

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 October 1978

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

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*; Nos. 535, 550, 575, 591, 592, 594, 603, 620, 624, 637, 640, 643-45, 647, 649, 667, 669, 671, 674, 675, 678, and 693.

## CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT

535. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many charges have been laid so far under the Classification of Publications Act?
2. How many of these charges laid did not proceed to prosecution?
3. Have any of these charges been withdrawn and, if so, why?
4. Have any of these charges been dismissed and, if so, why?
5. What is the number of successful prosecutions?
6. What was the fine paid in each successful prosecution?
7. Have all fines been paid?
8. Has there been more than one successful prosecution against any one trade and/or store?
9. Have any prosecutions failed and, if so, how many?
10. What were the costs in each case awarded against the State?
11. What is the average length of time before a charge is heard in court?
12. How many prosecutions have there been under section 33 of the Police Offences Act in each year since 1 January 1972?
13. How many have been successful in each year?
14. What fines have resulted in each successful case?
15. How many prosecutions have been unsuccessful?

The **Hon. PETER DUNCAN**: Statistical data collection on the scale required to answer all the questions asked by the honourable member in the House of Assembly on 14 September 1978 is not maintained within the Police Department. The Police Department Crime Reporting System is essentially "offence-based", as opposed to "offender-based", and it would take costly computer-assisted search to isolate relevant reports, followed by labourious manual location/extraction of data from the source documents to obtain answers to most of the questions. The following information is therefore supplied from readily available records:

## Classification of Publications Act:

Since the Act was proclaimed, 37 charges under the Act have been laid; 24 of these charges related to the financial year ended 30 June 1978, and at that date the results of 22 charges were still pending.

## Section 33 of the Police Offences Act:

The information recorded for each of the financial years from 1 July 1971 is:

	Offences reported	Persons prosecuted
1971-72	15	3
1972-73	20	6
1973-74	22	8
1974-75	8	1
1975-76	12	8
1976-77	3	Nil
1977-78	22	Results not yet available

Prosecutions under section 33 of the Police Offences Act shall not be instituted without the written consent of the Minister. The Premier has been the consenting Minister since 1973. There has been no instance of the Premier refusing to give his consent to any police request for a prosecution under this section.

## BUILDING APPROVALS

550. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is it necessary for rural landholders to obtain approval from the State Planning Authority before erecting sheds, sheepyards, and other farm buildings, including homesteads and, if so, what are the reasons?
2. What has prompted the State Planning Authority to carry out an advertising programme in relation to the erection of buildings?

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON**: The replies are as follows:

1. The situation regarding the need for consent being given to the erection of rural buildings varies in different parts of the State. In areas of State significance, such as the Flinders Range, the State Planning Authority normally controls the erection of rural buildings under Interim Development Control. In most other parts of the State the control has been delegated to local councils. In one or two instances, such as the District Council of Mount Barker, the authority has offered to delegate interim development control to the council, but as yet the offer has not been accepted. There are also some areas of the State where neither the State Planning Authority nor the council exercises any control over rural buildings under interim development control.
2. The reason the authority has recently carried out an advertising programme in this regard is particularly relevant to the areas of the Flinders Range where no control is exercised under the Building Act by councils. As a result, many people in the area do not appreciate that they have to seek approval under interim development control even where the Building Act does not apply. The programme was carried out throughout the State because of the need to ensure that people do not expect that they can commence building without planning approval being obtained.

## HAHNDORF LAND

575. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Has the Government made a decision in relation to the transfer of land currently owned by the Government on Paechtown Road at Hahndorf to the Mount Barker council and, if so, what are the details relating to this transfer and, if not, why not?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The Highways Department owns two parcels of land surplus to requirements in Paechtown Road, Hahndorf. The District Council of Mount Barker, together with other Government departments and instrumentalities, have not expressed interest in purchasing either property and it is proposed to dispose of them by public auction.

## COUNCIL GRANTS

591. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What has been the allocation of funds to individual local Government Bodies for 1978-79 and how do these amounts compare with the amounts for 1977-78?
2. If any councils have received no allocation for 1978-79 which are these councils and why have they not received funding?

3. If any councils have received less than 50 per cent of their 1977-78 allocation for 1978-79, which are they and why was their reduction so high?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is assumed the honourable member is referring to grants to local government recommended by the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission. Details for 1977-78 are available in the Parliamentary Library and 1978-79 from the Leader of the Opposition.

2. Every council received an allocation for 1978-79.

3. No council received less than 50 per cent of its 1977-78 allocation.

### RAILWAYS TRANSFER

592. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What was the final transfer date for the railway agreement and how many employees were transferred on that date and what was the amount of superannuation payable to those employees at that date?

2. What options were finally agreed in respect of superannuation entitlements and how many employees accepted each such option?

3. Have any employees lost job advancement opportunities as a result of the change and, if so, what are the details?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 1 March 1978.

(b) 7 783 employees transferred.

(c) Employees do not become entitled to superannuation payment until such time as they qualify by retirement, sickness or other prescribed reasons.

2. Employees were allowed the option of remaining in the South Australian superannuation scheme or transferring to the Commonwealth scheme. A total of 3 769 employees elected to remain in the South Australian scheme.

3. The authority is not aware of any specific instances.

### FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

594. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Which person carried out the analysis of roast lamb and roast beef from the Frozen Food Factory and an independent wholesaler as mentioned by the Premier in the House of Assembly on 9 August 1978?

2. Will the Premier table the full report of his analysis and, if not, why not?

3. For which organisation or department did this person work when the analysis was carried out?

4. Was the product sold by the wholesaler sold as containing 50 per cent gravy?

5. How many samples of each product were tested for its meat content and gravy content and what was the standard error for each of the analyses?

6. What analytical techniques were used to make these analyses?

7. What were the qualifications of the persons who carried out the analyses?

8. Did this person work for the frozen food service at the time of carrying out the analyses?

9. Was this person related to any of the Premier's staff and, if so, what was the relationship and with what staff member?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Quality Control Chemist (Bachelor of Science) who is responsible to the Quality Assurance Superintendent (Bachelor of Applied Science) analysed the roast

beef products. As stated by the Premier on 9 August 1978, no supplies of roast lamb were available for analysis.

2. No. Tabling the report would identify the wholesaler. A further analysis has been conducted under the control of the Director of Chemistry and Government Analyst. This analysis showed that the Frozen Food Service product was 98 per cent meat per kilogramme and the wholesaler's product was only 55 per cent meat per kilogramme, thus supporting the results of the earlier analysis.

3. Frozen Food Service.

4. The product was sold by the wholesaler as roast beef in gravy. No gravy percentage was specified on the label.

5. Refer to No. 2.

6. The analysis consisted of thawing the sample, washing the gravy from the meat using a 2 mm sieve, draining the residue, and weighing it.

7. Bachelor of Science.

8. Yes.

9. No.

### STATE ELECTIONS

603. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. How many persons were prosecuted for failing to vote at the 1977 State elections and what were the results of those prosecutions?

2. How many persons received a fine from the Electoral Commissioner for having failed to provide "a sufficient or valid reason" for having failed to vote, and have all paid and, if not, what are the details?

3. What was the electorate distribution of those prosecuted, those found guilty, and those required to pay a fine?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 374 persons were charged before courts: 373 were convicted and in one case the charge was proved but the complaint was dismissed under the Offenders Probation Act. (Comprised of those persons who failed to respond to notices sent out by Electoral Commissioner plus those who failed to pay expiation fees (See answer to 2).)

2. A total of 403 electors were given the option of being dealt with by Electoral Commissioner or appearing before a court: 358 of these paid expiation fees to Electoral Commissioner. The balance of 45 who failed to pay expiation fees were charged before courts and are included in answer to 1.

3. The electorate distribution of the persons referred to in 1 and 2 above is set out in the following schedule:

Electorate distribution of persons whose reasons for not voting were not considered to be valid and sufficient and who were either dealt with by Electoral Commissioner or convicted by courts.

House of Assembly District	Dealt with Electoral Commissioner	Convicted by courts
Adelaide . . . . .	14	16
Albert Park . . . . .	4	10
Alexandra . . . . .	8	—
Ascot Park . . . . .	4	2
Baudin . . . . .	14	6
Bragg . . . . .	10	6
Brighton . . . . .	2	1
Chaffey . . . . .	7	7
Coles . . . . .	6	3
Davenport . . . . .	1	5

House of Assembly District	Dealt with Electoral Commissioner	Convicted by courts
Elizabeth	15	7
Eyre	13	23
Fisher	12	5
Flinders	8	18
Florey	5	14
Gilles	9	13
Glenelg	3	1
Goyder	3	6
Hanson	8	8
Hartley	1	5
Henley Beach	9	6
Kavel	7	2
Light	4	1
Mallee	6	3
Mawson	11	3
Mitcham	4	1
Mitchell	9	3
Morphett	2	12
Mount Gambier	8	11
Murray	3	4
Napier	11	12
Newland	7	8
Norwood	10	6
Peake	2	5
Playford	5	11
Price	5	12
Rocky River	4	6
Ross Smith	9	4
Salisbury	25	13
Semaphore	8	20
Spence	4	6
Stuart	14	10
Todd	8	8
Torrens	10	19
Unley	4	8
Victoria	8	6 + 1*
Whyalla	15	17
	<hr/> 358	<hr/> 373

\*One person dismissed under Offenders Probation Act.

**FAMILY TICKET**

620. Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. When will the family ticket for travel on State Transport Authority vehicles be made available at a cost of \$2 as announced in 1977?

2. Is the Minister aware that other States have introduced similar types of tickets for public transport and, if so, what has been the cause of the delay in introducing these family tickets for South Australian people?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Early 1979.

2. Yes. The delay in introducing them in South Australia has been caused by the time required to modify machines to stamp the appropriate information on the tickets.

**RATES**

624. Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Can a plan entered into by a ratepayer and a district council for the payment

of rates by instalments include an interest charge on any of the instalments?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

**ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

637. Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many people were employed by the Government in each division of the Environment Department at 30 June 1977 and 1978, respectively?

2. What reason can the Minister provide for the fact that there was a larger decrease in the number of public servants employed in the Environment Department than in any other department in this 12-month period?

3. How many people (a) resigned; and (b) transferred, from each division in that 12-month period?

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

Division	Salaried Officers	
	as at 30/6/77	as at 30/6/78
Administration and Finance	48	46
Environment (now Projects and Assessments)	27	55
Coast Protection	11	13
Land Price Control	7	—
National Parks and Wildlife	70	74
Museum	63	—
Botanic Gardens	30	—
Co-ordination and Policy	—	4
	<hr/> 256	<hr/> 192

The figure of 285 previously given for 30 June 1977 included 29 officers from the State Planning Office whose records had not then been transferred to the Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department.

Upon the basis of information given by the Environment Department to Organisation Services Division for staff ceiling purposes the figure of 192 as at 30 June 1978 should be 196.

2. The reasons for the large decrease in public servants for the 12-month period was the transfer of Botanic Gardens and Museum staff to the Education Department in 1977-78 and land price control staff to the Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department in October 1977.

The department, following its reorganisation, has had an overall increase of 26 staff for the same period.

Division	Resignations	
	Transfers	tions
Administration and Finance	11	5
Environment (Projects and Assessments)	2	—
Coast Protection	—	—
National Parks and Wildlife	1	5
Co-ordination and Policy	—	—
Land Price Control	—	—
*Museum	—	5
*Botanic Gardens	—	2
	<hr/> 14	<hr/> 17

\*Transferred to Education Department in October 1977. The transferees were all promotions to other departments except for four officers who transferred from the Administration and Finance Division with the previous Minister when he took up his duties as Chief Secretary.

**FAUNA**

640. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):
1. Have the eggs of emus, Cape Barren geese and swans been destroyed by rangers at Cleland Conservation Park and, if so:
    - (a) why;
    - (b) how many have been destroyed; and
    - (c) how long has this practice existed?
  2. Have Cape Barren geese eggs been smashed at Flinders Chase National Park?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes for emus; no for Cape Barren geese and swans.
  - (a) this is a necessary part of fauna management to keep the number in balance within the area they are kept.
  - (b) 24 this year, including 10 infertile eggs.
  - (c) for some years.
2. Not in recent years.

**WAGE AND SALARY RATES**

643. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): How much of the \$43 000 000 voted in the 1977-78 Budget under the line "Allowance for increased wage and salary rates" was eventually allocated to each department and for what specific purpose was such allocation used in each department?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** During the 1977-78 financial year, wage and salary increases cost \$34 400 000, the bulk of which (\$22 600 000) related to the national wage case decisions. The balance related to sundry other increases granted by wage fixing bodies. This included an increase granted to medical officers which was backdated to November 1975 and cost about \$5 500 000. The attached schedule shows the amounts incurred by each department:

Allowance for Increased Wage and Salary Rates  
Amounts Allocated to Each Department During 1977-78

Department	Increases		
	National Wage Cases \$'000	Other \$'000	Total \$'000
Legislative Council . . . . .	5	—	5
House of Assembly . . . . .	7	—	7
Parliamentary Library . . . . .	5	6	11
Joint House Committee . . . . .	4	1	5
Electoral Department . . . . .	5	—	5
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works . . . . .	1	—	1
State Governor's Establishment . . . . .	5	1	6
Premier's Department . . . . .	100	34	134
Economic Development Department . . . . .	23	3	26
The Public Service Board Department . . . . .	75	24	99
Art Gallery Department . . . . .	14	1	15
Services and Supply Department . . . . .	193	2	195
Auditor-General's Department . . . . .	39	—	39
Police Department . . . . .	1 362	—	1 362
Correctional Services Department . . . . .	207	—	207
Law Department . . . . .	165	1	166
Corporate Affairs Department . . . . .	8	—	8

Department	Increases		
	National Wage Cases \$'000	Other \$'000	Total \$'000
Public and Consumer Affairs Department . . . . .	120	2	122
Supreme Court Department . . . . .	22	—	22
Treasury Department . . . . .	73	—	73
Lands Department . . . . .	375	44	419
Engineering and Water Supply Department . . . . .	904	654	1 558
Public Buildings Department . . . . .	507	75	582
Education Department . . . . .	7 027	2 222	9 249
Further Education Department . . . . .	805	477	1 282
Libraries Department . . . . .	103	4	107
Labour and Industry Department . . . . .	90	28	118
Agriculture and Fisheries Department . . . . .	279	105	384
Environment Department . . . . .	165	3	168
Marine and Harbors Department . . . . .	213	1	214
Transport Department . . . . .	172	12	184
Highways Department . . . . .	426	61	487
Community Welfare Department . . . . .	412	128	540
Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department . . . . .	50	14	64
South Australian Health Commission . . . . .	6 843	7 896	*14 739
Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department . . . . .	58	15	73
Mines and Energy Department . . . . .	136	—	136
Miscellaneous—			
Minister of Works . . . . .	9	—	9
Minister of Education . . . . .	276	4	280
Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests and Minister of Fisheries . . . . .	10	8	18
Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government . . . . .	1 282	14	1 296
Minister of Community Welfare . . . . .	3	—	3
Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport . . . . .	6	—	6
	<u>\$22 584</u>	<u>\$11 840</u>	<u>\$34 424</u>

\*Includes Miscellaneous—Minister of Health.

