department, and to make policy recommendations, develop management information systems, and represent the department at executive level.

Appropriate tertiary qualifications were an essential requirement.

There was already a Director of Finance—in effect, a Director responsible for the department's administrative and financial affairs. Is there a duplication, or is there such a divergence of activity now within the department that two seemingly similar top executive positions are required? Why has this apparent duplication been permitted to proceed? It may well be that there is an inbuilt quality to the two positions that makes them distinctively different, but it was not apparent to those onlookers of the education system at the time or from a document, issued at about that time, entitled "Inside Education, Volume 1, No. 1", which listed new directorates.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We first have to realise that, from the point of view of the individual teacher in the school, more problems arise in the administrative and finance area than anywhere else; this simply arises from the volume of work that has to be undertaken. I wonder whether there is any member who has not at any stage in his or her Parliamentary career been approached by a teacher with a complaint that he or she has not been paid for six weeks, or something like that. This arises particularly in relation to temporary appointments, ancillary staff, first appointments, and that sort of thing.

Dr. Eastick: Uncertainty about the—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, it is the sheer magnitude of the task that is the problem. The current Directorate of Administration and Finance is really flat out looking after what might be called routine sorts of problem. It was considered by the top management in my department that there was scope for a position in which a person could have an over-view of the whole situation and be free from the day-to-day slogging work involved in administration and finance.

Without going into too much more detail, that is the difference in flavour between the Directorate of Administration and Finance, on the one hand, and this new position about which he has inquired. It frees the individual from much administrative work and enables direct advice and information to be given to the Director-General on many broader sorts of problems. The person concerned has more time to grapple with these conceptual problems.

Dr. Eastick: Are tangible results already evident?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The position has only recently been filled, and it is currently subject to appeal. One can hardly say that the new person is off and running at this stage.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister indicate whether the internal computer system dealing with financial affairs and the payment of temporary and permanent employees has been upgraded, or is in the process of being upgraded? I point out, without reflecting on those directly responsible for this operation, that many of the problems seem to result from the lack of capacity within this system, involving not only the payment of wages to teaching staff but also the payment of accounts to outside organisations and individuals providing services to the department. I know of schools that have been unable to obtain professional or trade services because of this situation.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That has been a problem, and I appreciate the point that this is not a reflection on the people working in that area. It has been necessary to upgrade the equipment progressively, and there has been considerable upgrading recently. I take some confidence from the fact that the Auditor-General is largely silent this year about this sort of problem, although I do not want to suggest that it has been completely eradicated. As a

layman, I sometimes wonder whether computers are really worth the effort, although those in the know say that they are, and I accept their word. There has been some upgrading that I believe will help us considerably.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister say why primary school equipment grants were chosen as an area where cuts could be made? Further, following the Minister's statement last night that schools considered to be in need could apply for grants with the expectation that they might be given, how much money is available to meet requests from primary schools in need of such equipment? What will be the criteria by which need is judged?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: First, as to the amount in reserve, it occurred to me last night that I did not have that information in my papers and that I should get it. I have been delinquent today and have not obtained it. It is entirely my fault, and I will get it for the honourable member. As I said last night, this matter is in the hands of the regional directors, who have been told that the criteria that should apply should not be radically different from the sort of criteria applied, for example, by the Schools Commission under the disadvantaged schools programme: that they should look at the capacity of schools to raise finance in terms of the socio-economic profile of their catchment areas and that they should look at the equipment and facilities already available at the school, and at related matters. As to the choice of this area for a cut, no-one liked making this sort of decision, and it is hoped that in the next couple of years it will be possible to make good the cut that has been made. It would be quite unacceptable for us to have made cuts in other directions that would have led to actual staff retrenchments.

In other words, it was less painful to reduce expenditure in this area than it might have been in other areas. Although I do not personally subscribe to this philosophy, there have been those of the honourable member's colleagues who have given some credence in this place to comments that have been made in the community about over-supply of equipment in schools (microscopes being left unused in cupboards, and suchlike). I do not subscribe to that philosophy, but to the extent that there have been those statements made by her colleagues one would have thought perhaps this type of cut-back in expenditure might not be subject to the sort of criticism from the honourable member's side that other forms of cut-back might.

Mrs. ADAMSON: In response to the Minister's comments about the criteria, I doubt very much whether any of the primary schools in my district would qualify as disadvantaged schools. The fact is that, as money has been cut, the compensating amount is going to have to come from parents, and it is small comfort to those parents, many of whom have incomes that are fully committed to the last dollar, to be charged an additional amount by the school. The choice for the schools is a levy or fund raising. A levy is inequitable in terms of its effects on different households, and so is fund raising. My aim is to have those grants fully restored forthwith. I believe, having looked at the priorities, that this is an area that is going to hit parents hard, and it is my belief that those grants have been spent responsibly in the immediate past if not always in the past.

One further question on this general line involves the department's policy in relation to lending money to schools for capital works. One high school in my district, Thorndon High School, is attempting to use its own initiative to build a gymnasium. The people concerned believe that, with the extraordinary effort already made by students, if the money raised is to be used for that purpose they will have a good start, and they would like to know what percentage of the total amount will be lent by the department in future for projects of this nature that will be

totally financed by the school community.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This is covered under the recently announced variation to the old capital works subsidy scheme. Under either the new scheme or the old scheme, the department is not actually lending money: it is giving approval for the school to borrow the money with a commitment that the servicing of the loan will be met from the department's recurrent expenditure line. Under the new system, the amount that has to be met by the school is negotiable, but can go as low as 10 per cent of the total capital cost.

I have seen gymnasias at Christies Beach and Unley High Schools which a year ago were constructed for about \$80 000. They are fairly basic facilities; it is up to the school whether it wants more ambitious appurtenances to the facility than those two schools have been able to provide. If we are talking of about \$120 000, it is possible that, if the school can find \$12 000, the School Loans Advisory Committee would approve the school's borrowing the remainder with the servicing being paid for out of the Education Department's line. Schools should apply in the first instance to the Regional Director.

Mr. WILSON: I refer to the allocation for the Research and Planning Directorate. Can the Minister tell the Committee when the Government intends to introduce the proposed legislation relating to the recommendations of the Anderson Report, and whether the Government intends to form a tertiary education authority, rather than a tertiary education commission, as recommended in the Anderson Report? I ask this question particularly because the Federal Government has said that it will not fund State-based tertiary education authorities. Also, does the Minister intend that such a body will have the right of approval over courses, particularly university courses?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly. I intend to introduce legislation. Indeed, I hope that it will be introduced in a couple of weeks, although this will depend on drafting and final consultations that must occur. I am not sure what the honourable member is getting at when making a distinction between an authority and a commission, except perhaps that he is hanging it on the aspect of whether or not the authority or commission has the ability to approve courses or withhold approval therefor.

Mr. Wilson: I am referring to the Health Commission, where there is an overall umbrella control of the whole lot.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Very well. I make clear that, whatever power we give the authority, the Commonwealth Government will not fund it. At present, the Board of Advanced Education has fairly strong powers in relation to colleges of advanced education course approvals. Even if we were to retract from that position statutorily and not give this power of approval, I do not think it would make any difference to the Commonwealth decision that it would no longer fund such bodies, be they those already in existence or those contemplated, such as our tertiary education authority.

So, funding is somewhat irrelevant to the overall matter. However, it is certainly the Government's intention to introduce legislation. It is not contemplated in that legislation that the authority or commission (call it what one will) will have direct power to withhold permission for universities to mount certain courses. On the other hand, it is certainly intended that the authorities should have power to tender appropriate advice publicly to me, to this House through the annual report and, more important, to the Tertiary Education Commission. Whether that commission takes notice of the submission from individual institutions or from the authority in South Australia is its decision. It is up to the authority to win its spurs by the

quality of the submissions that it places before the Tertiary Education Commission.