**INCREASED PRICES**

644. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): How much of the \$5 000 000 voted in the 1977-78 Budget under the line "Allowance for increased prices" was eventually allocated to each department and for what specific purpose was such allocation used in each department?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The call by departments on the round sum allowance of \$5 000 000 for price increases is incorporated in the actual payments on goods and services by those departments. It is, however, very difficult to isolate the effect of unavoidable price increases from other factors which increased expenditures in those departments.

The main problem in attempting an exercise of this kind

in relation to goods and services is that there are thousands of items to be considered. It is difficult to establish base prices and the prices of most items move independently of the others. Treasury officers attempted a sampling exercise in the hospitals area last year and have reported that, even in that limited field, they could not be confident of the result. It is reasonable to conclude that the result of a detailed exercise across the Public Service generally would be unlikely to lead to such an accurate assessment as to justify the use of the resources necessary to arrive at it.

The only item which can be identified specifically relates to the cost of rentals and leases renegotiated during 1977-78 by the Public Buildings Department. Funds were not provided to this department in the Estimates in anticipation of these increases and a sum of \$458 000 was allocated from the round sum allowance during the year.

### ELECTRICITY

645. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. What increases in electricity charges have occurred during the past 10 years, on what dates did the increases occur and what were the specific details of the increases?

2. What was the total number of persons employed at the Port Augusta power station at 30 June of each year from 1976 to 1978?

3. What is the total salary bill for all staff at the power station?

4. What was the average over-award payment a week for the skilled tradesmen during June 1978?

5. What was the total payment for overtime worked at the power station during 1977-78?

6. What was the average over-award payment made to the skilled tradesmen as a percentage of the basic award wages during June 1978?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 5½ per cent average on 1 May 1971

11 per cent average on 1 September 1973

12½ per cent average on 1 September 1974

10½ per cent average on 1 July 1975

12½ per cent average on 1 September 1976

10 per cent average on 1 August 1977

10 per cent average on 1 October 1978.

Details of the increases can be obtained from the Electricity Trust's tariff schedules, relevant copies of which are attached. Over the whole period since June 1970 the rate of increase of Electricity Trust tariffs has been less than the rate of increase of the Consumer Price Index. From June 1970 to the present time, Electricity Trust tariff rates have increased by about 96 per cent, while the Consumer Price Index has increased by 128 per cent.

2. 30 June 1976—646

30 June 1977—672

30 June 1978—696

3. Total salaries paid to the power station staff for fortnight ended 29 September 1978—\$74 896.25.

4. Average of over-award payments made to power station skilled tradesmen during the two fortnightly pay periods ended 9 and 23 June 1978 was \$5.21 per employee per week.

5. \$788 568.

6. 2.7 per cent.

### OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

647. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is the Minister now prepared to speed up the introduction of legislation dealing with off-road vehicles as a matter of urgency and,

if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows: The delineation of areas to be available for the use of off-road vehicles is necessary before the introduction of any legislation, and the selection of such areas is proceeding as a matter of urgency.

### MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

649. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice): Will the Minister ascertain the need for a coffee/tea/beverage dispenser at the Mount Gambier Hospital and provide such services as are found to be necessary as a matter of urgency?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** An investigation has revealed that the expense of installing a tea/coffee dispensing machine cannot be justified in terms of its expected usage. In any case, any patients attending the outpatients department and who are required to wait for attention are offered a cup of tea or coffee by the hospital staff.

### WATER SUPPLY

667. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to extend services to people living in the hundred of Pordia and surrounding areas when the replacement is completed to the hundred of Wootoona?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No.

### OLARY DAM

669. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Will the Minister give urgent consideration to having the Olary dam cleaned out and new drains graded, in view of the fact that the existing railway dam requires urgent maintenance?

2. Will the department consider allowing local contractors, who are available, to do the work?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Olary dam is presently the responsibility of the Minister of Transport. Urgent consideration is being given to the Engineering and Water Supply Department taking over effective management of the dam which includes cleaning and drain grading.

2. If the transfer takes place, local contractors will be given the opportunity to tender for the work.

### OODNADATTA ROAD

671. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Has the Highways Department determined the exact route for a road linking Oodnadatta with the new standard gauge railway line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs and, if so, when will it be constructed and will it be an all weather road?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** No.

### CONSULTANTS

674. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice):

1. Which consultants received the \$55 000 referred to in the answer to question No. 617 and how much was paid to each?

2. Have Neighbour and Lapsys been given any consulting work on the feasibility study of the C.E.S.E. project proposed for Wayville and, if so, what are the

terms and conditions, including duration of the agreement?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Cheesman, Doley, Neighbour and Raffan.
2. No.

#### MINISTER'S VISIT

675. **Mr. CHAPMAN** (on notice):

1. What is the duration and purpose of Mr. Chatterton's reported visit to India?
2. How many public servants will accompany the Minister, who are they and how much is the tour expected to cost?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister departed from Adelaide on 10 October and will return on 21 October. The purpose of the mission is to finalise potential sales of South Australian forest products.
2. Only one public servant, the Director, Woods and Forests Department, is accompanying the Minister and the estimated cost of the visit is \$3 200.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

678. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Have any employees of the Public Buildings Department been formally dismissed immediately prior to taking annual leave breaks or any other holidays over the Christmas period and then been re-employed immediately after the holiday period and, if so, how many persons have been involved in such a practice and for how long has it been in use?
2. Have such persons been taxed on 5 per cent only of all payments made to them with respect to the holiday period?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. Not applicable.

#### ADOPTIONS

693. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Eisen Report relating specifically to inter-country adoption been received by the Government and, if so, when and, if not, when is it anticipated that such a report will be made available to the Government?
2. Will this report be made public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?
3. Are any members of the Community Welfare Organisation at present overseas looking at matters relating to inter-country adoption and, if so, who are they, what countries are they visiting, and for what reason and how long are they to be away from South Australia?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is expected that the report will be made available to the Government towards the end of December 1978.
2. Release of the report will be a matter for Cabinet decision.
3. Mr. Peter Fopp, Director, Specialist Services in the Community Welfare Department, has returned after four weeks of visits to five Asian countries for talks on arrangements for inter-country adoptions. As some of the countries requested that no publicity be given, it is not proposed to name them publicly.

#### IRRIGATION

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (11 October).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** In view of the above-entitlement flows entering South Australia, licensed private divertees will receive an additional 10 per cent of water above their allocation this financial year, upon application. Additional allocations to Government divertees are also being considered and I expect to be able to make an announcement within the next fortnight.

#### KOKI LODGE

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (13 September).

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** State Transport Authority Roadliner is operating snow tours to Koki Ski Lodge at Falls Creek throughout the 1978 snow season. The majority of departures are at weekends. However, the weekend accommodation at Falls Creek was not available unless six weeks full accommodation was reserved. Weekend departures have been, and continue to be, very popular and are usually booked out. Some problems were experienced selling mid-week accommodation and passenger loads were low on some occasions. The arrangement with the accommodation house permitted both parties to sell accommodation off the booking plan as the profitability of the operation was not dependent on STA Roadliner carrying all persons using the accommodation. As is usual in all businesses, a break-even point was used in pricing the venture to ensure that profits were likely to be made.

In addition to the sale of weekend and six-day snow packages to Falls Creek, the operation permitted the sale of accommodation only as well as the sale of transport only to persons interested. These business opportunities were available because of access to the Falls Creek accommodation and the regular departures of vehicles to that destination. A school party was accommodated at Koki Ski Lodge. No concession was given to these students on accommodation price but group travel provides the opportunity for lower costs per head when the capacity of the vehicle is well-utilised. This opportunity is used when quoting on educational excursions to schools and was applied to a minimum party of 38 students.

#### ART GALLERY

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (28 September, Appropriation Bill):

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** A new appointment of Registrar was made to the staff of the gallery on 2 May 1978 with the responsibility for the development of a registration section, including the establishment of a system to co-ordinate existing records and the design of appropriate systems to govern the movement and storage of works of art in the collection, on loan and in touring exhibitions. This person has a small staff and work is proceeding. The stocktaking policy agreed with the Auditor-General is that each section of the collections be checked in rotation once in every five years. The establishment of the registry should facilitate this requirement.

#### T.A.B. HOLDINGS

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (27 September).

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The South Australian

Totalizator Agency Board amended closing times of an evening to 7 p.m. as from 25 July 1978. This action was taken because of a spate of armed hold-ups being carried out in agencies at or just prior to the 8 p.m. closing time. A comparison of turnover before and after the above date shows only marginal variations above and below on a per night basis. The total average turnover shows a 1 per cent reduction, which is not significant in view of the variables involved such as meetings covered, weather, etc. The board is keeping the matter of earlier closing under continual review.

### STATE SUPPLY DIVISION

In reply to **Mr. WILSON** (20 September).

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The State Supply Division of the Services and Supply Department was one of the organisations which assumed responsibility for part of the former Government Produce Department's operations—in this case, the Port Lincoln abattoir and the Light Square works, the latter comprising a butcher shop and cold storage facilities.

The Port Lincoln abattoir was transferred to the South Australian Meat Corporation from 9 March 1977 in terms of an agreement entered into pursuant to an amendment to the South Australian Meat Corporation Act.

The deficit of \$167 000 relating to the Light Square operations during 1977-78 resulted in part from costs incurred as a result of the transfer and which are, in terms of the agreement, required to be borne by the State Supply Division. Portion of these added costs will be of a recurring nature, the remainder is a one-time cost borne in 1977-78.

The second factor contributing to the deficit resulted from a change in policy from bulk-pricing to one based on individual meat cuts which was considered more appropriate to the needs of Government institutions and certain other charitable bodies. Unfamiliarity with this pricing approach, combined with increased abattoir charges, resulted in prices being set too low to recover all of the necessary costs. This matter is now receiving constant attention.

Increased charges for cold storage facilities have been introduced during September 1978, and the State Supply Division has taken steps to further improve the efficiency of the Light Square operations by reducing staff through transfer and natural wastage.

I confirm my earlier reply to the honourable member and advise that Cabinet has authorised an investigation into the future of the Light Square complex.

### FESTIVAL THEATRE TICKETS

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** All tickets for the Adelaide Festival Theatre are now issued through the BASS computer system as operated by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Although discussions have been taking place with Australian printers for the past 12 months it has not been possible for tickets of this type to be produced in Australia. Tests are currently being carried out and, if successful, all future ticket stock will be purchased from Australian printers.

### NED KELLY

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The cost of the opening night party was part of the production's overall publicity budget and consequently was included in the total cost of the venture. The total cost of the production was met from box office income, investors and the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. It is not possible to apportion individual items of expenditure between the foregoing sources of income.

### WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Working Women's Centre is to be established as a liaison between working women and unions. The 1976 figures on the unionisation of women indicate that only 43 per cent of working women belong to unions in South Australia. The studies that have been done over recent years on women's employment conditions indicate that women, particularly migrant women, are left with the most boring and badly paid jobs in the workforce. At least one of the factors towards this is that women do not belong to unions in as great a number as male workers do. Working Women's Centres exist in Newcastle, Sydney and Melbourne.

In South Australia the Working Women's Centre will be administered by a management committee with the following composition:

The Women's Adviser; a representative from the Labour and Industry Department; three representatives from the Trades and Labour Council; an employee of the Trade Union Training Authority, with special knowledge of the needs of working women; a women's liaison officer; and a staff representative.

The \$23 000 is expected to pay the salary of two people for six months. From this, each are employed at \$10 000 per annum. There are further salary costs of \$1 250 to cover superannuation, long service leave and worker's compensation. It is expected that \$2 364 will be spent on rent and setting up an office; \$2 875 has been set aside for publicity and publications, and the rest of the money will be spent on a car and caravan to enable the women employed in the centre to take help, advice and concern for working women to suburban areas. This budget may be slightly flexible, in that some of the costs are not as yet forecast; for example, the exact amount that the centre will need to apply in rent as the location has not yet been decided. These matters must wait for the decision of the management committee, which is expected to have its first meeting late in October.

### OVERSEAS VISITS

In reply to **Mr. TONKIN** (28 September, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** During 1977-78 the following officers travelled overseas for the purposes as shown:

W. L. C. Davies, Director-General for Trade and Development—Participation in the trade and investment mission to the United States of America led by the Premier.

T. J. O'Connell, Senior Project Officer—Ksar Chellala project discussions in Algeria.

I. J. Kowalick, Chief Project Officer—Proposals for

exports to Malaysia.

A. M. Smith, Director, Economics Division—Discussions with international institutions on economic trends and economic relations between developed and developing countries.

During 1978-79, the following visits have been undertaken or are proposed:

Mr. P. G. Boros, Assistant Director, Statutory Corporations—Investigate specific trade and investment proposals in Malaysia and Jordan.

Mr. T. J. O'Connell—Ksar Chellala project and trade mission to South-East Asia and Arabian Peninsula.

Mr. R. D. Bakewell—Trade and investment discussions in Sarawak.

Mr. R. D. Bakewell—Visit to Malaysia for Commonwealth Secretariat business, with the major cost being borne by the Secretariat. Discussions will be held in Penang on trade and investment matters. Proceed to London for trade discussion and to Paris for an O.E.C.D. meeting.

#### CULTURAL CENTRE TRUSTS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The separate amounts of \$3 050 incurred by the Port Pirie and Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trusts during 1977-78 were under the \$40 000 provided in each instance due to both trusts being formed later than anticipated in the financial period. No provision is required for either the Port Pirie or Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trusts for 1978-79 as expenditure requirements during that period will be met from the retention of interest earned from the short-time investment of capital funds not needed immediately for planned building projects.

#### PETITION: VIOLENT OFFENCES

A petition signed by 252 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 was presented by Mr. Dunstan.

Petition received.

#### PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 194 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Corcoran, Eastick and Nankivell.

Petitions received.

#### PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

A petition signed by 151 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: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 188 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 was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

A petition signed by 72 electors of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take steps to ensure that continuance of the State Bank of South Australia's banking facilities at Wirrulla was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: ILL TREATED DOGS

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to establish an authoritative body to have power to impound any ill treated dogs and to prosecute offenders when necessary was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. TONKIN:** I address my question to the Premier. In view of the alarming figures released last week showing that South Australia has the highest level of unemployment of any State, and a level significantly higher than the national average, will the Government now support a widely based conference of South Australian business and community leaders to consider and recommend measures the State Government should take to restore confidence and again create employment opportunities in South Australia? Figures released last week showed that, despite falls in national levels for each month except June, the South Australian level of unemployment has continued to increase over the past six months, and is higher than that of any other State.

The Minister of Labour and Industry has stated that the increase simply reflects withdrawal of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, but statisticians say that, if this were the case, the South Australian figure would be much closer to the national average. The present figure for South Australia of 7.8 per cent is about 27 per cent higher than the national average of 6.1 per cent, and indicates that specific factors are operating in South Australia to increase unemployment in this State over and above the levels in the rest of Australia.

I am informed by business leaders that a widely based, round-table conference of industry, commerce, trade union, community and other leaders to consider the influences increasing unemployment in South Australia against the national trend, and to recommend appropriate action to be taken by the South Australian Government would receive general support. Is the Government prepared to co-operate in such an initiative organised by members of the community concerned at the increasing level of unemployment in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am always prepared to enter into conference with business and trades union leaders in South Australia about any situation in the



economy. If business leaders have put that proposition to the Leader, they have not, so far, specifically done so to me. The Industrial Development Advisory Council in South Australia specifically assists Government in its assessment of situations relating to industry and maintains communication between the Government and industry in matters of this kind. No such suggestion has come from those gentlemen.

The Leader is in the habit of making generalised statements as to the opinions of people in the community that are not backed up by any specifics. I would have thought that, if there were any specific requests of this particular kind, beyond the conference in which the Government is already co-operating about the problems of unemployment in Australia at a national level, business leaders in South Australia would have made those representations to me, as they have ready access to me. If the Leader is in any way mystified about the situation in South Australia, he ought not to be. The position that we are facing in South Australia at present is exactly the one that I predicted, and there are good reasons why South Australia should be in this particular position, given national policies.

South Australia has heavily concentrated on producing consumer durables and items of household purchase. We produce much furniture and we produce much that goes into housing. The present national policies have, throughout this country, reduced consumer spending. They have specifically been designed (they could not have been introduced otherwise) to reduce consumer spending within this country. While people are not buying motor cars, home appliances, and the things that are the major items of consumer expenditure, then South Australia gets hit harder than does any other part of Australia, because our industry is so heavily concentrated in these areas.

In addition, when, apart from general consumer spending, the national Government chooses to withdraw from the housing and building sector significant national resources, and that is what has happened because the building rate is down throughout the country, in consequence we are faced with the fact that since people do not buy houses and are not building them throughout the community (not only here but also in the other States as well) they do not buy the things that South Australia produces to go into those houses.

As to the position in the past 18 months, South Australia has had the closure of the major shipbuilding yard in Australia by a specific decision of the Federal Government not to support the shipbuilding industry in this country equally with comparable countries. We have had great difficulties arising from the disastrous drought from which we have suffered and which not only reduced spending by farmers generally in this country but meant that the agricultural implement industry, of which we have 40 per cent in South Australia, was hit hard: indeed, the Mannum works of Horwood Bagshaw virtually closed and the works programme of Shearers was reduced.

In addition, we have had a significant reduction, if the Leader examines the figures, in food processing in South Australia, particularly in the meat industry, but also in other areas of food processing to a lesser extent. All of those things have come together at the one time and have adversely affected South Australia. One simple answer to the way in which we could get rapid recovery in South Australia is to stimulate consumer spending and return national resources to the housing and building industry.

That is the proposal which has been put unanimously by Premiers of all political Parties in Australia, and the only person who is out of step on this is the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader continues to support national

policies against his Party colleagues in leadership of his Party interstate, then of course he is out to hurt South Australia. It is very obvious from the statements which are constantly made by members opposite that, if there is one way in which they believe they can get some political support in South Australia, it is to knock employment in industry in this State.

#### GHAN

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether there is any truth in the rumour that the Federal Government intends to discontinue the Ghan passenger rail service? A strong rumour to this effect has been circulating through the railway centres of Port Augusta and Port Pirie, and this is very surprising in view of the recent assurance by the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) that the future of the Ghan railway service was assured. If the service is to be discontinued this will have a dire effect not only on the service provided to the territorians but also on the railway employment base in Port Augusta and Port Pirie.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I shall be pleased to take up this matter with the Federal Minister for Transport, because it would be very distressing if we had now reached the stage where the word of the Federal Minister could not be relied on. As the honourable member has rightly said, a short time ago, in response to a report, to which I referred in the press, that had been submitted to the Federal Minister (and he said, first, that it did not exist and, secondly, that it was only part of a programme and had not been adopted), the Minister gave an unqualified assurance that the Ghan service, the passenger and freight service to Tailem Bend, the real lifeblood between the south and Tailem Bend, would not be removed. It is very distressing to hear now that rumours are floating about that in fact the Minister is about to do a flip.

**Mr. Keneally:** A Nixon.

**Mr. VIRGO:** A Nixon.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart has asked his question.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Maybe Mr. Nixon is so overawed with his coup on the A.C.T.U. that he is not thinking as clearly as he should be at the moment. I believe we should accept the Federal Minister's previous assurance, which was quite unqualified, until he indicates that he is going to retract it. I will raise the matter urgently, so that the electors of the honourable member's area may then receive what I believe is the assurance they now need—that the Federal Minister is not going to do a backflip on this matter.

#### WEST LAKES

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Minister of Works believe that the companies involved in developing the West Lakes area have "seduced successive State Governments and proceeded to rape the residents", as was recently alleged by Dr. Cornwall, an A.L.P. member of the Upper House? I was present, as was the Minister of Works, at the opening of one of the facilities at West Lakes some time ago when tribute was paid to the fact that the State Government had been heavily involved in the West Lakes project in building bridges, roadworks and other site works.

It seemed strange that a Government member would accuse the Government of having been seduced, when it has obviously co-operated, in large measure, in the West

Lakes development. The Government has made statements lauding the development of West Lakes as a progressive development in South Australia. In view of the Government's promoting the West Lakes project and actively supporting it, I ask the Minister whether he believes that it has been seduced by the West Lakes company.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The answer is most definitely "No". This Government is proud of its association with this company in the development of one of the largest projects of its kind in the State, and is also proud of its success.

#### M McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr. GROOM:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what action he intends to take to examine the issues raised at his meetings last week with staff of the McNally Training Centre?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Members will recall that in a press release I said that the two meetings I had with staff at the centre were useful and constructive, and I undertook also that the issues raised at that time would be thoroughly examined and that staff would be involved in that process. I can now inform the House that the supervisor of the McNally centre has been requested by the Director-General of my department to convene a six-member committee to consider the issues raised and any action which should be taken. The committee will consist of the supervisor of the centre, the two deputy supervisors and, before the member for Glenelg jumps in to ask how the remainder of the committee will be selected, I am pleased to inform him that there will be three representatives of the staff. The choice of staff representatives for the committee will be a matter for the staff to determine, and discussions will be held with the McNally consultative committee on this matter.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You found out all I told you was right.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has an opportunity to ask a question.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Director-General has requested that he be supplied with progress reports from the committee each fortnight to ensure that he and I are kept up to date with developments and any recommendations made by that committee.

#### PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

**Mr. ALLISON:** Does the Minister of Education agree with the accuracy of the statement made by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Mr. John Gregory), in the recent edition of the *Teachers Journal*, dated 11 October 1978, and, if so, does the Minister foresee the possibility of employing the additional primary school teaching staff in 1979? I refer briefly to only a section of the article, which contained several allegations. Referring to primary school staffing, Mr. Gregory asks readers to appreciate the side effects of the manpower budget that will limit the number of staff that can be employed to the same number as was employed last year. He continues:

The budget provides another \$3 000 000 for primary teaching staff. The effect of the manpower budget is that no more staff can be appointed than were appointed this year. If the increased money was spent we could employ another 3 per cent of teachers in primary schools.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I do not agree with the

statement made by Mr. Gregory, and I do not anticipate that additional teachers will be employed next year.

#### WEST LAKES

**Mr. HARRISON:** Can the Minister for Planning say whether or not the Director of Planning will refuse the subdivision of land at West Lakes that has been the subject of a controversy because of the sandhills contained in part of that land?

**Mr. Gunn:** Who wrote that?

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

**Mr. HARRISON:** It has been reported that the "Save our Sandhills" group has approached the Director of Planning, requesting that subdivision be refused, hence my question.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The land at West Lakes which has been the subject of controversy for some time is, under the West Lakes regulations, zoned R3C, so it is land that is available for housing development. Two applications have been submitted so far to the Director of Planning for subdivision of land in the vicinity. The normal practice of the department when these applications are received is to submit the subdivisional plans to other relevant authorities for their comments. That process is going on at present. The Acting Deputy Director of Planning (Mr. John Harris) wrote to the people concerned, I think on 6 October, informing the group that the contents of its letter would be taken into account, together with further information which the group has advised that it intends to submit, before a decision is made on the two applications at present under consideration.

The only way in which the Government could prevent the subdivision of this land, if a reasonable proposition were to be put forward, would be to acquire it, and that would cost about \$1 000 000, which at present is not available. It may be that there are difficulties with the current plan for subdivision, but, in view of the zoning of the land, it is certain that some subdivision proposal will inevitably be approved at some stage or, if not approved, will be the subject of an appeal before the Planning Appeal Board. It is important to make clear that, whilst any representations made to the Director of Planning will be considered, the basic zoning of this land implies that it is available for residential development. So long as the subdivisional proposals were proper, in the normal course of events a subdivision of some kind would be allowed to go ahead. At this stage no decision has been made.

#### TYRE BURNING

**Mr. EVANS:** Can the Minister of Works say why the Engineering and Water Supply Department is burning old tyres in an attempt to burn scrub at Brick Kiln Road, Heathfield, when more satisfactory methods are available to remove the scrub so that a treatment works can be established? The Minister would know of the delicate situation in relation to the proposed establishment of a treatment works at Brick Kiln Road, Heathfield. Neighbouring property holders were given assurances that there would be no undue smells or odours that would affect their quality of life. Quite foolishly, the department this week has taken truckloads of motor tyres into the area and has set alight to them in the bush land in an attempt to burn the bush. Black smoke has been belching out over neighbouring house properties, with the accompanying offensive odour. The department could have used other

and probably cheaper methods than those being employed at the moment. If the Minister cannot answer the question now, will he have the matter investigated so that people will not be inconvenienced and so that public relations affecting the department, the Minister, and the overall project will be improved?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not think the honourable member would expect me to know that this happened this week, but I shall have inquiries made and ask why this method was used. It appears, on the face of it, that the honourable member has a legitimate complaint, and I shall get back to him as soon as I have a report.

## GAS

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Has the Minister of Mines and Energy been kept informed about the takeover of all the shares of Burmah Oil Australia Limited in Santos, Reef Oil and Basin Oil? Will the acquisition of the 46 per cent shareholding in the Cooper Basin gasfield by Bond Corporation Holding Limited affect any agreement for the supply and sale of gas and liquids in South Australia and New South Wales? A report in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Bond gets green light for entry to Cooper Basin", states:

Mr. Alan Bond has been given the green light for his Bond Corporation Holding Limited's \$36 000 000 entry into the Cooper Basin natural gasfields.

Santos Limited had previously objected to the takeover by the Bond corporation of Burmah Oil, and the takeover has taken place as a result of a court decision.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The remarks in the press today about a "green light" could be described as a wee bit colourful. My understanding of the situation is that the Santos board and Mr. Alan Bond have reached agreement in relation to proceedings that the Santos board had undertaken in the New South Wales Equity Court in relation to the purchase of Burmah Exploration by interests associated with Mr. Bond. The substance of that agreement relates to representation on the Santos board that was previously held by interests associated with Burmah. The South Australian Government is not in a position one way or another to effect the sale of interests in a company which is not directly involved in the Cooper Basin but which holds shares in another company.

The equity case that was being carried out by the Santos board I think related to certain undertakings that it believed it had with Burmah Oil which had been breached by Burmah in the sale of its interests to Mr. Bond. Apparently, that was sorted out yesterday and I was informed yesterday by the Managing Director of Santos that the statement was being made. That means, of course, the interests associated with the Bond corporation now holds 37½ per cent of the shares in Santos. According to the agreement I think it will have three of the 10 directors of Santos. The Government has been informed of the situation at all stages by the current board of Santos, and has had discussions with Mr. Bond's representative (Mr. Oates) and also personally with Mr. Bond. We have expressed certain views to Mr. Bond as to what is the Government's position and what we expect in terms of the future development of the resources of the Cooper Basin. I think Mr. Bond understands perfectly well the Government's position. I hope that the changes that have taken place with respect to Santos as a result of the sale of the Burmah interest will ensure that the orderly development of the resources of the Cooper Basin continues.

The various agreements that relate to the Cooper Basin

are agreements between the unit which involves Santos, Delhi, South Australian Oil and Gas, Vamgas, and some other companies such as the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, the Australian Gaslight Company in Sydney, and so on. A series of agreements exist which are completely unaffected by any change in the ownership of shares or portions of shares in any one of the companies that is a member of the Cooper Basin unit. It should be understood that the various contracts that apply between the Cooper Basin producers and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia are completely unaffected in any way by the kind of change that has taken place in the structure of Santos.

## SCHOOL FIRE

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Can the Minister of Education give an assurance that the buildings and equipment lost in the fire at Campbelltown High School in the early hours of this morning will be fully replaced and that in the long term the school will not be disadvantaged as a result of only partial replacement of facilities that were destroyed? As reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, a fire, believed to have been deliberately lit, caused damage amounting to between \$100 000 and \$250 000 at Campbelltown High School. Four classrooms and a teacher preparation area were destroyed, and an art room and a storeroom were badly damaged. The school is naturally concerned that these facilities, together with equipment, should be replaced in full, and not just partially.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** There is no doubt that, in the long run, the school will not be disadvantaged but, in the short run, there is no way in which we can avoid dislocation. Four classrooms and an art room have been completely destroyed. An adjacent quadruple block suffered broken windows and burnt paintwork, but the block is usable. Two science laboratories and four classrooms have also been damaged, particularly in the roof area, but they will be usable on Thursday. Arrangements are in hand to provide the school with two transportable units and an art room immediately, as soon as they can be shifted. Students in years 8 and 9 were sent home today; parents will be informed of what happens from here on. All of the buildings that were destroyed or damaged were wooden. Mr. Simmons, the department's security officer, was there in the early hours this morning. He has prepared a brief report, and will supply a full report later. Arson is suspected, and the police are making inquiries. We will do all we can to ensure that the dislocation which the school is unfortunately facing will be as temporary as possible.