Mr. WILSON: The Minister has anticipated my next question by arguing about whether the Tertiary Education Commission will accept advice from an overall State body. I believe there are considerable doubts whether it will. However, I refer again to the Anderson Report and the amalgamation of colleges, specifically to the amalgamation of Kingston and Murray Park Colleges of Advanced Education. I am sad that I will lose Kingston college from my district; it has served this State well and could have been retained as an independent autonomous body. Be that as it may, the dice has fallen and this is not to be.

Can the Minister give any indication of the time table for the transfer of the Kingston college campus to Murray Park? I understand that a working party has been examining this matter for some time. However, I am not aware whether it has reported or whether the Minister expects the campus transfer to occur within the next three years.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is more than one working party, the substantive one being the Joint Interim Council, which is chaired by Mr. Kevin Gilding, formerly Director of Adelaide College of Advanced Education. That council is charged in the first instance with providing me, in effect, with a draft piece of legislation that will replace the two current councils and their statutes with a new council for the college, as well as with a brand new Act.

It is substantially that document that I will be presenting to the House soon. It has subcommittees considering different aspects, such as the configurations of staff and future capital facilities. How long Kingston and its present staff remain in North Adelaide will depend entirely on the availability of funds supplied through the Tertiary Education Commission for the rebuilding of the college on the Murray Park site. Once the decision is taken, and I appreciate the honourable member's sadness at the need for this decision, I believe that it will be better for the amalgamated institution to be a mono-campus rather than a bi-campus institution. Ideally, we would like to be able to establish the Kingston people at the Murray Park Campus as soon as possible, I hope that this can be done within three years, but it will depend entirely on finance made available through the Tertiary Education Commission.

Mr. WILSON: The Kingston college, and I believe the School of Art in Stanley Street, to become vacant, are two significant properties, and no doubt they will be much sought after by various Government agencies. Has the Government any plans for moving departments into these buildings? I have heard a rumour that the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research or the Tertiary Education Authority, when it is formed, may move into one of these buildings.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Under an agreement reached by my predecessor as Minister of Education, the Further Education Department will inherit the School of Art building, and its present classes, being conducted at the Norwood Primary School (a situation which is not really satisfactory to anybody), will be re-established in the School of Art Building as from the beginning of the next calendar year.

No final decision has been made on the present Kingston college institution. TEASA will need a home and this location will be ideal. The authority will not take up all of the available space, so that some facilities will be available for students and student organisations within the college sector. At present these are based on campuses of the colleges where, by and large, they should be.

However, some student organisations and activities embrace more than one of the colleges, and there may be grounds for establishing facilities for them in a centrally located site.

Mr. BECKER: I draw the Minister's attention to one of his recent circulars concerning equipment grants to high schools. Can the Minister say from which line equipment and ground maintenance grants are paid?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The item would be under "Contingencies". All of these matters come under the various "Contingencies" sections. By and large it would be "General" under the heading "Curriculum Directorate".

Mr. BECKER: How much will the Government pay this financial year in equipment grants and ground maintenance grants to secondary schools, primary schools, and special schools? How do this year's grants compare with last year's grants? I refer particularly to Plympton High School, which will miss out on its equipment grant for the first half of this financial year, amounting to \$3 500. That sum has to be made up in some way. The school council is considering increasing the voluntary donation by parents to make up some of the short-fall. In addition, fund-raising activities will be necessary if the school library is to be maintained and if equipment is to be replaced. Henley Primary School and Fulham Primary School have experienced considerable reductions in enrolments. In such schools the pressure is on a relatively small number of parents to maintain the fine grounds that are made available. On behalf of these schools and other such schools, will the Minister take to Cabinet my plea that additional finance be made available to assist schools at which there are fine playing fields but a relatively small number of students? Will the Minister review the whole system?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It may assist the honourable member if I read out the main variations from the 1977-78 expenditure in specific areas. I will have to get additional information for the honourable member concerning specific ground maintenance grants.

The provision for books for free scholars is increased by \$15 000. Books and materials allowances are increased by \$172 000, which largely reflects the increase from \$40 to \$42 in the secondary book allowance. For conveyance of students, there is an increase of \$57 000, for equipment the amount is reduced by \$149 000, and fuel and power (electricity, oil and gas) provisions are increased by \$206 000. Equipment grants are reduced by \$512 000, and that is one of the areas of which the honourable member complains. Supplies grants are reduced by \$335 000, which it is anticipated does not actually represent any reduction in effort because in the last financial year there were carry-over payments from the previous financial year which inflated the expenditure in the last financial year. It is the timing of payments in this case, rather than any reduction of effort on that particular item.

Materials are reduced by \$175 000, and the amount for transport of handicapped children is increased by \$175 000, which includes a special allocation to cover transport to the special school annex at Adelaide Children's Hospital. Beyond that, I will have to get information for the honourable member.

He has asked me to place before Cabinet his desire that the whole system be reviewed. However, just what does the State Government do in some of these areas when, for example, in pre-school education we have to increase our allocation over a 12-month period of 45 per cent, merely to maintain the *status quo*, because of the wholesale cutback that has occurred from the Commonwealth in that area. I will not go on further about the outcome of the Premiers' Conference earlier this year, but some of these items are

suffering because of the enormous increase we have had to make in the pre-school area to "keep the show on the road".

I am aware of the honourable member's concern. I share it, and I hope that we will have a more favourable budgetary situation next year. There are particular problems regarding ground maintenance, where often in small country schools the pool of parents available to do this work is not large.

Mr. ALLISON: I refer to the provision for administration and finance. I do not know whether I have completely misread this, but, human nature being what it is, I envisage that there could be a problem with the work now being undertaken by Mr. Kevin Gilding, on behalf of the Minister, regarding the impending legislation, and he may be equal or subordinate to Mr. Ramsay in the amalgamation of the colleges. Is Mr. Gilding to be seconded on a temporary or a permanent basis to the Minister's department, or will he still be paid by or responsible to the colleges? This is a conflict of interest at a high administrative level.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Dr. Ramsay is the Director-designate of the new amalgamating college. Mr. Gilding was appointed to a position at Torrens College at equivalent to Deputy-Director status. He was then seconded from that position to me until the end of the 1979 calendar year. His salary is being paid by the Torrens and Adelaide colleges.

Dr. EASTICK: The amount allocated for transport of students has been increased by more than \$800 000. Does this indicate a new approach by the department and a change from the existing policy? I am aware of the demands made on the department for improved transportation. This is not because people are dissatisfied with the services available, but because there are anomalies. Some people are denied access to a bus whereas others, in an almost identical situation, but inside the radii that normally apply, are being transported because there is individual bus capacity.

I make a plea on behalf of the parents of young children who are being transported to school at an early hour and home at a late hour because buses are being used to transport senior students to a high school at a distant point. The problem basically relates to the country areas. I wonder whether the department intends to use mini-buses, and whether that policy is reflected in this increased sum, to try to give younger students benefits they do not now enjoy.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I should like to be able to say that this increase represents a significant expansion of services, but it does not; it is to cover increases in costs and contract rates. No significant expansion of services is involved in the additional \$821 000.

I am aware of the problem. The area I have represented since I came into this place at the same election as did the honourable member is not vastly different from the southern half of his district, and therefore I have experienced problems similar to those experienced by the honourable member. It would be nice to be able to reduce the 5 km rule to 3 km, but that has not been possible. The Treasury has been reasonably generous with us on the purchase of buses to make sure that the fleet is kept up to date and the children are not carted around in old crates, but the figure represents no significant expansion of operation.