## SOLAR ENERGY

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister of Education say what is his department's policy regarding the introduction of solar energy for schools and colleges? I have received inquiries from constituents and members of school councils concerning the threatening energy shortages, and wondering whether architects, when considering plans for new buildings, should take advantage of solar energy resources where practicable.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** About two years ago, I think, the Education and Public Buildings Departments sponsored a conference, held at the Raywood in-service centre, on energy utilisation in the construction of school buildings. A report was prepared, which, I think, is a public document (certainly, it has been widely circulated

among Government departments), detailing various ways in which in the design of school buildings maximum use could be made of sunlight and ways could be adopted whereby in winter maximum use was made of insulation, and in summer heat could be kept out and the classrooms kept cool. This report is simply in relation to design features, and some of these design features have already been incorporated. The use of solar energy for running, for example, an air-conditioning system would involve a much greater capital cost, and this matter is still being debated. I will get what other detailed information I can for the honourable member. As I have said, design features in buildings are now the subject of a document that has been widely distributed throughout the Public Service. Certain recommendations in that report are being incorporated by Public Buildings Department's architects in buildings they are currently designing.

### COUNTRY TRANSPORT

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Will the Minister of Community Development explain to the House the reasons for the Government's belief that elderly and disadvantaged persons living in country areas of this State do not warrant the same consideration as people living in the metropolitan area? On 12 July last the Riverland Community Council for Social Development (of which I have been a member since its inception) wrote to the Minister of Transport outlining the problems relating to the transport needs of elderly and disadvantaged people, particularly those living in the Riverland, although all country areas are faced with the same problem. The letter states:

This Community Council is very concerned at the lack of public transport available for people in the Riverland area. We have received many reports, both verbal and in writing, from pensioners, incapacitated people, people in the home with young children and the community as a whole, regarding this problem.

The letter continued that the committee felt that the dial-a-bus concept that the Government introduced in Adelaide some time ago—

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** It was never introduced in Adelaide; it was private enterprise.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Well, the Government supported its introduction.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are far too many interjections. The member for Chaffey has the floor.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** The letter continues:

We feel that a "dial-a-bus" service similar to the one which has operated in Adelaide could work effectively in the Riverland area by a private operator if it were subsidised.

Although public transport in the metropolitan area is heavily subsidised, we are looking here at the problem of disadvantaged people living outside the metropolitan area. The Director-General of Transport (Dr. Scrafton) replied to that letter on behalf of the Minister of Transport in the following terms:

I have discussed this matter with the Chairman of the State Transport Authority who has advised that there has been a number of attempts by private operators to operate intra-town and inter-town services in country areas, but with the exception of one these have all failed. It is therefore apparent that any commercial type of service initiated to meet the need referred to by your organisation would require substantial subsidy. Unfortunately, in view of the present economic climate, it is not possible for the Government to render support in this regard, and consequently your request is

denied.

The Community Council has since written again to the Minister of Transport in the following terms:

The Riverland Community Council discussed this reply at our meeting on Monday night, 9 October, and it was unanimously decided that we should voice our disapproval in the strongest possible terms at the Government's attitude.

In the light of this situation, will the Minister say whether he believes that people in disadvantaged circumstances, whether they are living in the country or in the metropolitan area, should receive the same sort of consideration?

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** It is a pity that the honourable member framed his question in such an aggressive and provocative way, because I think he is raising a reasonably important issue.

**Mr. Arnold:** I have raised it—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** To ask whether the Government believes that there should be this sort of discrimination is provocative and misleading, and quite clearly the answer is "No", there is no such belief. The Government has done many things to assist country people in disadvantaged circumstances. Obviously, resources are crucial in this area, and there must be a reasonable deployment as between city and country needs, but within that concept the Government has an extremely good record indeed.

The fact that the Community Council in the Riverland has focussed attention on this issue, and on care of the aged in general, is very commendable. That is the sort of reason for which community councils have been set up—to find community problems, identify them, and articulate them to Government. These community councils exist as a result of the direct pioneering initiative of the current Government in 1972, and it is something in which we have led Australia. The creation of the new Ministry of Community Development is a further step in the development of this particular approach to community problems which is being looked at with great interest throughout Australia. As I say, that is commendable, and it is something that the Government views sympathetically and is dealing with.

It is obvious from the correspondence quoted by the honourable member that the Transport Department has given this matter close attention. It has pointed out the realities of the situation and the economics involved in it. It requires a subsidy, and the council has requested the Government to look at the subsidy issue. The Minister of Community Welfare administers a fund, and he relies on advice from a representative committee as to how the moneys in that fund are disbursed. That committee has given a number of specific grants to aid aged care activities both in urban and in rural areas. So, there is a sympathetic body which can process and look at these things.

We happen to be in a very tight financial situation, and all areas of Government service delivery must suffer. It is a pity, but we must deploy the resources as best we can. I am sure that full and sympathetic consideration has been given to this request by the Riverland Community Council, and it still believes that the need should be met. I would certainly be pleased to look at the specific proposition, and I am confident that a referral to the Minister of Transport will get a further consideration of the matter. It may not be possible for anything to be done in the current financial year, but certainly we can look at it for the 1979-80 financial year.

One of the problems about our financial stringency is that many desirable things scheduled to be done have to be

slowed down or deferred. Again, that is a pity, but I hope the people in the Riverland and those connected with the council understand the problems faced by the Government and see it not as discrimination but as the genuine way in which the Government is sorting out its priorities.

### SURS SCHEME

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Does the Minister of Labour and Industry consider that those persons engaged on State Unemployment Relief Scheme work to whom he spoke on Sunday at the opening of the Fremont Lake at Elizabeth (which has been funded under a SURS grant) would agree with the continuous statements made by the Opposition, especially by the Leader and the member for Davenport, that the SURS scheme has been a waste of money and an abject failure? On Sunday 15 October at the official opening of the Fremont Lake, which opening was attended by over 1 000 people, I understand that those workers who had been employed under the SURS scheme were highly critical of the Opposition's continually knocking the scheme.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I actually learnt of the member for Davenport's speech to, of all places, the Young Liberals, when I was on my way out to the opening of Fremont Park.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It was well received, too.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Of course it would be, by Liberals.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** That's the sort of reactionary stuff they like.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I was going to say, before I was interrupted by the member for Davenport, that normally I would not take any notice of a speech like that at that sort of gathering, because it is the sort of flag waving that the honourable member would have to do to ensure his preselection. Nevertheless, not only did I hear what the member had to say on radio, but also the 30-odd workers who were employed on the Fremont Park project were discussing it in the afternoon. They were quite critical of the comments, and had many other things to say which I cannot repeat in the House, because my manners prevent me from doing so.

The Opposition has continually knocked every effort by the South Australian Government to try to get its economy moving. Our policy was to get it moving through the SURS scheme, which I and many thousands of people in South Australia believe has been a tremendous success.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** What about the figures last Friday?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Davenport to order. That is the second occasion.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I quote some facts on the scheme: 2 115 projects were approved throughout the State, all of which will remain forever an example of what the scheme did. It did not, like many forerunning schemes, have people sweeping streets, cleaning gutters, or chopping down trees. Almost every project in the scheme had a concrete foundation and will leave a memory of the scheme within the State. Not only did the scheme do that but also it taught many unskilled people crafts and trades that they did not know they could perform. They had never before been given the opportunity of working. Talking to these young people about finding and expressing skills within themselves was, to me, a delight. To members of the Opposition that may not be so.

The scheme provided 13 509 jobs by the end of July 1978. I suggest that a large number of those people would never have found employment if it had not been for

SURS. At its height, 2 444 people were employed as at 1 February 1978. That is a large number of people to be employed under a State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I have now had the opportunity of travelling to almost all parts of the State to inspect these projects and to talk to people who performed their duties well and who carried out jobs that they would not have thought possible to perform.

Never have I been more touched or enlightened than I was last Sunday at the opening function of the local Fremont Park. It was said that there were some 2 000 people there, although the member for Napier suggested that there were over 1 000 people. My estimate was that between 800 and 1 200 attended. Everyone in Elizabeth who knew about the scheme's operation and that people from the area were employed in it turned up to see what a great success it was. Surely the Opposition cannot decry such a scheme when an enormous number of people came out on a Sunday afternoon to see the opening of that project in their area.

Afterwards I chatted with 15 or 18 of the 36 people who had been employed on the scheme. Some of the stories that they told were pathetic. One of the workers on that job told me that he had been out of work for some 12 months and that if it had not been for SURS almost all his furniture, his car and everything else he was paying off on time payment would have been repossessed. No other Government avenue gave him assistance to find employment. At one time when he was looking for a job in town his wife was visited by an inspector from the Federal Government whose job it was to find out why people were not working. He did not mind that. He was willing to give his impression about why he could not find work. The inspector subjected his wife to so much criticism and questioning about her husband that when he got home she was in tears, saying that she had been subjected to the worst interrogation in her life.

That is the sort of thing the member for Davenport and the Opposition want to keep going. They want to see people unemployed. They do not want to see the existence of a greatly successful scheme like SURS, which was able to lift people off the dole, as it is often described. I do not use that word, but it is commonly used.

That is the policy of the Liberal Party. Its members do not want to see South Australia find work for these people. I suggest, particularly to the member for Davenport, who has been most critical of the scheme over a long period, and especially in the past few days, that members opposite should talk to the people working in these places, especially those working at Fremont Park. They might find out in that way what the SURS is all about.

### WATER METERS

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has considered the merits of placing water meters underground in new subdivisions? The matter has been referred to me by a number of people who have recently built houses. In many cases, in new subdivisions, front fences have been done away with, and lawns have been extended, as a result of which the water meter is not only unsightly but often is dangerous. It has been put to me that, in some cases, meters are placed underground in some form of metal box, and perhaps the cost of doing this is not prohibitive in all instances. Has the department looked at the matter?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not know whether

the department has looked at the proposal. Its present policy is to place the meter above ground just inside the boundary, to facilitate the replacement of the meter, if necessary, and also the reading of it. The honourable member has suggested that, in some cases, meters are placed below the ground in steel boxes. This happens, for example, where the building is on or up to the building line. I shall put the proposal to the department to see whether or not it will consider any requests made for placing meters underground, provided the people concerned were prepared to pay any additional costs.

#### OAKLANDS CROSSING

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Will the Minister of Transport say what is the Government's programme for the upgrading of the Oaklands crossing, on the northern side of the railway line to Marino? The Minister will know that work is progressing on the southern side, with considerable financial assistance from the Federal Government, but he will also be aware of the anticipated extra traffic flow as a result of this work and also from the south. The difficulty vehicles now experience, once over the crossing, in getting into Morphett Road is causing serious problems, especially for the two local schools and the residents of the area.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The honourable member has raised an important subject, and it is a shame that he spoilt it with his comment about considerable financial assistance from the Federal Government. Had we received as much assistance this year as we have received over recent years, we would have been well ahead with the Oaklands crossing. As the honourable member well knows, we have not been able to proceed with this job and many other jobs to the extent that we would wish because we are steadily but surely having eroded the funds available from the Federal Government. The honourable member should know that, and the sooner he and some of his colleagues join with the State Government in demanding that the Commonwealth Government provide the States (not just South Australia, but all States) with a fair share of the increasing revenue it is collecting year by year from petrol tax, the better it will be.

Instead, the honourable member, like his Leader, is always trying to prop up the Fraser Government as being the answer to a maiden's prayer, when in fact it is a disaster. If only the honourable member, his Leader, and his colleagues would acknowledge that and start fighting for South Australia rather than knocking it, the situation might improve. The Minister of Labour and Industry clearly demonstrated a moment ago how the Leader and the member for Davenport are continually knocking South Australia. I invite the honourable member to join with the Government to get a better deal for South Australia so that some of the jobs he wants done can be done.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked the question.

**Mr. Mathwin:** But he didn't answer it.

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

#### WARDANG ISLAND

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Can the Minister of Education say what specific skills will be developed in the outdoor education scheme at Wardang Island and in what type of participation will schools and other interested groups be involved? Will the Minister say what parties are expected

to be included in "other interested groups"? In answer to a question during the debate on the lines of the Estimates the Minister said:

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.

Many people are interested in the Wardang Island scheme, and I wonder whether the Minister can give us further information on it.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The specific skills in which the Aborigines are involved include painting, carpentry, reroofing houses, putting on guttering and downpipes, fencing, and all skills necessary to restore such residential accommodation as is currently on the island to a condition which would be appropriate to an outdoor education programme. That work is proceeding. The young people from schools involved in an outdoor education programme will study biological science. I think Scotch College either owns or leases a small island off Wardang Island, and for many years it has been involved in biological science programmes associated with marine life in that area.

Elizabeth West High School, some students of which went to Wardang Island recently, undertook a similar programme based in part on what had been pioneered by the Scotch College programme. Not much of that has been done at this stage because some problems are still unresolved, particularly, as I mentioned in the debate on the lines of the Estimates, in relation to the water supply to the island. At the moment we are not pushing, with schools, too fast the concept of their going to Wardang until some of these matters have been resolved.

We are looking at all sorts of things involving the Aboriginal community. Some members of the community operate the boat to and from the island, and workshop sessions occur from time to time. When I was there they were stripping down an outboard motor. Exactly what they were doing with it I am not too sure, because I am almost illiterate when it comes to mechanical things. That sort of programme was proceeding. If the honourable member wants more specific information I can get it for him, but I think that, in reply to a question without notice, that is sufficient.

#### BUSHFIRES

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Because of the possibility of bushfires in the fast approaching summer season as a result of the increased growth of vegetation due to this year's rainfall, will the Minister for Environment ask his officers to examine whether additional fire protective measures are required in the Anstey Hill reserve and to keep the position under review? The reserve is under the control of the Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department, and the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Environment Department has carried out fire suppression and protection in the reserve on behalf of that department. Many protective measures have been implemented on a co-operative basis between the two departments.

**Mr. Chapman:** He can go up and have a barbecue.

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

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not appreciate the member for Alexandra—

**Mr. Chapman:** I have asked the same question five times.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member

for Alexandra to order.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not appreciate the honourable member's being facetious about such a serious question.

**Mr. Chapman:** Ha, ha!

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not know what the "ha, ha" is about.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister must answer the question.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I suppose there is something in what the Minister of Transport said: that if you kick a pig in the guts you will always get a grunt.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the Minister will answer the question.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I appreciate the question. One of the disadvantages of a bountiful season is that it leads to a dangerous fire season during the summer period. Not only is the park referred to causing concern but also the whole of the State will be under threat, and it behoves not only the National Parks and Wildlife Division to be on its toes but also the Country Fire Service and everyone else involved in this area. I shall be pleased to confer with the Minister for Planning, who has an interest in this matter, to see whether or not it is necessary to do other than we are doing and whether we can reach an agreement on doing it. I will let the honourable member have a report.

#### MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Does the Premier still estimate that the total annual cost to the State of the thirteenth Minister will be only about \$60 000, exclusive of the Minister's office? The figure of \$60 000 was mentioned by the Premier in debate as the estimated annual cost of the extra Minister in this State in answer to the estimate which I had suggested of about \$150 000 to \$155 000. Since then, of course, the Bill has been passed, thanks to the pusillanimity—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I want the honourable member to stick to his question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was. I was dictating the history of the thing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is allowed to explain his question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes, I am explaining it. We now have the thirteenth Minister. The member for Ross Smith is now the thirteenth Minister. I give him my personal congratulations for getting into the position. Of course, Parkinson's law always applies in these cases.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member obtained the concurrence of the House to explain, but if he continues in this way I will withdraw his leave.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I noticed in the *Australian* and the *Advertiser* of last Saturday an advertisement for a Director of the Community Development Department at a salary of \$34 382, and I believe that already five other new positions (more junior positions than this one) have been advertised for the new department. When the matter was debated, the Premier said that under the new manpower budget arrangements (I think that was the term he used) there would not be any increase in the Public Service and no extra cost. If that is so, I should like to know which Director's job is going to make way for this one and what other jobs are being abandoned. It seems patently obvious that the cost of the new Ministry will be far more than was estimated.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not intend to let the honourable member continue in this way during Question

Time. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member had better look back at the explanation I gave.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I read it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. He knows the Standing Orders of this House.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government made it clear that some changes in status would occur because of the creation of posts within the new department but that in fact it was not expected that there would be an alteration in the overall number of people employed. Some savings would be made elsewhere that would offset the cost of extra people in this department. The honourable member knows that perfectly well, because it was explained at length.

At 3.11 p.m., the bells having been rung:

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve on behalf of this State an agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States of Australia in relation to housing, and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** 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

It ratifies and approves a new housing agreement, the text of which is set out in the schedule. It authorises the Treasurer on behalf of the State of South Australia to carry out the terms of the agreement. The objective of the agreement is the provision of Commonwealth financial assistance to the States for rental housing and home purchase. The provision of this assistance is to be in accordance with the principles set out in recital C of the agreement.

The principles enunciated in the agreement replace a number of restrictions and conditions for the use of housing assistance funds which applied in previous agreements. The adoption of principles rather than rules has the effect of introducing greater flexibility into the arrangements, and thereby enabling the States to pursue policies better suited to their particular circumstances. In general, the principles agreed to seek to concentrate any assistance given on those families or individuals who are deemed to be in need. However, in the result, they produce higher interest rates and enforce the Commonwealth demand for higher rents.

The agreement provides that in the financial year commencing on 1 July 1980 not less than 40 per cent of the total amount of the advances shall be for home purchase assistance purposes. In South Australia, this provision presents no difficulty, as the amount provided for this purpose has exceeded this proportion for many years. In the financial year just ended, for example, 57.8 per cent of

agreement funds was devoted to home purchase assistance through both the State Bank and South Australian Housing Trust.

Home purchase assistance funds will be paid into a Home Purchase Assistance Account, from which amounts will be loaned to the State Bank and Housing Trust. The funds paid into the account are repayable over 53 years and attract an interest rate charge of 4½ per cent a year against 4 per cent under the old agreement. The rate of interest charged to the two lending authorities will commence at 5 per cent a year and increase by ½ per cent a year each year until a rate equivalent to 1 per cent below the long-term bond rate is reached. The rate charged to the house purchaser commences at 5¾ per cent.

In general, it is a matter for the State to determine the conditions of eligibility and the conditions that are to apply in respect of loans for home purchase advanced by the lending authorities. In South Australia existing eligibility criteria for State Bank loans and for the rental-purchase houses of the Housing Trust will for the time being continue to apply. The Government has already announced that the interest rate on State Bank loans will be progressively raised in line with the increasing rate charged to the bank. Funds provided for rental housing assistance will continue to be provided to the South Australian Housing Trust. The rate of interest on these funds has been increased from 4 per cent, as applied in the previous agreement, to 5 per cent. The term of the loan remains 53 years.

Eligibility rules for rental housing are no longer specified in the agreement, except that they should comply with the principles mentioned earlier. The agreement does, however, specify that rents should be determined by the State which should have regard to a "policy of generally relating rents to rates of rental in the open market". In addition, it is required that as far as practicable rents should be reviewed annually and adjusted according to the movement of rates of rental in the open market. The Government does not anticipate that these provisions will require any further substantial revision of rents. Rents charged by the Housing Trust have been progressively raised in recent years and are now very close to achieving the intentions of the new agreement.

Rent reductions determined in accordance with the income of tenants will continue to be provided, and paid for, it should be noted, from the ordinary revenues of the trust. In South Australia, the rent reductions for needy tenants are among the most generous in Australia.

The agreement also provides that rental houses may be sold on a cash basis at either market value or replacement cost. Proceeds from such sales must be applied to the housing purposes of the agreement. While the possibility of selling rental houses will be reviewed, the long-standing concern of the Government to retain a much needed stock of public rental housing in a wide range of locations will remain the paramount consideration.

The foregoing is a summary only of the terms of the new housing agreement. The agreement, despite forcing up interest rates and rents, does provide greater flexibility in the development of State housing policies. It is most regrettable, therefore, that the Commonwealth Government has chosen to subvert this potential gain by making one of the most savage cuts ever made in funding under the agreement. Having suffered a diminishing real value of advances since 1975, the Commonwealth has now chosen to cut housing agreement funds in real terms by one-quarter. This is at a time of acute recession in the dwelling construction industry throughout Australia, and at a time when continuing recession has significantly increased the number of families and individuals in need of housing

assistance.

The funds to be provided to South Australia under the agreement will be \$47 368 000 as compared with \$58 460 000 last year. Of the total to be provided, \$19 487 000 must be matched on a \$1 for \$1 basis from other sources. It appears that South Australia will be able to meet this requirement through other borrowings already planned and from State sources. As such matching funds would have been provided in any case, the reduction in Commonwealth funding will be translated into reduced housing activity. Notwithstanding efforts to provide additional funds, a reduction in the scale of activity by the Housing Trust has this year become inevitable. It is also a matter of regret that the Commonwealth has seen fit to raise the interest rate on rental housing from 4 per cent to 5 per cent. The effect of this change on rents for new rental houses is significant.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. The Act will be brought into operation as soon as the agreement has been formally executed. Clause 3 provides the definition of the agreement. Clause 4 ratifies and approves the agreement, authorises the Treasurer to carry out its terms, and authorises the appropriation of moneys required for this purpose. It also ratifies any act done by the Treasurer in anticipation of the agreement coming into force. Clause 5 provides that loans made by the Treasurer in pursuance of the agreement shall be made upon terms and conditions determined by him with the approval of the Minister in charge of housing. It also authorises bodies which received such loans to accept them on the terms and conditions which are made, and extends their borrowing powers accordingly.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## HUNDRED OF KATARAPKO

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare):** I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1973, section 80, Weigall Division, Cobdogla Irrigation Area, hundred of Katarapko, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Section 80 contains 1 265 hectares and is located adjacent to the Gerard Reserve. Irrigation perpetual lease 2315 over the section was transferred to the Gerard Reserve Council Incorporated in September 1975 following negotiations with the lessees. Funds for the purchase were provided by the Australian Government. The Gerard Reserve Council has requested that section 80 be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust, subject to the trust leasing the land back to the council for 99 years with a right of renewal on expiry of the lease.

Gerard has an Aboriginal permanent residential population of over 125 persons, whose livelihood is dependent at present on the farm and irrigation activities. The acquisition of additional land is vital to the continued survival of the community as it will allow for expansion of primary production thus providing continued employment for the growing population and at the same time a training medium for the younger people who wish to be employed and skilled in this direction.

The Community Welfare Department and the Aboriginal Lands Trust agreed to the proposal, and section 80 has now been absolutely surrendered to the Crown as a necessary step to enable the vesting to proceed. A plan of



section 80 is exhibited for the information of members. In accordance with section 16 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, the Minister of Lands has recommended that section 80, Weigall Division, Cobdogla Irrigation Area, be vested in the trust, and I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

### HUNDRED OF BONYTHON

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare):** I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1973, section 250, hundred of Bonython, County of Way, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Section 250 has an area of 0.5169 hectares and is situated alongside the Eyre Highway at Ceduna. This section was formerly part of section 192, hundred of Bonython, which was dedicated as a reserve for the use of the then Aboriginal Affairs Department and placed under the control of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in *Government Gazette* dated 23 October 1969.

There are several buildings on the property including a residence that is fenced off from the other improvements. The fenced area and residence are to be retained for the use of the Community Welfare Department for a school for agricultural science, and it is intended that the balance area, together with all the improvements thereon, is to be conveyed to the trust. The department and the Aboriginal Lands Trust agree to the proposal and the area now numbered section 250 has been resumed from the previously mentioned dedicated reserve as a necessary step to enable the vesting to proceed. Thus this section is now Crown lands.

A plan of section 250 is exhibited for the information of members. In accordance with section 16 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, the Minister of Lands has recommended that section 250, Hundred of Bonython, County of Way, be vested in the trust, and I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1971-1976. 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

It amends the Police Pensions Act upon two separate subjects. First, the power to invest the superannuation fund established under the principal Act is substantially widened. At present the fund can only be invested with the Treasurer, in trustee securities, or in local government securities. The Public Actuary has recommended that the powers relating to investment of the fund be widened to conform to the corresponding provisions of the Superan-

uation Act. It is felt that an extension of the powers of investment will make possible a higher rate of return on the assets of the fund and will thus offset the effect of inflation on salaries and hence pensions.

Secondly, the Bill deals with the age of entrance to the Police Pensions Fund. Last year an amendment was made to the regulations under the Police Regulation Act reducing the minimum age at which a person may be appointed as a member of the Police Force from 20 years to 19 years. The first appointment of recruits under the age of 20 years occurred in September 1978. As the Police Pensions Act stands at the moment these members, on joining the Police Pensions Fund, will be required to contribute 5.1 per cent of salary to the fund. By contrast, a person of similar age joining the South Australian Superannuation Fund would contribute 5 per cent of salary to that fund. The present Bill therefore amends the second schedule of the Police Pensions Act to reduce to 5 per cent the proportion of salary to be contributed to the fund by a contributor who joins the fund at less than 20 years of age.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 expands the powers of investment relating to the Police Pensions Fund. Clause 3 inserts a new schedule providing for the case of a recruit under the age of 20 years joining the fund.

Mr. GUNN, for Mr. BECKER, secured the adjournment of the debate.

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1431.)

Schedule.

Labour and Industry, \$4 700 000.

**Mr. GUNN:** It has been brought to my attention that Mr. Phelan, an organiser with the Australian Workers Union, has been going around the country making a thorough nuisance of himself by interfering with show societies in the conduct of shearing competitions at annual shows. Recently, I was invited to a show in my district at which the Chairman, in his opening remarks, said that, because of unfortunate union action, the shearing competition could not take place.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is the honourable member referring to an A.W.U. official?

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** How does the honourable member relate that to the line under discussion?

**Mr. GUNN:** As the Minister is responsible for the arbitration and conciliation legislation, I want him to act to protect my constituents. Under that Act, it is an offence to compel anyone to join an organisation or a society against his will. I understand that the people concerned were threatened that, if they did not join a certain organisation before taking part in the shearing competition—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must be able to relate his remarks to the line under consideration. Unless he is able to show where, in the line we are debating, comment is made about A.W.U. officials and show societies, I will be forced to rule him out of order.

**Mr. GUNN:** I draw your attention to line 00-10, "Administrative, Clerical and General Staff."

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out that there has been a tendency for discussions to wander far and wide during the Committee stage of this Bill. It is a requirement of discussions in Committee that they have some relevance to a vote listed in the Estimates of payments of revenue. The

honourable member has not been able to indicate to me that the matter he wishes to raise has any relevance to the lines.

**Mr. GUNN:** I also draw your attention, Sir, to line 00-20, "Industrial Relations and Training Division", which lists the Deputy Director, Industrial Registrar and other officers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out that if I were to allow a discussion about the activities of an Australian Workers Union organiser to be related to any of these lines, I would have to allow any matter at all that any member wanted to speak about to any line. That is a tenuous thread that the honourable member is trying to establish. I do not want to inhibit discussions by the Committee, but I will not allow the honourable member to continue to discuss the activities of an A.W.U. organiser.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member for Eyre has not yet finished putting his case and, therefore, it might be rather difficult for you to judge the matter. He explained that under line 00-10, "Administrative, Clerical and General Staff", among other things, he is putting that the activities of an A.W.U. organiser (and the fact that he acted in a most reprehensible way is not the point) go beyond his duties and inflame reactions. I am certain that the member for Eyre is trying to point that out and to ask whether the Minister, his staff, or his department have had complaints about this matter and whether those complaints have been investigated. I spoke to the member for Eyre today about this matter and I know that was his intention.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

**Mr. GUNN:** As was pointed out, I made only passing reference to the activities of the union organiser. What I was about to explain was that the information I seek from the Minister is in relation to what redress my constituents have. I was seeking that advice under a particular line so that I would be able to inform my constituents how they could overcome this problem, which will have industrial connotations if it is allowed to continue.

The organisation involved was placed in a position in which, if it went on with its competition, certain people who may have participated could have been blackballed and would not have been permitted to carry out their occupation of shearing in the future. The Burra Show Society was faced with this situation for the second year running. I understand from the member for Rocky River that something similar happened at the Crystal Brook show. I ask the Minister what action voluntary organisations such as show societies can take to guarantee that they will not be placed in the position I have just outlined.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry):** I have received no complaint about this matter. I am not saying that the department has not received complaints, because it could have; all complaints do not get to me but go to the inspectorial area and are processed from there unless they are addressed to me personally. In Australia is a federation called, I think, the Show Sheep Shearing Federation of Australia. That is a joint federation of the Australian Agricultural Society and the Australian Workers Union, which have an agreement that, where sheep-shearing contests are held at shows, before any person can participate in any event he must be a member of the Australian Workers Union.

**Mr. Chapman:** What a load of rot.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order.

**Mr. Chapman:** So is the Minister.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the honourable member

for Alexandra to order.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The member for Alexandra has obviously not kept himself financial in the Australian Workers Union, as I have.

**Mr. Chapman:** I don't intend to.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have already called the honourable member for Alexandra to order. If he continues to ignore the directions of the Chair I will have to take further action. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I was reading in the current issue of the *Australian Worker* that the world champion sheep shearer from New Zealand and his crew had just arrived in Australia. To enable them to take part in sheep shearing at shows and in other areas, they were issued with membership in the Australian Workers Union virtually as they came off the aeroplane. That is consistent with the federation's rules. To the best of my knowledge, at every show I have ever attended, all participants have been members of the Australian Workers Union. I would say it is for that reason that the organiser of that union has been visiting show sites.