Mr. ALLISON: I assume that grants for Aboriginal advancement will be placed in the general working account of the Education Department, as the Auditor-General states on page 103 of his report. The credit balance on 1 July last year was about \$71 000, and at 30

June this year it had almost doubled, being \$137 000. In view of the apparent urgency with which we treat Aboriginal education problems and the Minister's recent comment that Aborigines were to be trained on a time basis rather than on a specific term basis, such as our normal teacher trainees are committed to, over a four-year period, are we finding it difficult to obtain people of recognised calibre and quality educationally to train as teacher aides? Why are there such substantial amounts in that account, and why are they increasing annually?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will have to get that information for the honourable member. I imagine that it relates in part to the fact that this is usually section 96 money; section 96 of the Constitution relates to disbursements by the Schools Commission to us for specific projects, and it is necessary that we get the approval of the Schools Commission on how the money is disbursed. This means that from time to time there will be temporarily large balances in account, which will then be paid out.

It may relate to the time of the year when the balances have been taken out, but I will get more specific information to reassure the honourable member. There have not been any large-scale problems in obtaining people which would generate such balances, and that is why I do not think that is the reason for the figures as they are revealed.

Line passed.

Further Education, \$40 698 000.

Mr. WILSON: Has the Senior Internal Auditor been appointed to the Further Education Department? I think that more than any other department the Further Education Department comes in for constant criticism by the Auditor-General in his report. I do not wish to reflect on the department as such; it is doing a very necessary and important job. I bring to the Minister's attention comments which he has no doubt already seen. As in the case of another department, there is an unsatisfactory method of control over the issue of air travel vouchers. Regarding internal auditing, the Auditor-General states:

The poor accounting standards of some colleges of further education were emphasised by the difficulties experienced and, in some cases, by the inability of certain colleges to prepare an annual reconciliation of fees received with roll books, etc. The department has acknowledged that a properly established internal audit function would assist both the management of the department and of the colleges and would also help to improve the accounting standards of the colleges. A position of Senior Internal Auditor has been created but to date has not been filled.

That was the reason I asked this question. Regarding the College of External Studies, the report states:

An audit of the accounts of the South Australian College of External Studies revealed several unsatisfactory matters, including inadequate control over cash receipts, especially moneys received through the post, and the lack of adequate internal checking.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: To my knowledge, the position has not yet been filled and is the subject of negotiation between my department and the Public Service Board. However, the filling of the position is regarded as a priority area. As to the College of External Studies, a particular problem there has now been overcome. Regarding the general position in the colleges, as the honourable member indicates some of these problems will not be solved until the Senior Internal Auditor is appointed.

Mr. ALLISON: My office has received queries from a variety of sources about the Wardang Island project, mainly about the rationale behind the Further Education

Department taking over this project and being responsible for it. Criticism has been expressed whether originally there was any collaboration with the Federal Aboriginal Affairs Department, or whether any feasibility study was conducted on whether this would be a viable project. This leads to the question whether the Minister has been landed with this project as a practicality or a matter of sheer necessity. Does the Minister envisage that the project will become workable under the new management?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: When I visited Wardang Island earlier this year, I was impressed with what I saw. Basically, the project involves the Aboriginal community upgrading the whole island and the facilities there, for use for outdoor education. The Government sees the outcome of the process not merely being that schools and other interested groups can go to Wardang Island and undertake outdoor education with the facilities that have been provided by this programme; we also see the upgrading of the skills of the Aborigines involved in the programme as important. I personally see that as perhaps a more important outcome than the fact that some schools have already taken the opportunity of visiting the island; Elizabeth West High School has had a camp there.

Regarding who should be responsible for it, there have been fairly close negotiations with the Aboriginal Affairs Department all along the line. Cabinet believed that it was appropriate that it should go to the Further Education Department, because it agreed with me that the educational component should be critical to the whole exercise. As it involves adults, clearly it should not be the Education Department. The Community Welfare Department has always shown an interest, but it cannot provide the educational component.

I would not want to suggest that a feasibility study, in the sense that it is carried out when some private industrial investment is made, was undertaken by the Government. A fairly thorough investigation was carried out by officers in my department, the Premier's Department and, I believe, the Community Welfare Department before we went into the project. It certainly suggested that the location for outdoor education was superb, and that the need for a training programme of this sort for the Aborigines from the peninsula was much needed. It was recognised that certain basic facilities were already there. So, we would not be starting from scratch, but that is not to say that there are not continuing problems.

For example, we are having discussions with the Engineering and Water Supply Department for a permanent water supply for the island, because this is one of the areas in which it is deficient. Discussions are proceeding with local government bodies on Yorke Peninsula for the establishment of a jetty or some kind of landing facility directly opposite the island, instead of having to take the fairly long trip from Port Victoria, and other problems still remain unresolved. I am satisfied at this stage that reasonable progress has been made.

Mr. ALLISON: Regarding general staffing in the Further Education Department, will the Minister comment on the relative cost effectiveness of full-time as against part-time employees within the department? It has been put forward as a strong proposition that perhaps part-time employees, irrespective of whether permanent or casual, are more effectively employed on a cost basis than are full-time staff.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It depends on the course and the conditions under which the course is run. We have a large part-time component in the teaching force, and I have no criticism, from a cost effectiveness point of view, of what they do. By and large in the past where part-time appointments could possibly be made, they have been

made. This applies particularly to the so-called stream 6 area, the enrichment courses, but there will be those areas in which part-time appointments simply are not possible. I do not know that we can come down with a definite decision on cost effectiveness—it is simply “horses for courses”. Many part-time appointments have been made, and we certainly are not sorry that they have been made.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether action has been taken to examine the policy relating to the use of motor vehicles by staff members? One of the components of further education is that staff members move about from site to site, and not all of them report to the one spot each day. I believe it has been a departmental policy that, if a staff member is required to use his motor vehicle to get from point A point B to satisfy a class requirement, on that day (and in some circumstances by organising the programme on every day) the staff member is able to claim full mileage from home to college, and then to the point of teaching.

In some instances staff members living across town can obtain the total benefit on a daily basis for their transport costs between their home and their point of teaching. It has been put to me that an element of organisation is involved in some of the arrangements which gives some staff members a distinct advantage over others. If this matter gets out of hand (I believe it has in one or two places), it markedly increases the cost of providing lecturing services. Is the Minister aware of this problem? Has positive action been taken? If he is not aware of it, will he seek information about the relative total costs of staff transportation?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter has not been previously drawn to my attention; I thank the honourable member for doing so, and I will take it up with my officers. The Government is currently undertaking a complete review of the availability of motor vehicles and their use by public servants. That applies to all departments.

Mr. Gunn: Will you put identifying number plates on the vehicles as in New South Wales?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is aware that we do have the “G” disc, which is sufficient in normal circumstances. A public servant can obtain exemption from a “G” disc; that exemption applies, for example, to people in the Community Welfare Department, probation officers and the like. That is adequately covered by the department's actually asking Cabinet, which makes a decision on each exemption for a clean skin, as we call them.

Dr. Eastick: I was referring not so much to departmental cars as to the private cars of those concerned.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This will also be brought into the general review. I will take up the matter.

Mr. ALLISON: At page 108, the Auditor-General makes the following statement regarding the Youth Work Unit:

All salary payments applicable were not charged to the scheme . . .

Has a grammatical error been made? Were not all salaries charged, or were some charged whilst others were not? It would involve a considerable reimbursement from the Youth Work Unit in favour of the colleges if that statement were true.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that it is an insignificant amount, but I will try to get it quantified for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: How many electric typewriters, as compared with manual typewriters, did the department purchase last year? How many does it intend buying this year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain a report.

Line passed.

Libraries, \$7 180 000.

Mr. EVANS: What libraries are to be established during the next year in South Australia? Has the Minister a list?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not have a list, but I suppose that I should have one. I can probably provide this information in relation to the Public Purposes Loan Bill. This matter has been the subject of a public statement previously, certainly as to the next few years, if not the next seven years. The information is readily available.

Mr. EVANS: How many manual and electric typewriters were bought last year, and how many will be bought this year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will attempt to get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the steep increase in the amount allowed for the purchase of motor vehicles include an allocation for mobile libraries? Has the Minister given any thought to the provision of further mobile libraries? They are operating quite well in some council areas, but there are still areas where this type of library is needed.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This amount provides for the replacement of a demonstration mobile library transferred to the Port Adelaide City Council and Western Region (as announced by the Government last year), the replacement of a station sedan, and the purchase of a one-tonne van and a station sedan for the Public Libraries Branch.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister considered providing light buses to take aged persons to libraries and other facilities or does the Government believe that this matter ought to be handled by local government?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I recall the honourable member asking me a question about this matter a year or so ago. I am aware that it is something he strongly favours. We examined the matter at the time it was raised, but it is partly a matter of not being able to do everything one would like to do at the one time. Where local government is able to take on this responsibility, the Government would certainly cheer it on. We recognise that in some cases local government is flat out keeping pace with the library initiatives the Government is urging on it, anyway.

Mr. EVANS: I seek a breakdown of the amounts of subsidies to each local government library for the coming year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will find out for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous, \$26 357 000.

Mr. GUNN: Last year \$120 000 was allocated for community centre projects. Some of that money obviously went into the construction of a centre at Cook, involving the Minister's department. Coupled with that project was approval for a swimming pool in the same vicinity. Can the Minister tell me when funds will be forthcoming so that the project in question can be completed? The community centre at Cook is an excellent facility, and I am concerned to see that the swimming pool is completed also.

The Hawker school has been involved in negotiations with the local council and the Minister's department to provide a swimming pool in Hawker. I would be grateful if the Minister could say what stage negotiations have reached and when it is likely that his department will take over the administration of this swimming pool, on which, I understand, more work must still be done. However, the Minister will recall that during the last State election campaign much was said and great promises were made by his colleagues about this project. Despite that, nothing has yet come to fruition.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I point out that this item

does not provide finance for projects such as that referred to by the honourable member: it covers the Parks and Thebarton Community Centres only. However, I will certainly get information on the matters referred to by the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the allocation for the Specific Learning Difficulties Association of South Australia and, more particularly, to the problem that has been experienced in my district relating to young deaf people who have a specific learning problem and who seem to be in need of specific tuition. I am not unaware of the problems with which the Minister and his officers are confronted. However, it seems that these deaf mute children are intelligent people who become terribly frustrated after reaching puberty, therefore needing more individual instruction than they are now getting. I notice that only a small sum is allocated for this item. However, much more than this is needed in relation to these children. I draw to the Minister's attention the concern of people in the South-East regarding this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. The \$7 500 allocation is purely a grant to a private organisation that is indeed active, and it by no means limits the money spent by the Government on youngsters who have learning difficulties, whatever they may be. If the honourable member examines the earlier item relating to special education, he will see the total sum that will be spent in this respect. I am not suggesting that this expenditure meets all needs that exist. However, I want to place on record that the grant to which the honourable member has referred is a grant to a specific organisation and does not represent the whole sum spent by the Government on special education.

Mr. EVANS: One thing that has always concerned me about SPELD and its limited resources is that it mainly uses films produced in America to try to correct difficulties that Australian children have. After all, South Australia has its Film Corporation, and I have asked the Premier at least twice whether the Government would consider trying to produce in South Australia films in which people spoke with an Australian accent. Children who already have difficulties are confronted with films made outside Australia that are being used to help them overcome their learning difficulties. Will the Minister, through his department, check with SPELD to ascertain whether it is still experiencing this difficulty, and whether SPELD, the South Australian Film Corporation, and the Premier's Department could get together and produce more films that would be beneficial to the children to whom I have referred?

Also, will the Minister make available a break-down of the way in which the \$13 500 000 allocation is expected to be spent through the Childhood Services programme, and would he say whether all that money is State money, or whether it has come from the Commonwealth and is merely being distributed by the State department?

Can the Minister say how the South Australian State Association of School Parent Clubs is made up? Is it an association made up of Parents and Friends Associations or is it a separate organisation, and why has provision for this association been increased by \$200 for this year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The first suggestion made by the honourable member is a good one and I will take it up, because the Film Corporation has produced some excellent teaching films in the general area and in special fields. The South Australian State Organisation of School Parents Clubs is the present name for what used to be called Welfare Clubs Association, and from time to time was also known as Mothers Clubs, and it tends to operate

basically in the primary and junior primary schools.

Most of the money provided for the Childhood Services Council is for pre-school education with some provision for child care made available under special Acts of the Commonwealth. The State is now funding about 69 per cent of the total expenditure, but there is a Commonwealth component in this amount.

Line passed.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Labour and Industry, \$4 700 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister indicate what manpower planning techniques are now being used by the Government to produce long-term projections on the need for manpower in certain areas? Does it include different trade areas, and will there be fewer or more skilled tradesmen available in the next 10 years?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I appreciate the question because the Manpower Development Branch is an important part of my department. It has the responsibility of servicing the training council, and from time to time establishes training courses used quite extensively by employers in this State. Recently, we had a successful training campaign for people requiring assistance with tractor driving and crane driving and this type of thing.

In the past couple of years the Manpower Development Branch has mainly been making projections, not only for the short term but also on a long-term basis, and played a major part in the excellent report compiled by the head of my department (Mr. Lindsay Bowes), who, for want of a better word, was elected to chair the Federal-State organisation on manpower planning.

In that regard the Manpower Development Branch was able to provide much information. I hope the honourable member has had a copy of that report; if he has not, he should have had one by now. Further, he should have examined it. I am sure we would have sent him a copy. That is about the extent of the duties, apart from assisting with advice where possible. Mr. Smith, the head of the section, is busily engaged in advising on all aspects of manpower planning and training.

The honourable member also asked about future manpower planning in connection with the surplus of tradesmen. It is pretty hard to give an estimate of future requirements in the current economic climate, but it is generally expected that, if (and I use the word "if" advisedly) the economy picks up (and I hope it does), there could be a shortage of tradesmen. In the current downturn in the manufacturing industry it is difficult to assess the position. Today, I have examined closely the apprentice intake in South Australia, and the big decrease in the intake is disturbing, particularly in the building industry.

Mr. Dean Brown: What is the total decrease in apprentice intake this year?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: One cannot consider it in total or compare this year with last year, because last year there was an all-time record. The figure was 600 greater last year than in 1976, which also was a reasonably good year. I do not know whether the high figure for 1977 resulted from the Government's efforts and from the response by private enterprise. What we really need to do is compare 1978 not with 1977 but with 1976, which appears to have a more normal intake.

If we do that, the decrease is not nearly as significant as

it is between 1978 and 1977, but it is still alarming, so much so that I have decided that within a few days we will circularise all employers in South Australia asking them to reconsider the position not only with regard to apprentices but also with regard to school leavers. I signed the letter only this morning. Of course, many such letters are to be sent out, and it will take a few days to process the correspondence. I am writing to all employers asking them to reassess their position in the hope that they can provide more jobs. One would hope that this would apply to apprentices as well.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has referred to a comparison between years. We can take 1976-77 as a normal year, because in that year, despite the so-called peak to which the Minister has referred, South Australia still had fewer apprentices per capita than the national average. Figures recently released by the National Training Council show a 23 per cent downturn in the number of apprentices; that is a downturn not from a peak at least on a national basis, as suggested by the Minister, but what could be seen as a fairly low point already for this State. It was already just below the national average.