**Mr. GUNN:** Many participants who wish to take part in these contests are learners or sons of farmers, and they are not in any way connected with the union, nor do they wish to be. Under industrial legislation that the Minister administers it is an offence for anyone to endeavour to force them to join a union. What action can organisations or individuals take to protect themselves from these sorts of threats and intimidation?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I have no knowledge of anyone being forced to join a union at these shows. I have not been contacted directly by any person about this matter. The honourable member could be inventing the circumstances he has talked about. If he produces evidence of what he says has happened, I shall be prepared to look at that evidence in the context of what is occurring. I reiterate that there is an agreement between the Australian Workers Union and the federation whereby it is mandatory for contestants to be members of a union. If the honourable member goes to the Adelaide, Melbourne or Sydney show he will find that before any participant can take part in a contest it is mandatory for that person, under the rules of the federation, not the rules of the Australian Workers Union, to join the Australian Workers Union.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I am interested to know what action the Minister will take in the event of a show society secretary, or representative of that organisation, being faced with a situation similar to that described by the member for Eyre. The Minister challenged the member for Eyre to give him details about this matter. I do not know how much more detail is required than that already given. The honourable member has not only given the name of the society, the site at which this occurred, the period during which it occurred and who was affected, but he has also named the union organiser involved in the incident. What further detail does the Minister want? The member for Eyre named the type of event, stipulated that it was a shearing competition at an agricultural show, and gave all of the other detail necessary. Surely that is enough to bring the Minister up to date with the position that has applied in the member for Eyre's district and the member for Rocky River's district.

I do not know what more could possibly be required by the Minister to enable him to reply to the question asked. I require a reply from the Minister on that subject because I represent an area where there are five or six agricultural show societies, of which a number conduct show shearing competitions annually. Having been a convener and a participant in this type of operation over many years, I am

most interested to know the Minister's reply today. This is important because we are right in the middle of the agricultural and horticultural show society period. On 14 November I will be attending a show society function at which a shearing competition is planned and at which there has been a show shearing competition ever since that society commenced. The Leader of the Opposition and I will be present, and we hope to witness a show shearing competition without the kind of interference described by the member for Eyre. I can assure the Minister of the outcome if that sort of tomfoolery commenced in our area.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Last Thursday I was speaking to this line, Mr. Chairman, when one of your deputies stopped me, even though I was following on the remarks made by the honourable member for Davenport and the Minister. It was a discussion arising out of the item "Manpower Development Officers". It was a debate on the question of business confidence in South Australia and the industrial outlook for this State.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I hope the honourable member will be able to relate any comments on manpower development officers and business confidence in South Australia to the expenditure connected with the item "Industrial Relations and Training Division". As I pointed out earlier, I do not want unnecessarily to inhibit discussion in the Committee stage. Honourable members are aware that the second reading debate on Bills, particularly the Budget, allows for the widest range of views to be expressed but, when we are in Committee, there has to be much more relevance attached to the comments made. I hope that in future this relevance can be identified, so that the Committee stage is not unnecessarily extended. Honourable members know that they are able to speak as often as they like and for as long as they like. Under those conditions, there have to be certain restrictions on the matters to which they can refer.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The only pity is that I was speaking in a debate initiated by the member for Davenport, followed up by the Minister, and I was speaking directly on the subject matter that they had been canvassing, and this new policy of strictness came in in the middle of the debate and I felt that that was quite unfair to me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I trust that the honourable member is not reflecting on a decision of the Acting Chairman.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** All I can say about that is that, if he had given me a fair go—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member ought not to reflect on such a decision. The honourable member can continue his contribution, and I will judge whether it is relevant or otherwise. I hope the honourable member does not reflect on the decision of the Chair last Thursday.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** All I can say is that the line probably would have gone through on Thursday if it had not been for that, but that is not a reflection on the ruling itself; at least, maybe it is not. What I was coming to, when I was stopped, was the question of confidence in the community, and of course it is confidence in the community which leads to employment. The manpower development officers are responsible for projections relating to employment in the future, and I proposed, and perhaps I was taking a long view of the thing—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I thought you were doing well.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I thought I was, too. It was unfortunate that the member for Port Adelaide, or whoever he was, was in the Chair.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope the honourable member for Mitcham does not refer to the actions of the Acting Chairman again. In any way that the honourable member refers to the Acting Chairman, it can be

interpreted as a reflection. In future I will interpret it in that way. I hope the honourable member continues his remarks.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was leading up to asking the Minister about what I think is a quite alarming trend. I think he may have already made public comment on it; it is the future outlook of various manufacturers in South Australia and their future capacity to employ people. I refer particularly to the attitude study entitled "The Outlook for Manufacturing in South Australia" which was carried out a couple of months ago (it is dated August) by Eric White Associates and W. D. Scott and Company. It shows widespread pessimism amongst the business community in South Australia. We do not need to go into the reasons for the pessimism. Some of those reflect on this Government, some reflect on the Federal Government, and so on.

The point of the thing is that pessimism is there whether it is justified or unjustified, whether it is real or not. Ministers in this Government can talk until they are blue in the face about how appreciative industry is to them for what they have done; that just is not shown by the responses that were given. To take a few examples: about 90 per cent of the respondents rated the outlook for manufacturing in South Australia as unsatisfactory or, at best, static over the next three years. Fifty per cent of the respondents saw the outlook for Australian manufacturing as being equally disappointing. However, the other 50 per cent rated prospects as being good to extremely good in Australia. Thirty-three per cent of the respondents named high costs or in some cases the cost disadvantage here as being the major factor behind their pessimistic outlook in South Australia. Twenty per cent mentioned State Government legislation, interference, and over-spending. Twenty per cent saw future difficulties for South Australian manufacturing because of over-dependence on cars and white goods, and because of what they saw as an inevitable loss of opportunities to other States as rationalisation and structural adjustments occur. That was the very point I was making when I was stopped.

Ten per cent of respondents stated that opportunities for manufacturers in the State would fade because of a lack of management expertise. They were some of the reasons that were given for what is a most alarming trend in South Australia. I have already said (and I will say it again very briefly) that the opinion has been expressed to me that we will be lucky to hang on to what we have, because there are not any real advantages of industry in South Australia. Previous Governments were able to attract it here. It would not matter which Government was in office now, we would still be in somewhat the same position, but we are very unlikely to be able to develop any new industries here unless we manage to crack Redcliff or something of that nature.

Having said that, I refer again to this most pessimistic survey. I think it was the Minister, or it was probably more typically the Premier, who said it was all wrong or nonsense, or badly organised or whatever. I would like to hear the Minister's comments on this attitude survey, because it is, to me, more important than anything else. Whether the attitudes are justified or not, there they are, and we have got to do something about it, or the natural situation which I have sketched and in which we find ourselves will take over inevitably and we will be even worse off. Can the Minister comment on that survey?

**Dr. EASTICK:** I would appreciate an indication of the initiatives the Minister expects to flow from his department, and the various executive heads of the departments listed under this heading, during the months ahead. I appreciate the problems in South Australia which

have been alluded to by other members and which have just been highlighted by the member for Mitcham. They are serious problems and need a concerned and total effort by anyone in South Australia who can help.

The initiatives, in the first instance, should come from the Minister's department, because that is the body charged with the responsibility of looking into these matters. What initiatives have already been undertaken during this current period of time, what initiatives are in the pipeline which may be expected to surface in the near future, and what initiatives, if any, would allow for members on both sides to put their shoulder to the wheel to get some distinct benefit for South Australia?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I have asked the department to comment on this very question, because I believe it is a reasonable one. I received the following reply:

The manpower development branch of the Labour and Industry Department has done some work with the Australian Bureau of Statistics concerning the possibilities of developing and introducing a system to enable manpower forecasting and projections to be possible in a limited way on a State basis. Work was to be done for the Industrial Training Council and the Labour and Industry Department. After some time it was agreed by the two departments that it was not practicable to develop and maintain such a system at a State level. Members will appreciate that manpower forecasting is not just a simple matter of projecting on from where an industry now is, and has been in the past, to find out where it might be in five to 10 years time. Sophisticated and complex output models are needed to take account of a whole variety of variables, such as levels of business activity, economic prospects, technology change, population statistics, and so on, which will have a pronounced bearing on likely work force requirements. Many of these factors can only satisfactorily be handled at a national level.

In the debate last Thursday, which went on for an hour and 20 minutes and did not achieve very much, I said that it was difficult for a State on its own to try to develop manpower policies and manpower projections; that is supported by what the department has now reported to me this morning. It is interesting that over the weekend the South Australian Young Liberals conference passed a motion calling on the Federal Government to implement long-term planning on manpower and economic matters. The Young Liberals made a wise and sound decision, because I have been saying, for about three years, that we need at least to have an input from the States into a Federal body; yet nothing was done until late last year. I could not agree more with the honourable member that we need to know where we are going and that we need to do some planning. However, in the present climate we are all in a difficult position (and this State is no different from any other) until we get a body agreed to and headed by the Federal Government.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I appreciate what the Minister has just had to say, but it does not cover the complete field of the Labour and Industry Department. Can the Minister indicate the initiatives we can expect to come out of the various branches of his department aimed at stimulating or assisting in an advancement in South Australia?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am disappointed first of all—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Don't be disappointed, because I will deal with it when it comes up under the no-confidence motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am disappointed that the Minister has not replied and I can only conclude that it is a bit difficult to answer at this stage, but I will remind the Minister later on, so he will have to reply sooner or later.

I now raise the further matter of apprentices, which was one of the matters raised in the earlier debate that the Minister was talking about. As I understand it, there has been a very great decrease in the number of young people entering into indentures of apprenticeship this year. I raise this matter now because I believe one of the reasons for this is the economic situation, and I agree very largely with the Government's viewpoint on the reasons for that. However, because we are in such a situation of stagnation, pessimism and lack of employment, masters cannot afford to take on apprentices. It means a four-year commitment to somebody to train apprentices, to pay them and to allow time off. If the position regarding apprentices in trades is in any way comparable to the situation in relation to articulated clerks in solicitors' offices, one may get a bit of value out of them in the end but it does not pay at all in the early days. People are simply not prepared to take on apprentices, because they cannot afford to bind themselves for four years. Therefore, there should be some alternative to the present apprenticeship system so that people can receive training in the hope that the economy will pick up later and they will be able to get jobs. What I am suggesting is not an original suggestion.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Did you hear what I had to say over the weekend?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Davenport does himself too much credit, because I do not know what he said over the weekend. I was not invited to the Young Liberals' convention; in days gone by I used to go to them, and I used to wow them, too.

I make the suggestion, which I would like the Minister to consider and maybe put to the Apprenticeship Commission, that as an alternative to the present system of apprenticeship it should be possible for a person to go from master to master and have a sort of log book which sets out what training and what work he has done with any master, and only when the apprentice has achieved a particular standard and, in aggregate with a number of masters, a proper standard of training, he should finish his apprenticeship and be regarded as a tradesman. That may be difficult to implement, but it seems sensible, and it would get over what I think is one of the most difficult things at the moment, that is, the lack of willingness of employers to bind themselves for four years to an apprentice who may be a millstone around their neck when they have no work to do.

If they could have him for as long as they had work and then fill in a record for him (kept by either the apprentice or the Apprenticeship Commission), he could go to someone else and get more work. In that way, at least people would be being trained, even though under a different system from the present one. I guess that we all know that at present there is not work for apprentices. I have had specific complaints that in the Engineering and Water Supply Department apprentices have no work to do. In some places they are sitting around, not getting any training, while their apprenticeship time is passing.

The member for Glenelg has disappeared, but I am told that in the painting trade, without there being the formality of the transfer required under the Apprentices Act now, this sort of system is being used. Apprentices are doing work for other people who have work. In a situation such as the present one, there must be much more flexibility. It may be that in times of plenty of work, money, and so on, our system is good, but we are not in that time now and we must do the best we can.

What I have said is an alternative that has been put to me as one way in which we could overcome one of the worst aspects of the present situation. I raise it now with the Minister to ask him (because I do not think that this

matter will come into the no-confidence motion) what he thinks about the germ of the idea and whether he would be prepared to ask the Apprenticeship Commission to see whether it could be worked out. I had a quick look at the Act, and it may well require amendment. On the other hand, the Act seems to be fairly flexible. All it provides is that one has to take up to four years in apprenticeship. It might not be necessary to alter the Act but, if it were, that certainly would be worth doing.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I commend the member for raising the plight of apprentices, about which we are all concerned. Some of us go about it in the wrong way, but others try to approach the problem in a sensible way to overcome hazards present now. I will forward the honourable member's suggestion to the commission. It is not the first time that the idea has emanated. As the member would be aware, the commission is master of its own destiny, virtually; it is a separate body, with the right to make its own decisions. Whilst it would be quite prepared to accept advice from Parliament in this regard to try to overcome the problem, it still has the right to decide what way it should operate.

This may be an opportune time to announce that I have written to the Federal Minister (Mr. Street). He should have received my letter today, so I feel under no obligation to keep it private any longer. I put to him a proposition that would, if the Federal Government agreed, overcome an acute problem. Businesses are closing down and apprentices are virtually being suspended from the apprenticeship system. They are out of work, out of training, and out of time regarding trying to conclude their apprenticeship. I do not have the copy of the letter with me but the proposition is along the lines whether, if and where an employer is prepared to take on an apprentice, irrespective of whether he requires an apprentice or not, for training purposes, the Federal Government will reimburse the employer the sum the employee otherwise would receive from social services.

That seems a practical way out of a situation where apprentices are suspended and virtually paid social services for nothing. If we could agree on a useful method with the Federal Government, it would keep the lads in employment, and they could conclude their apprenticeship and become tradesmen, which may never happen in the present climate. This would prepare them for the employment market, and it could induce employers to employ out-of-trade apprentices. I hope that I will receive a favourable reply from the Federal Minister.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I will draw two points to the Minister's attention. The first relates to the subject raised by the honourable member for Eyre and the subsequent discussion here this afternoon about the involvement of the Australian Workers Union at show societies, particularly in connection with show sheep shearing. I have made some brief inquiries of an officer of the Adelaide Royal Show Society about this situation, and I believe, after talking to him that either the Minister has made a mistake or that he has misled the Chamber in his reply to the member for Eyre.

About five or six years ago when Mobil Oil Company sponsored the sheep shearing competition in conjunction with the Australian Workers Union, a list of conditions under which that section would be conducted was prepared. As is the case in each of the sections at such shows, the show society allows the organisation to fix its own rules and conditions and its own prize-money, trophies, etc. The society accordingly inserts the information in a book. In the case of the Adelaide Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society, listed clearly in that section was a requirement of Mobil Oil Company in

conjunction with the union that all senior participants in the championship be union members.