The significant fact is that now South Australia has dropped well below the national average in the number of apprentices being trained on a per capita basis of population. I heard Mr. Bowes give an address on manpower planning for Australia, I think in April this year, and I have a copy of it. It dealt not so much with specific data on each professional or trade area, but with the principles of manpower planning, the need for it, and how it should be carried out.

I specifically seek manpower planning information relating to certain trades, and I am looking for information that can be supplied to people so that we know whether or not there is likely to be, say, a surplus of bricklayers in South Australia in the next five or 10 years or a deficiency. I recently received some information from the Careers Advisory Board, Adelaide University, that I thought was quite staggering.

If one compares 1985 and 1975, the total number of graduates available to enter the entire South Australian work force will increase by 85 per cent in that 10-year period. The disturbing fact is that traditional areas that take up university graduates will not be taking them up at the same rate as they have in the past. I am thinking particularly of the Education Department demand for teachers and the growth of the South Australian Public Service, which is now frozen, compared to the rate of growth we have seen in the past seven years.

If this is the case, we will have a tremendous surplus of university graduates in South Australia. It has been predicted that they will have to move into new areas, such as into private commerce, as salesmen, marketing people, and clerks, and into other areas where traditionally university graduates have not been employed. Has the department carried out any long-term projections, on a three, four or 10-year basis, of the various needs and the supply and demand available in each job area?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member knows as well as I do that it is almost impossible to develop a manpower policy of projections at State level. Anyone who thinks otherwise is not thinking correctly. The States do not control the economy, its flow, changes, downturn or upturn. The States are in an isolated situation. The Federal Government has the entire responsibility to generate the economy. It also has the responsibility of acting in manpower planning, but has not done anything. For about 20 years nothing was done and nothing would have been done even now. A very minimal amount has

been done on a national basis.

If it was not for my initiative, and the support of the Tasmanian and New South Wales Governments, we would not have got the Manpower Planning Committee, the one chaired by Mr. Bowes, operating in the first place. There is little question but that, if the initiatives had not been taken at that stage, the Federal Government would not have done anything about manpower planning. So far as we are able to do our own projections for the State, we are doing them, but it is almost impossible, with the economic downturn at the moment. I will give the member whatever information is available but, in the present climate, I will not make a forecast that is tremendously accurate.

However, if the honourable member got his Federal counterparts in Canberra to inject some money into the economy and do some planning themselves, maybe we would know where we are all going. The State looks at this matter from time to time to try to work out the requirements, but it is impossible, in the present situation, to determine what our requirements will be.

I am told by some economists that there may be a change in pattern in the building industry after the new year. Others tell me something different. In such a situation, I do not know how it is possible to forecast accurately what manpower will be required in the industry. Although our knowledge is minute, it is no more minute than the information of the Federal Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Probably better.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I should think so. At least we have done something about it. I am not an economist and I do not know what will happen to the economy. The honourable member is welcome to the forecasts we have, and I shall see that he gets them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is possible to make projections on the housing and construction industry. It has been done by the Indicative Planning Council. I am sure the Minister for Planning could supply figures to the Labour and Industry Department outlining projections of the number of houses to be built in South Australia over the next two or three years, and possibly over the next 10 years. Some figures released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in relation to civilian employment in South Australia are especially disturbing. They show that, from June 1971 to June 1978, the total civilian employment dropped from 285 100 to 282 600, a decrease of 2 500. It is astounding that the number of civilians employed in South Australia is 2 500 fewer today than in June 1971, seven years ago. For the past seven years, this State has been sliding backwards and has made no progress in terms of private civilian employment.

Further disturbing figures coming out of the report are on manufacturing industry employment in South Australia. The latest figures show that, in June 1978, 102 700 people were employed in the manufacturing sector in South Australia, compared to 111 000 in the same sector 12 months ago. From June 1977 to June 1978, the number of people employed in manufacturing industries declined by 8 300.

It is well known that the department has been trying to tell the Premier for some time how bad is the employment situation in South Australia, and it can be seen from articles appearing regularly in the *Australian* that the Premier keeps turning down that information. He does not want any bad news, no matter how realistic it might be. We have some more bad news. I hope the Premier, as he seems to read certain parts of *Hansard*, will read this part. There has been a down-turn of 8 300 in manufacturing industry employment in the past 12 months, and South Australia has 2 500 fewer people in private civilian employment than it had seven years ago. That is a

disgrace.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think the figures used by the honourable member are a disgrace. We can go on about this all night. The honourable member well knows how those figures are arrived at. That is a major point in this discussion. He knows very well that the down-turn in this State has been caused by his counterparts in Canberra, and there is no denying that.

Why did it take the Prime Minister almost three years to finally recognise the unemployment problem, which he had not recognised before? According to the Prime Minister the problem had not been there; this is also the view of the member for Davenport, who criticised the South Australian job creation scheme. Let us consider the record of the Federal Liberal Government regarding unemployment. Right from the beginning of South Australia's job creation scheme, the Premier and I have been attempting to obtain assistance from the Federal Government, financial or otherwise. Every other capitalist country in the Western world has been creating jobs for some years, and that is the correct policy. This can be done by capital works. However, how it is done is not important as long as it is done. There must be concern for the unemployed.

On at least six occasions I have either written to or discussed with my Federal counterpart, Mr. Street, the problem of unemployment and I would say on record that I think Mr. Street personally wants to do something; he believes that something needs to be done. However, on each occasion that the Federal Cabinet was approached, assistance was refused. As far as the Federal Government is concerned people can just go on the dole. The South Australian Government then suggested to the Federal Government that, if a Federal job creation scheme was not to be implemented, reimbursement of the South Australian Government scheme should be considered, because of the money saved by the Federal Government. That humane approach received the assent of every Liberal and Labor Minister at the conference. Again the Prime Minister refused.

The member for Davenport said the Premier of South Australia had no concern for the unemployed but the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister regarding the same proposal, and he was also refused. We must not kid ourselves on this issue and allow the member for Davenport to carry on in this manner, telling downright untruths. He is not a fool, although he is some other things, and he knows why the unemployment situation in Australia is critical, not only in South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The people of New South Wales gave—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Davenport knows the message of the people of New South Wales to the Federal Government. If the Federal Government takes no action to rejuvenate the economy and get people back to work, it will be responsible for causing a third society to develop in Australia; so many people will be unemployed that a third society will be created. If that situation develops, with all its trials and troubles, the responsibility will be on the shoulders of the member for Davenport and his Federal colleagues.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: One must answer a statement like that from the Minister of Labour and Industry. Reflections like that (and the Premier makes them, too) are made by those who turn their backs on the fact that South Australia has a special unemployment problem, over and above the national unemployment problem.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You would do less damage—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: One knows when the bone of the Government has been hit. There is one Minister who

interjects whenever possible, and that is the Minister of Mines and Mouth—I mean Energy. He is known as Mr. Big Mouth and he certainly uses it. There is a specific unemployment problem in South Australia, caused directly by the policies of the State Labor Government.

I will present some figures, but I know that the Premier will not accept them. He has even turned down advice from one of his own departments—from the head of his Department of Economic Development—DED—and no wonder people call it that, not because it does not try, but because the Government will not listen to it. During the past 12 months, unemployment in South Australia increased by 52 per cent, compared to 18 per cent throughout the whole of Australia. How can anyone say that South Australia's unemployment problem is part of the national problem? There is a national unemployment problem, but it is much smaller than the unemployment problem in South Australia, which now has the highest unemployment rate of any Australian State.

We also have the highest rate of youth unemployment. Regarding the figures for the past month, no other State increased significantly, except South Australia, with a rise of 1 200. No other State has leapt above the 7 per cent unemployment level, except South Australia. No State has a youth unemployment rate higher than 20 per cent in the category of people aged between 15 and 19 years, except South Australia, with 23 per cent. South Australia has a specific unemployment problem.

Mr. Harrison: What have you done about it?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitten): Order! The honourable member for Albert Park is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister boasts about his State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I am trying to do something about unemployment, by pointing out the facts to the Government but, unfortunately, it will not listen to anyone, not even to its own advisers. Let us look at how effective the State Unemployment Relief Scheme has been. During the year in which the Government spent \$24 000 000 on the scheme, this State had the highest unemployment rate in Australia. Rightly we could ask ourselves how effective the scheme has been. The answer is "totally ineffective". The Federal Government introduced a system of wage subsidy, which has applied in other countries, and it has been adopted under what is called the "sweet pea" scheme and also the NEAT scheme.

The facts show that it has been extremely successful in getting younger people jobs and allowing them to retain these jobs once the wage subsidy has ceased. I have given facts here which show that, under the "sweet pea" scheme, there is over a 60 per cent retention of jobs by those who have been subsidised by the Commonwealth Government. Comparing that to the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, which this Government so boldly boasts about, we see that the retention rate under SURS has been a miserable 20 per cent. That is one of the main reasons why we have a high unemployment level in South Australia. It can be directly attributed to the State Government and to the fact that private enterprise, particularly manufacturing industry, has completely lost confidence in the State of South Australia under its present Government.

We will not reverse these trends until there is a complete change of Government policy or a change of Government. No new strategy has emanated from the Dunstan Government. This Budget simply shows a perpetuation of the present line. What is more important, the Government's priorities are wrong: it is prepared to give over \$10 000 000 to the arts, yet only \$2 400 000 in total grants to industry. I know that this embarrasses back-benchers, because of the unemployment in their districts, and I know

that it embarrasses the member for Whyalla.

The Premier, as the member for Mitcham said, has his own fads and fancies in the arts and is willing to spend funds on those fads, fancies and pet projects over and above giving people jobs in this State. South Australia has a serious unemployment problem, and the South Australian Government will not face it—it will not even admit that it exists, let alone do anything about it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Davenport knows why unemployment exists in South Australia, and he also knows that South Australia for the past 2½ to three years held up, much to his dismay, while other States around us crashed with much higher unemployment. When New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland had unemployment of about 7 per cent, our unemployment rate was down to about 4.5 per cent. I am not proud of a 4.5 per cent unemployment level, but in comparison with the rate elsewhere in Australia it was certainly reasonable at that stage.

The decline came a year later to South Australia, and occurred all of last year. The member for Davenport tries to blame the Government's policy, claiming that manufacturing industry has no confidence in the Government, yet my door has always been open to manufacturing industry (not one employer in South Australia can claim that it has not), as I am sure applies also to the Premier, the Minister for Planning and other Ministers. No firm has blamed our policies. True, a couple have claimed that our industrial democracy policy is frightening people from South Australia, but when I ask who is frightened, no-one can ever give me names.

Mr. Dean Brown: I can.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I challenge the honourable member to produce evidence of where our industrial democracy policies have kept people away from South Australia. I did not know the debate was going to develop into such an argument, as I thought we would deal with the lines—

Mr. Gunn: You want to sweep it under the carpet.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not want to sweep it under the carpet. The A.B.S. *Monthly Summary of Statistics* report states:

South Australia in the year to June 1977 was slightly greater than for Australia overall. In the two-year period to June 1977, however, the decline in manufacturing civilian employment in South Australia was 3.6 per cent compared to a 4.4 decline for Australia.

What is all this piffle about South Australia being in the worst situation? From the same magazine quoted by the honourable member we see that we have a 3.6 per cent level while the rest of Australia has about 4 per cent. The report continues:

The loss in employment during 1976-78 appears to have resulted from a deterioration in the eastern markets to which much of South Australian produce is dispatched.

That is the reason given, and there is no statement about the Government's policies or inadequacies, or any claim made that people will not come here and produce goods in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is true that, in the short term, the priorities of this Government are wrong. I referred to this matter on Tuesday, and the member for Davenport has referred to it now. I believe that we are spending far too much money on what I termed "the Premier's pet projects" when we could be giving this Minister and those concerned with unemployment relief schemes, and so on, more money rather than spending it on the arts.

The debate we have just listened to between the Minister and the member for Davenport sickens me, because each side is trying to justify its own position and to

blame the other. The Minister is defending the position in South Australia and blaming the Federal Government as hard as he can. That is the general pattern in this State. The member for Davenport is ignoring the Federal Government (and he is wise not to try to champion it), and is blaming the State Government for everything that has gone wrong. Both approaches are entirely inaccurate and inappropriate in this situation.

The trouble that we are in in South Australia is a far more deep seated problem than that and this is not only my view but is the view of many people in this State. Until the 1930's South Australia was predominantly a primary-producing State: it did not have much industry. In the 1930's an attempt was made to attract industry to this State. It succeeded mainly through the boost in munitions production during the war.

Tom Playford built on that after the war, and was able for 10 or 15 years to literally con industry into coming to South Australia. I heard a group of quite senior men in manufacturing industry say the other day that, in fact, he cooked the books and persuaded them to come here and establish in this State, when South Australia really had no advantages for industry. He was able, in one way or another (by fair means or foul), to persuade them to come to this State and build up our manufacturing industry here. Looked at rationally and detachedly it could not possibly last, and it has not lasted.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to come back to a line and say something specific about that line. I have been tolerant during this debate, but I now ask the honourable member to come back to a specific line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am directing my attention to the decline in manufacturing industry in this State and therefore the consequent rise in unemployment. I thought that that would be obvious to you, Sir, with your background. The fact is that, even before he went out of office in 1965, we were in dire trouble; it was difficult to attract industry to this State.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What line is the honourable member speaking to?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am speaking to "Labour and Industry".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What specific line?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: "Administration", Sir, 10.01. The fact is that now we are in greater and greater trouble, and the opinion has been expressed to me that in the long run it does not matter which Party is in office—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member with what he is dealing with. Is it the line "minor equipment and sundries", because he said line 10.01?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that is the same line as the member for Davenport started on.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to come back to the lines so that we can get somewhere.

Mr. Dean Brown: I didn't speak on that line. I am sure that the member for Mitcham could not speak about unemployment on that line.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Mitcham to speak to a particular line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point is that manufacturing industry in South Australia is declining and that it would be declining irrespective of which Party was in office. There is no doubt at all about that: it is merely a fact of geographical life in South Australia. We have not got, in the long run, any real advantages for the manufacturing industry here, and we will be lucky to hang on to what we already have got.