In that case it was not the show society's responsibility: it was that of the sponsoring group. It is interesting to note that that show society has conducted shearing competitions among juniors (or apprentices, if one likes to describe them in that way) and that it sponsored a Rural Youth section, which does not mention union membership, nor is it likely to do so. Clearly, the show society recognises that those presons, although participating in a sheep shearing demonstration and competition, may never be involved in the shearing industry. In those circumstances, they should not be involved, pressured, blackmailed or otherwise, about becoming union members in order to participate.

The same principle applies throughout the rest of the shows. They do not belong to a federation at all in South Australia, as intimated by the Minister. I know of only one State that has anything like a federation of its agricultural and horticultural show societies, and that is New South Wales, where an organisation controls the Agriculture and Horticulture Show Society. That situation does not apply in South Australia.

I have good reason for raising this subject this afternoon and I hope that the Minister will recognise and take whatever action he can, within his capacity as Minister, to ensure that no country show society, one of its committees, the secretary, or any of its other officers, is involved in an embarrassing situation, such as that which apparently occurred in the Eyre District and, I understand, in the Rocky River District before then.

I hope that is the last we hear or see of such activities by people in that particular organisation, particularly when the community is seeking to enjoy that type of situation, which I know can produce entertainment and interest.

The only other point I would like to draw to the Minister's attention is almost an apology. I made a mistake last Thursday when I said amended workmen's compensation legislation had been introduced in this Chamber by the present Minister. However, this legislation was introduced by his predecessor, the member for what was then the District of Port Pirie.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I move:

That this line be reduced by \$100.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is the honourable member moving what is, in effect, a no confidence motion on the manpower and development line, or on the total line?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** It is on the total vote.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** It is specifically about manpower development, is it?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** It relates to manpower development and I will also touch briefly on the Industrial Democracy Unit and the policies there. The unemployment figures released last Friday clearly indicated the grave unemployment situation in South Australia. This State has the highest unemployment of any State in Australia. The Premier this afternoon, and the Minister for Labour and Industry last Thursday, argued that unemployment was a national problem. According to the figures, unemployment is not just a national problem but is a particular problem in this State and the cause can be attributed to the South Australian Government.

First, the figures released on Friday by the Australian Bureau of Statistics showed that unemployment among people seeking a full-time job was 7.8 per cent in South Australia, whilst it was only 6.1 per cent on a national basis. South Australia has an unemployment problem 28 per cent higher than the rest of Australia.

Excluding those seeking part-time employment in S.A. the picture is worse. For those seeking full-time

employment, 8.6 per cent of the South Australian work force is unemployed compared to a national figure of only 6.1 per cent. In addition, South Australia has the highest unemployment of any State in Australia in the youth area (15 to 19 age group), namely, 26.3 per cent compared to a national level of only 16.9 per cent.

As further proof, for each of the past six months, unemployment in South Australia has increased; this situation is completely opposite to what has occurred nationally where, in five of those months, unemployment has decreased. In other words, South Australia, for the past six months, has been going against the national trend. That is significant proof that there is a particular problem in this State which does not relate to national unemployment and one which must come back to the South Australian Government.

There is a complete loss of confidence of private industry in the South Australian Government. The Opposition, for some time, has argued that companies are closing down in this State or moving out. I can now give proof of this. A major transport company previously operating in South Australia has conveyed its entire operations of at least 12 client companies interstate during the past three months. Furthermore, a service company has indicated to me that in its area of operation three companies every month close their operations in South Australia. That is only the tip of the iceberg, because many other transport companies in South Australia are moving client companies out of South Australia.

The manufacturing employment figures released last Thursday are further proof. Manufacturing employment in this State dropped from 111 000 in June 1977 to 102 700 in June 1978, a reduction of 8 300, or 7.5 per cent. In a report in today's *Advertiser*, the Minister quoted figures on manufacturing industries in Australia and it was interesting to see those figures were taken up to June 1977. The Minister is so dishonest that he was not prepared to use the latest figures, even though they were available. He deliberately did not use figures up to June 1978 because they gave exactly the opposite trend to what the Minister was trying to prove. That shows the extent to which the Government is attempting desperately to put the entire blame for unemployment on the Federal Government rather than face the truth of what is happening in South Australia.

In addition, we should examine what some private companies say about their future in this State. I take this up because on Thursday the Minister challenged me to say whether any companies blamed the Government's policies for the lack of confidence in industrial development in South Australia. I will quote several extracts from letters sent to me from various companies in this State. The first company wrote to me on 15 June 1978 about whether it would leave this State, stating:

The answer, of course, is to move, and that is being considered.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** What about the reason? Give us the reason.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Another company said:

It is disturbing to note the loss of the State's competitive position in relation to other States in its capacity to attract fresh industry to South Australia.

Another company said:

However, the continuing problem is that many of our South Australian suppliers are unable to invest any longer in labour-saving devices or do not have the necessary confidence to invest because of the anticipated end result by increased pressure by unions for more and more of the small proportion left of the cake. As a net result, as a company, we are being forced to purchase from interstate and overseas to

remain competitive in the market place . . . Over the three years we have faced and met many challenges with varying degrees of success and remained a South Australian manufacturer despite the incentives offered by other States on a continuous basis, so we would wonder what incentives are being offered to others (could easily be competitors) when in fact there is no incentive to stay here.

This was referring to South Australia.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Does the honourable member intend to table these letters? If not, is there a need for him to table them?

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no need for him to table them.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** They are letters written to me and in many cases the writers have specifically asked that their names not be divulged publicly and I would adhere to that request. They clearly indicate what private enterprise thinks of the South Australian Labor Government. Last Thursday the Minister threw out the challenge, asking me to produce the letters. I have now produced the letters, and the Minister is not able to accept them.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I asked you to name the companies.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** You did not. The Minister said that no firm had blamed the Government's policies. I am pointing out that many firms have blamed the Government's policies. The figures released last Friday are a clear vote of no confidence in the policies adopted by the South Australian Government to control unemployment. South Australia has a unique unemployment problem and the blame must lie squarely on the shoulders of the South Australian Government, particularly the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry. Their policies have been found wanting. They have announced no new strategies whatsoever in this Budget. The only policy they can put up is to reduce the amount of money being spent on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, a reduction from \$24 000 000 to \$7 000 000.

The Minister of Labour and Industry accused me earlier of saying that SURS had been a complete failure. He misquoted me, because I said that SURS had been a complete failure in keeping down the number of unemployed in South Australia. The facts given last Friday clearly indicate that. No State in Australia has had a higher increase in unemployment than has South Australia, and yet South Australia is the only State that has such a scheme to create jobs for people artificially. The Minister has boasted about SURS and the number of jobs it has created. However, the statistics show that of the total number of people in SURS, which has had about 1 000 at any one time, only one in every five is likely to retain the job. About 3 600 South Australians are currently employed under the Federal Government "sweet pea" scheme. That is about 3½ times the number employed under SURS. The Federal Government scheme has been far more successful in giving people permanent jobs. Over 60 per cent of people who received a wage subsidy under the "sweet pea" scheme of the Federal Government ended up with permanent jobs at the end of their wage subsidy period. The "sweet pea" scheme, which has put people into realistic jobs by way of a wage subsidy, has been far more successful in helping the unemployment scene throughout Australia and in this State than has been SURS.

It is most unfortunate that so many young people in South Australia are faced with the possibility of not finding a job, and they are faced with that possibility as a result of the direct policies of the South Australian Government, because private industry has completely lost confidence in this State. It is interesting to see that the

number of private enterprise jobs in South Australia has actually declined in the last seven years of the Dunstan Administration. We have fewer private enterprise jobs now than we had in June 1971. What a staggering indictment on any Government, especially a Government that under its present Premier boasts to be a Government that understands the problems of industry! In these seven years of the Dunstan Government there has been no growth whatsoever in the private sector. In June 1970, there were 285 000 private enterprise jobs in South Australia, and in June 1978 the number of jobs had been reduced to 282 000. What a record for any Government to boast about! There have been seven years of prosperity for the whole of Australia but not in this State. We have seen an actual reduction in the number of private enterprise jobs, and that is the basic reason why we have the very special unemployment problem in South Australia at present.

There can be no denying that South Australia has the worst unemployment problem in Australia, and the worst youth unemployment in Australia. The South Australian Government's policies have failed completely in the past 12 months; the figures stand by themselves. In the past six months the rest of Australia has seen an improvement in employment but not in South Australia. This is the only State that has had a continual decline in employment over the past six months. What a shameful record for any Government to have, and yet the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry have still got the hide even as late as today to stand up and try to wash their hands of the problem, saying that it is a matter of Federal Government policy; they are putting the entire blame on the Federal Government. The figures clearly indicate that private companies would rather manufacture in other States than in South Australia. This afternoon I indicated that at least 12 major companies had moved out of this State in a three-month period. They had been moved out by the one transport company, let alone how many companies have been moved out by other transport companies. The companies are deserting the State for other States because they have lost confidence.

I point out to the member for Morphett that the latest Bureau of Statistics figures show a reduction of 133 in the number of manufacturing enterprises in South Australia for the past 12 months, compared with a slight increase in the period before that. The member for Morphett had the hide to distribute a letter in his own district which showed there had been an increase. However, he did not use the latest available figures. He tried the same dishonest tactics used by the Minister of Labour and Industry. He used the period 1975-76. He is so dishonest that he is not even prepared to tell his own electors what is really going on in South Australia.

**Mr. Groom:** You didn't read it properly.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I read it properly, and I have a copy of it here. If I were the member for Morphett I would feel ashamed to put out such a dishonest and distorted series of statistics, which gave an entirely wrong picture of what was going on in this State. Having seen the unemployment figures last Friday, the people will not believe the trash handed out by the Premier, the member for Morphett, or the Minister of Labour and Industry. They have lost all confidence in their Government, just as has private enterprise.

The unemployment figures show that South Australia does have a particular unemployment problem, and that has been caused directly by the policies of the South Australian Government. I have not yet mentioned the industrial democracy policies. I could quote from a series of other letters about this, but I will not do so, because I

think this Chamber knows the feelings of private enterprise about the Government's policies on industrial democracy. I could quote from other letters that clearly damn the policy. One letter states:

Many industrialists could be frightened off by the Labor Government's industrial democracy policy.

I have plenty of other statements like that one. The survey carried out and reported by the Minister last week certainly is no reason for confidence by the Government. In the report the Minister boasted that so many companies were adopting industrial democracy, but we know that the number of respondents to that survey was extremely low if taken in statistical terms. The Minister would boast that a number of companies were going to adopt worker councils, the type of industrial democracy policy adopted by the Labor Government.

Only six companies out of the 300 surveyed were prepared to adopt the worker council policy, and of the total 78 per cent that, so it was said, had some form of employee participation, the majority, or 61 per cent of the 78 per cent, involved in fact simply participation on safety committees. The Minister of Labour and Industry knows only too well that the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act requires that there be a worker on the safety committee if he requests that he should be on it. By legislation, the vast majority of the 78 per cent that were said to practise employee participation were forced to do so simply through their safety committees under existing State legislation.

That survey was no vote of confidence for the Government's policy on industrial democracy. A quick look at the figures, particularly at the six companies in the whole of the 300 who have yet even looked at the Government's style of industrial democracy, shows there is a clear vote of no confidence in that area. The facts stand by themselves. There is an unemployment problem in this State, and the South Australian Government must take full responsibility for it. Industries are leaving the State or are closing down their operations here, and they will continue to do so.

The week before this State Budget was introduced, I predicted that South Australia would have 50 000 unemployed by March next year. Based on the latest statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the rapid deterioration that has occurred since then, I would now have to lift that prediction to a figure of 55 000 unemployed by March next year. By the end of September, the level had reached almost 47 000, with the school-leavers still to come on to the market. Even the estimate of 55 000 will be conservative. I cannot accept the Minister's prediction that things will improve in South Australia in the next 12 months.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I didn't say that.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I heard the Minister on the A.B.C. news twice this morning, and I read it in the *Advertiser* today. He claims that, in the short term, things will improve in South Australia, and he puts forward various reasons. I argue the opposite viewpoint. In the short term, things will continue to deteriorate very rapidly in South Australia, to the point where close to 9 per cent or 10 per cent of the total work force in this State will be unemployed, and where about 30 per cent to 33 per cent of young people will be unemployed. That is a damnation of a Government and its policies, and that is why I have moved the motion.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I support the motion in the strongest possible terms, and I condemn the continued attempts by the member for Morphett and the member for Newland to make asinine interjections; this

shows their lack of concern for the real factors in these matters. I have said on many occasions (and we will keep on making this comment) that, if there is one major disincentive to industrial development in South Australia and to the creation of new job opportunities, it is the Labor Government's policy, as stated many times, as varied and as revised many times, on industrial democracy, worker participation, or call it what you will.

I shall go a little further than the member for Davenport has done, and I say that no-one trusts the present Labor Government in South Australia on many things but, in relation to industrial democracy, no-one trusts it one centimetre. Everyone remembers the way in which that policy was first introduced: one-third of the directors coming from shareholders, one-third from the shop floor, and one-third from the department, presumably from Government advisers. No matter how often that policy is reviewed, or how often the Premier shuffles around or backs away, people in the business community, inside South Australia and outside of it, will recall the original proposals. No amount of revision will ever take away that suspicion.

**Mr. Allison:** They can read the Labor Party platform.

**Mr. TONKIN:** As the member for Mount Gambier says, they can read the Labor Party platform, too. Nothing can remove that suspicion, and probably only one thing will remove, once and for all, the major barrier and obstacle to industrial development in this State—the policy of industrial democracy promoted by the Labor Government—and that is the removal of the Labor Government from office. That is the only thing that will satisfy intending investors in South Australia that their money will be safe, that their projects will be safe, and that they will not be raided and taken over by a socialist Government intent on State ownership.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I imagine that as good a way as any to reply to this debate would be to go back to the debate in this place last Thursday, when the member for Mitcham was developing what I thought was a fairly sensible approach to this problem. I shall quote from what the honourable member said on that day, and this was probably the most rational part of the debate from members opposite. The honourable member said:

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 1930s South Australia was predominantly a primary producing State: it did not have much industry. In the 1930s 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 year 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.