Mr. Nankivell: There are great disadvantages.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, there are great disadvantages. One of the advantages we used to have was the lower labour cost, which allowed South Australia to transport its goods to Eastern States' markets. However, we lost that advantage in the 1960's. The opinion has been expressed to me that anyone now thinking of establishing industry in Australia would be a damn fool even to look at South Australia, unless it involved a special case. We are fighting as hard as we can for Redcliff, which is a special case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member please return to a specific line instead of just wandering around all over the shop?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What line were you talking about, Jack?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member please resume his seat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that item 00-20 is a good one.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member for Mitcham continues to transgress and disobey the Chair I will have to take action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will let someone else take the running. I think the member for Alexandra wants to say something.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I heard through the amplification system a few moments ago the vicious attack made by the Minister of Labour and Industry on the member for Davenport when he referred to item 00-20, on which item the debate has continued for the past 15 minutes. Debate thereon commenced with a question asked of the Minister by the member for Davenport regarding a specific training programme.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have already stated that the honourable member must return to the item.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Item 00-20 is the one that is being debated. The Minister attacked the member for Davenport, challenging him to cite good reasons why industry in this State was refusing to employ labour, which refusal has resulted in our serious unemployment problem.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That wasn't the challenge at all: it was new industries.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The debate was taken up on that item. No new industries will come to South Australia under the present climate, and this is demonstrated each day. Worse than that, industries that have been in South Australia for many years are leaving the State. Those industries are not able or, indeed, attracted, to employ trainees in the category referred to by the Minister under item 00-20. That is what this item is all about.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is appropriate for the honourable member to tell the Chair what this item is all about. The Chair will listen to the honourable member and determine whether or not he is speaking to the item. That, unless I am sadly mistaken, is the way in which the Parliamentary system works.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I accept what you say. I wanted, in support of the member for Davenport, to explain a few of the reasons why industry is not remaining in South Australia but is transferring to other States and, accordingly, why no new industries are establishing here.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member doing so under item 00-20?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is so, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member could explain to me how the matter of industry's coming to or leaving this State could be discussed under that item, I should be pleased to let him continue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Before he does so, Sir, I take a point of order. The department of Government that

is concerned with the location and establishment of industry is the Economic Development Department, not the Labour and Industry Department. I therefore suggest that any discussion about industry's leaving this State should be dealt with when the line covering the Economic Development Department is being debated.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. It is exactly right. If the honourable member wishes to continue the discussion along the lines he started when I resumed the Chair, it would be more appropriate to do so in the debate on another line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. The Acting Chairman allowed a very wide ranging debate between the member for Davenport and the Minister on the general question of the industrial climate in South Australia. I then rose to continue the debate on that same theme and was in mid-flight, when suddenly the Chair wanted to stop me. The member for Alexandra now wants to carry on the same debate that was initiated by the Minister and the member for Davenport, and you are trying to stop him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not believe I can uphold the honourable member's point of order. If there has been a discussion between the Minister and the honourable member for Davenport, and if the Acting Chairman allowed them and the member for Mitcham to debate—

Mr. Millhouse: He did not, he stopped me.

The CHAIRMAN: I will respect the judgment of the Acting Chairman. I am in the Chair now and I will determine whether the debate is relevant to the Industrial Relation and Training Division line. The member for Alexandra was not referring to this line when I raised this matter.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The sum of \$1 231 000 for several purposes is provided under the allocation for the Minister of Labour and Industry. For Industrial Relations and Training Division, specific amounts are cited for expenses incurred by manpower development officers, the Apprentice Commission, the Industrial Training Council, and so on. I take it there is no question about the specific role of those respective officers and the approval for that sum. However, there is a question about the effectiveness of continuing that sort of expenditure in this State, when industry is being attracted away and there is no inducement for new industry to come in.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member agrees that there is no question about the relevance of paying \$1 231 000 to Industrial Relations and Training Division as covered by the line. The other matters he wishes to take up are more properly covered under another line. This has already been determined and it will be equally irrelevant to take up the matters then. I will not allow the honourable member to continue to discuss under this line, as he would tell the Committee, the loss of industry to this State and the reasons for it. That is not relevant to this line.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. With respect, this whole matter arose because we were talking about manpower planning in South Australia. If you are talking about that, and therefore employment opportunities and the lack of them in this State, surely you can discuss the reasons why new or fewer jobs will be created in future. We had quite a reasonable debate on this area of manpower planning, whether we expect there to be an increase in unemployment in this State, and whether there is likely to be a surplus of tradesmen. The points made by the member for Alexandra are quite legitimate to this debate because he is putting forward reasons for increases or reductions in the number of employment opportunities.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member for

Alexandra confines his comments to the manpower problems and the Industrial Training Division, he will be in order, but the Chair will listen very closely. The honourable member for Alexandra, in my view, was speaking on a much broader basis when the Chairman intervened.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I should like to refer specifically to the case of a young person who not only has enjoyed education in a particular field in this State but also is seeking a job. I wish to refer to the way in which he views the situation, despite the funds spent last year, in previous years, and this year on this line. This boy left school nearly a year ago when he was 16 years old. Apart from a few short casual jobs, he has not worked since leaving school. His letter, addressed to an employer, states:

When I left school I would have cost you \$73.50 a week. During the past year I have not really learned anything that would make my services more valuable to you but now that I am 17 I will cost you \$88.10 a week.

I shall cite costs that an employee in that age group would cost an employer in this State in the present climate, as a result of legislation promoted by the Minister of Labour and Industry in recent years. The letter continues:

If you decide to employ me, this is what you will have to pay me and do for me.

In return for my \$88.10 I will put in a nominal 40 hours a week. Allowing for tea breaks, etc., plus a bit of lost time after starting, and before knocking off, I will probably total about 35 effective hours.

Each year when I pass my birthday you will have to give me a rise—\$102.80 a week at 18, \$117.50 at 19, \$132.20 at 20, \$146.90 at 21, \$150.90 at 22, \$154.70 at 23, \$158.60 at 24. This is assuming that you took me on for clerical duties. The rates might vary a bit under some other awards.

These rises will not be dependent in any way on my having learned anything during the previous year or being able to do my job better. Perhaps I will be worth more but I will get the rises anyway.

In addition to this, you will have to increase my pay every quarter in line with whatever the Arbitration Commission decides is the change in the cost of living. You will have no control over this. It may have been caused by the Government raising bus fares and water rates, by a drought driving up meat prices or by a world coffee shortage. You will still have to pay your share and mine. If you can increase your prices to cover it, well and good. If you can't, well, that's bad luck.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I ask the honourable member whether his purpose in reading this letter is to prove to the Committee that the Minister of Labour and Industry somehow or other can affect increases in salaries that apply to juniors and that that might not be outside the Minister's authority?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is exactly why I am raising the point. The situation referred to is a direct result of the legislation promoted by the Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Let us look at the problems that an employer is faced with when a young man is seeking a job. The letter continues:

Over and above these rises, those nice people in the Conciliation Commission will periodically review our award and give us still other pay increases (they give it, but you have to pay it). These increases will be quite substantial and quite likely back-dated several months, so that I should collect a nice little windfall. I realise that you cannot raise your prices retrospectively to cover it, but that is your problem.

For every \$100 you pay me, the Government will charge you \$5 in payroll tax.

As an employer you will be subject to more controls and

regulations than I care to mention, and to Government inspectors and busy-bodies telling you what you can and can't do. This will get progressively worse as you employ more people.

We all know that that is the serious situation with which we are faced in this State. The letter continues:

There are 10 public holidays every year and you will have to pay me for all of these, even though I will not be working. I expect to be sick for two weeks every year, and you will have to pay me for this time also.

If I am not sick I will save it up in case I am sick for longer than two weeks next year. In case I do not get sick often enough to use it all up, I can take a few sickies and I know an obliging doctor who will give me a week off when I want it. It would be a pity to waste it. You will have to give me four weeks' holiday every year. I will do no work for you during those four weeks but you will have to pay me an extra 17½ per cent on top of my normal wages while I am away. It's pretty tough on you but it looks alright from where I stand.

On top of this, you will have to give me 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years or pay me pro-rata in cash if I leave earlier. This works out in theory to just over a week per year, but it will probably cost you about three times as much as that. The leave I accrue now as a teenager will have to be paid for at whatever rate I am getting in 10 years' time. Your accrued liabilities are going to go up every time I get a rise. By the time I have built up 10 weeks of long service leave due, a \$10 rise will add another \$100 to what you owe me for work done years earlier and for which you thought you had paid in full already.

He goes on to the prospective employer, and I say prospective employer because no way in hell are they employing those young people now, not under the sort of legislation we are faced with here. The letter continues:

In addition to all of this, of course, you will have to pay me for time off for compassionate leave for various reasons. You could hardly expect me to use any of my holidays. In a few years' time, I will probably get married and have a family. By then I expect you will have to pay me for two or three weeks' paternity leave.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I am fully aware of the letter from which the honourable member is quoting. I want to know whether it is proper to quote from a letter the author of which has not been named.

Mr. Harrison: He wrote it himself.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He did not write it himself; I know who wrote it. Is it proper for the House to have to listen to that information?

The CHAIRMAN: The decision is that the honourable member for Alexandra is in order in finishing the letter now that the Chair has allowed him to start it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Would you, Sir, ask him to name the author when he finishes?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is published in an industrial magazine that has been floating around the place. I can appreciate that it would concern the Minister. As I do not know the name of the author, I cannot provide it. It seems to be extremely relevant to the situation of thousands of young people in Australia, but particularly in South Australia. The letter continues:

You shouldn't really expect me to use my holidays for that either. If you think this is rough on you, just remember that if I was a girl it would cost you about 12 weeks' pay. You will have to insure me against accident or injury while I am working for you, plus all the time while I am travelling to and from work. It doesn't matter how I get hurt, you are going to have to pay.

I might disregard safety rules at work or refuse to wear the equipment you provide. I might hurt my back getting into the

car to come to work, or ram a stobie pole on the way home. You will still be held responsible and have to pay all my expenses, plus full pay for all the time I am off. In fact, I will probably be getting more money on "compo" than I would at work and will be saving my travel costs as well, so once I get on it there will be no incentive for me to get better. In fact, if I had a part-time job on the side such as serving petrol on Saturday mornings, you would have to pay me what I missed there as well.

If you try to dispute your liability you could find the cards stacked against you. Should I finally be cleared and told I am fit to resume work I don't have to go back unless I want to. If I don't, you have to give me three weeks' notice of your intention to cease my payments so that I will have another three weeks off anyhow. If it is finally established that there was nothing wrong with me in the first place or that it did not occur in connection with my work I don't have to refund anything, unless you can prove fraud or misrepresentation against me. Should I keep complaining of the pain or other symptoms when the doctors can find nothing wrong with me they might decide that it is all in my mind. I think this is called "compensation neurosis" or something like that. It seems to be compensatable in much the same way as the real thing and so I could pick up a nice little lump sum for that. The advantage of this sort of complaint is that I will probably recover quite suddenly once the payment has been made.

Within the next 15 to 20 years, I will probably begin to accumulate a bit of noise induced hearing loss. A fair bit of this will be due to amplified rock music at discos plus the motorbike scrambles I go to on weekends. Some of it will be due to other things such as traffic, jet planes and the noise at work.

A hearing loss of 30-40 per cent will probably not cause me any serious inconvenience but it should be worth \$5 000 or \$6 000. Irrespective of how the hearing loss was caused you will be held responsible for the whole of it, even if I was born with it.

The only way you could avoid paying would be to prove that you did not contribute in any way to any of it. Even the possibility of a fraction of one per cent and you must pay for the lot. I don't have to prove you caused any of it. You have to prove you didn't and there is no way you can do that, so I can look forward to a nice little bonus later on. If my hearing deteriorates further I can keep getting progress payments every few years. Your hearing will probably deteriorate over the years in much the same way but you won't get anything.

Later on, I could develop into a bit of a radical and become active in the union, doing a bit of stirring and perhaps even be a shop steward. I could have some fun and probably damage your business. There is nothing you can do about it. In fact you would have to help me, give me time off on pay for union business, use of a phone, a notice board and access to many of your wages records, etc. There is no way you will be able to fire me for my trouble-making. In fact, the more I stir the more secure my job will become. Even if I were foolish enough to give you a lawful reason to dismiss me it mightn't do you much good.

This is the sort of situation employers are faced with under the legislation we have in this State. The letter continues:

With luck, by the time I get to be a union steward you will have to give me time off with pay to go to Albury and learn how to screw you even harder. At the moment the awards that have it only provide for two weeks at a time, and only cover wages. Later it will almost certainly be extended to cover longer courses and leave you to pick up the tab for my travel and accommodation costs.

There is an incredible amount of information along the lines I have mentioned promoted by this article as simply citing the situation here that destroys the incentive for anyone to employ these people. No-one on this side denies

the serious unemployment problem. This letter appeared recently in an industrial magazine.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Which one?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I shall find it for you later. I have referred only to a part of the explanation given.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am finding it difficult to hear the honourable member for Alexandra, and I ask members not to interject, noisily or otherwise.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I did not intend to buy into this argument until the Minister started to boast in his attack on the member for Davenport, and that prompted me to quote this letter, to illustrate why employers refuse to employ young people in this State: simply because they are too costly.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What is the legislation here that allows for the increased award rates?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister's amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act have been one of the straws that have broken the employers' backs in this State. That legislation is destructive in allowing an employee to receive more net income when off work than his colleagues enjoy while at work. While that situation prevails, no employer with any sense will expand his business. There is correspondence everywhere, letters to the Editor and articles written day by day, about the drift of South Australians and South Australian industrialists to Queensland.

I have previously cited the case involving the George Raptis family, much to the embarrassment of the Government. The family was driven out of South Australia, their incentive to continue a multi-generation family enterprise in the fish-processing business having been absolutely destroyed. Not only did Mr. George Raptis leave South Australia, but he took every cent he could accumulate together with his top personnel and, of course, his wife and family. On arrival there, he received the sort of incentive that one would expect for an enterprising industrialist: \$2 600 000 in addition to his accumulated funds to set up business in Queensland.

I have received a letter from a land agent on the South Coast, demonstrating exactly what is happening. A letter dated 2 October, written by a real estate agent in Queensland to the Manager of a wellknown real estate

firm in South Australia, states:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated 26/9/78 for which we thank you. From response received to our newspaper advertisement—

this is a newspaper advertisement inserted in Queensland—

both locally and in South Australia, it is apparent that vast numbers of persons are dissatisfied with Mr. Dunstan's Labor State and are moving to Queensland's Sunshine State in rapidly increasing numbers.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Members can laugh, but that quote is from a letter that arrived in a land agent's office a few days ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I pointed out to the honourable member earlier that any discussion he wished to follow along that line had to be related completely to the manpower policy that he alleges the honourable Minister is following.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have very little else to say about this, Mr. Chairman. The unemployment situation prevailing in South Australia is directly related to available manpower not being employed because of the matters that I have brought to the Minister's attention this afternoon, as well as many more other matters. It would take hours to cite the disincentives that apply in the industrial sphere in South Australia.

I know from my own experience, as the Minister would well know, that in 1972 I had 76 on the pay-roll. How many have I now? Only six! I would have none, if I could get away with it. That is after developing a business for 25 years, but at present no-one will involve me as an employer. I fully appreciate, from my limited experience, why people are trying to phase out their businesses in this State. There is no incentive left here to employ people, let alone young school-leavers, who are so costly and without experience, and who are a burden on the industrial employer.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 17 October at 2 p.m.