I think that is a very fair assessment of what has been happening over that period. Whilst we, as a State, were able to stand up for a couple of years in the face of the very serious national down-turn, finally the crunch had to come in South Australia. I shall not try to deny the position we are in. I loathe it just as much as anyone else does. That is one of the things members on this side are sincere about. Members opposite are quite insincere about unemploy-

ment. They use the topic in circumstances in which they think they can make some political gain to embarrass the Government. Let us look at how honest is the member for Davenport. He accuses me of being dishonest. He made a statement about what I am supposed to have said on A.B.C. radio today.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** I said you—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The honourable member did not say that I was quoted. He said he heard me say that things were improving in South Australia. I was never on the A.B.C. on voice this morning, and the honourable member knows damn well that I was not on voice on the A.B.C. this morning. He will say anything to try to prove a point, no matter how inaccurate that statement may be. I did not say that the position had improved. I will read from the speech I made yesterday. If I was quoted on the A.B.C. radio this morning (and I did not hear it), it was on this basis—and I shall read what I said at the conference yesterday in relation to the point the honourable member is making. I said:

There is some ray of light shining through in the short term for South Australia with the car manufacturing industry picking up.

I can produce evidence to substantiate that. I refer in this respect to a report in the 29 September 1978 issue of the *Advertiser* which, under the heading "Upsurge in some South Australian job prospects", stated:

Chrysler Australia Limited, which had retrenched 180 South Australian workers in May, is now taking on labour, and job openings have occurred in other areas.

I went on to state that more stock was available. Is that arguable? More stock is now available for slaughter and, indeed, more will become available as the season develops. I also said that there would, hopefully, be a vastly improved farm output. In that respect, the Premier said that we have had three bad drought years. I continued:

Those factors will help to provide jobs for several hundred workers but, as a counter force, we expect several thousand school leavers to enter the labour market within the next few months, to further worsen the problem.

Is that being dishonest? I am putting the position exactly as I see it. There is no dishonesty about it at all. The only dishonesty in this regard is the member for Davenport's claim today that I forecast on A.B.C. radio that there would be an up-turn. However, I was not on A.B.C. radio on voice, and I made no such forecast at all.

I will now deal with the figures used by the honourable member. He accused me again of being dishonest in relation to the statistician's figures on the "sweet pea" scheme. The honourable member alleged that the job situation under the "sweet pea" scheme is much more favourable than that under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. As a result of an analysis that I have done in relation to the "sweet pea" scheme, I can state that three out of five employees are virtually sacked by the employer on the completion of their six-month (now four-month) training period. They are not my figures but those of the Federal Minister. So, 60 per cent of persons are not finding employment after their training period. I do not know what happens to them. Some may find jobs under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, although there is strong evidence to suggest that a much higher percentage of the people who find jobs under that scheme go on to more permanent areas.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** The Auditor-General's Report does not show that at all; it says 20 per cent.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I know what that report says, but it is subject to argument in relation to where these people finish up.



**Mr. Dean Brown:** Are you questioning the Auditor-General now?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am not questioning what he is saying. I am merely saying that this matter is open to question. No-one knows what happens to these people, because they find jobs all over the place. It is as hard for the Auditor-General as it is for my department (which has tried to do so) to trace these people. I am merely saying that the number involved is subject to question.

The State Unemployment Relief Scheme has found employment for people, enabling them to work for reasonably high wages. This has, in turn, injected finance into the economy, causing a spin-off. So, it is hard successfully to argue what the effects of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme have been.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** I'll stand by the Auditor-General's Report.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Perhaps the Auditor-General is correct. I am merely saying that there is a question mark in relation to the number of people who commenced employment under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and finished up somewhere else where it is hard to trace them. Despite the efforts made by my department, it is a hard job to trace these people. Given that the figure is 20 per cent, the injection into the economy would certainly be higher than that under training schemes, and the spin-off would certainly inject more money into the economy than would the "sweet pea" scheme. However, the Government has not abrogated its responsibilities in relation to the "sweet pea" scheme, which it has used and which it will continue to use. The Government does not under any circumstances say that it is not a good scheme, because it is good, and the Government wants to continue using it. My only objection to the scheme is that it gives an employer an opportunity, having got the training period out of the employee, to discard the employee and say that he is no longer required. The scheme should in some way guarantee that the employee will be trained and employed by the employer. However, some employers are no doubt using the training period to get valuable work out of employees. Indeed, one finds that three-fifths of employees are being discarded after the training period. So, let us not kid ourselves that the "sweet pea" scheme is the be all and end all in relation to solving this country's employment problem.

The honourable member has said that the Government should change its policies. I would be willing to do so if, for example, the member for Davenport could put forward some good ideas. I am sure that the Premier would be willing to listen to any sound scheme which was forthcoming and which would in some way help to solve this national problem. Let us not kid ourselves that it is not a national problem.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** But you agree that there is a particular problem in South Australia, don't you?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am coming to that. There may be problems in South Australia which are causing this situation, but that is not this Government's fault. Let us be honest about this.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Come on!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Who was responsible for closing the Whyalla shipyards? Did the South Australian Government put 1 700 people at Whyalla out of work? The fact is that the present Federal Liberal Government closed the Whyalla shipyards. Who was responsible for South Australia's drought conditions? Is that also supposed to be this Government's responsibility? If the Government is responsible for drought conditions, it is certainly responsible for the weather conditions now that they have changed.

The Government is accused by its opponents of not having proper policies to get the economy moving. However, it is never given any constructive ideas: no-one suggests to the Government what should be done. The interesting thing that occurred in today's Question Time was the false action, taken for political purposes only, by the Leader of the Opposition, who asked the Premier whether he would convene or attend a conference of employers and persons interested in this State's unemployment situation. However, those people have never asked the Premier about this matter.

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order, the Minister has imputed to me motives which are basely wrong and false and which I refute entirely.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I must say that they occurred to me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I find that I am agreeing more with the member for Mitcham, who is at least able to espouse some reasonable policies and think for himself from time to time. The Premier clearly explained what had happened regarding the economy of South Australia, and I do not believe that the Leader had been contacted by people asking for such a conference. If he had been, he should have referred those people to the Premier, instead of grandstanding in this Chamber for political purposes, as he and his Opposition have been doing for some time.

The member for Davenport talked about our policies on workmen's compensation and industrial democracy. The present workmen's compensation legislation has been operating since about 1973, which is about five years. If the honourable member claims that our workmen's compensation and industrial democracy legislation is the cause of industry's not developing or maintaining its development in South Australia, I challenge him to tell us why it has taken until this year for the deterioration to affect South Australia. Members opposite may be disappointed to know that South Australia has been able to handle its unemployment situation much better than have other States. We were able to maintain our position after the other States started going bad. The Australian Bureau of Statistics *Monthly Summary of Statistics* (page 59), in its review on manufacturing industry states:

Detailed manufacturing statistics from the 1976-77 census will not be available until mid-1978, and the civilian employment statistics are the only indication of employment changes since 1975-76. Table 3.2 indicates that employment declined in all industries in Australia in the year to June 1977 and in all industries in South Australia other than chemicals and miscellaneous manufacturing. During the year, South Australian industry showed signs of the increasing loss of employment which had been experienced by the other States in 1975-76—

that substantiates my claim completely—

and decline in employment in manufacturing industry in 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 per cent decline for Australia. The loss in employment during 1976-77 appears to have resulted from a deterioration in the eastern markets to which much of South Australian produce is dispatched.

That is consistent with what the Premier said today, explaining why we are now at the bottom of the trough, and neither the Government nor I are proud of it. If the Federal Government, whether it be Liberal or Labor at the time, does not realise that the economy needs a stimulus, it should not be in office. Whatever action it takes is the Government's business, but it must decide on

some means to move the economy along.

The Carter Administration in America has been credited with establishing 6 000 000 new jobs since President Carter took office. President Carter attributes the increase in the number of new jobs to the injections given to the economy over the past 2½ years. The State Government has injected into South Australia's economy all the money at its disposal. It has injected \$53 000 000 in the past three years to ensure that the economy is buoyant. Whilst we had the funds, as the unemployment figures show, we were able to stand up in comparison with the position in the other States, but with only \$7 000 000 to spend in this area this year the responsibility falls back on to the Federal Government (in fact, it always had that responsibility but discarded it).

Malcolm Fraser did not even start talking about unemployment until about two weeks ago. Despite hundreds of thousands of unemployed people, he never previously bothered to comment on it. He was never concerned about it: he merely pursued his policies irrespective of the consequences on the unemployed, the sick and the weak. Provided that he had a majority, he could ensure his re-election, a policy similar to that of the Liberal Party in this State. It is time the Federal Government followed other Western countries and started job creation schemes, capital works schemes, or did whatever else is necessary, as something needs to be done now in Australia.

Four or five weeks ago I presented a paper at a Brisbane conference on technological change in Australia, and on the unemployment situation as it was developing and as we could see it in Australia, running between 10 and 12 per cent in the next five or six years. The Federal Minister tried to brush this matter under the carpet and said, "There is good information in it, but let us talk about it in February." At my insistence, we discussed the matter then and, after a discussion lasting about 2½ hours in which each State Minister voiced his criticisms about the Federal Government's actions, it was decided to hold a conference on 24 November, chaired by Mr. Street. Only three or four days later, the Federal Liberal Government made a turnaround and stopped concealing the truth, as it had done in the past, with Mr. Street making that famous declaration to the nation, telling us where we are going and what it is all about. Even now, the Federal Government has not decided what it is going to do. The Premier has already said that he and his officers will be attending the Hamer conference on 10 or 12 December, making every endeavour to overcome the situation. However, unless the Federal Government is willing to take some action, little can be done in addition to what has already been done by the State in the past three years to try to overcome the unemployment problem.

The final point I make is in relation to the situation in New South Wales. It was being said that New South Wales was the worst State in the Commonwealth for unemployment, because a Labor Government was in office. In June 1975 the Labor Party in that State came into office, and for a long time (and I suppose that Mr. Wran was not pleased about it) the New South Wales Government, led by the Labor Party, was the first State to crash the unemployment scene. It led the field with 7½ per cent to 8 per cent for some time, whereas now it is the first State really to recover.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It didn't get up to 8 per cent.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** If I am wrong, I will have the figures checked. The New South Wales figures were between 7 per cent and 7½ per cent. It was the highest State at that stage, although it has the strongest manufacturing base in Australia, and is the best located of

all Australian States. Victoria and New South Wales have been through many depressions during recent years. Now, under a Labor Government headed by Neville Wran, New South Wales is starting to pick up. If New South Wales picks up, South Australia has some chance of selling its consumer durable goods. The reason why South Australia has failed is that consumer durables were not being sold to the other States. I am convinced that Australia will never return to what we have always recognised as full employment. I quote Mr. Hayden as saying that it would take at least 10 years for that to happen, and that is long enough. Even if he is right, 10 years is a long time. With recovery in those States, South Australian consumer durables ought to start getting on to the market again and be part of this State's recovery.

It will do us no good if we have to contend with the continual barrage we hear daily from the Opposition, which criticises everything about the Government and the State, thus frightening industry away. That is the key point in the whole question. Why do we not hear encouragement to industry to come here? Until we start speaking to industry, as we have done in order to encourage it to come here, the Liberal Party must take the major part of the blame for the deterioration.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is one of the most pathetic statements from the Minister that I have heard for a long time. He thinks that employers and others who have money to invest are so gullible as to believe that the Opposition has been successful in frightening them off. How weak can he get! It is about as weak as the Minister's point when reiterating something said by the member for Mitcham last week in seeking to detract from the accomplishments of the Playford years in South Australia where industry—

**Mr. Millhouse:** I was not at all. I was—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Mitcham said that Playford, by fair means or foul, managed to attract industry to South Australia, the clear implication being that he hoodwinked industry into coming here. That speaks poorly of business men who came to this State. From what I have seen of business men and of the investigations they make into new enterprises, I believe that they are hard-headed in their dealings. It is a sad reflection on them, if what the member for Mitcham said is true. What nonsense. What tripe!

**Mr. Millhouse:** You ought to talk to some of them.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the member for Mitcham believes that they were tricked into coming to South Australia, that is a poor reflection on them. I do not believe it for a minute. South Australia was an attractive place for business and investment for many years, simply because we had a significantly lower cost structure. Even the Premier has come out in the past week or two and said, "We must preserve the low-cost structure we have in South Australia." What tripe the Government churns out at the drop of a hat. It is particularly churlish of the Minister to seek to detract from the achievements of the Playford years.

Even the Minister said he had no idea what should be done about unemployment. He referred to the important conference in Queensland and said that he gave them the good oil. He also said, "I don't know what we should do, but something must be done." How helpful is talk such as that? The Government has spent \$50 000 000 on its unemployment relief scheme. What has that achieved! The highest unemployment figures of any State—about 1.7 per cent higher. What answer has the Government got? Only short-term stop-gap application of funds it

received by flogging off the country railways. This is a Government of short-term easy options. Unfortunately, the easy options have all run out. When it comes to long-term planning, the Government has no clue. Let us have the best superannuation, long service leave, holiday leave loading, and all the benefits and exercise the easy options. Where do we finish up? In queer street. The Minister referred to Neville Wran. The only success Wran has had is that he has been following certain Liberal Party policies.

**Mr. Groom:** Which ones?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** He has abolished succession duties, as an incentive (he cannot live with Queensland). How is it that he can afford to abolish succession duties and increase spending on education when this Government cannot afford either of those things? If we look at the position in South Australia and compare it with the record of other States (the next worst is Tasmania), we will see that the solutions this Government has come up with in times of recession have been pathetic, and this Government's record is pathetic. The Government cannot escape the fact that the situation in this State has deteriorated more rapidly than it has elsewhere in Australia and that we have a deficit far greater than that of any other State. Tasmania does not have a deficit anything like our deficit. We have the highest percentage of unemployed in Australia. The cost of labour in this country has risen too high. People talk about technology, and machines replacing workers. How can employers employ labour if they are not making a profit?

The solution suggested by this Government is to put more and more people on the payroll and create jobs. What was the Premier's answer to the member for Mitcham last week about the money spent on the arts? The Government is providing employment. Employment must be productive, and the Premier indicated that the arts are partly productive because people have to pay to see performances. In a country like Australia, unless we produce something and sell it in a competitive world (and it is a competitive world whether we like it or not), we are in Queer Street. That is the fundamental fact of economic life, which the Government does not seem to have grasped.

Every person who is put on the pay-roll in a non-productive occupation has to be supported by somebody in the productive sector. What the Federal Government is trying to do is create conditions whereby the productive sector, which is mainly the private sector, can engage in profitable enterprise and sell its wares. Unless those conditions obtain there is no answer to the problem. For the Minister to go on with the tripe he has gone on with today, saying, "I don't know the answer"—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I didn't say that.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will read the *Hansard* pull with interest tomorrow, because that is one of the things I thought was so hopeless and so nebulous in what the Minister said. What is wrong is that industry cannot afford to employ people if it cannot sell its goods competitively.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Wages are lower in South Australia than they are anywhere else in Australia.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Investors will not come to this State: the record of this Government is there in black and white, and the sooner it faces up to that the better.

**Mr. Groom:** Is your policy to reduce wages?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the member for Morphett examines today's *News*, he will see where the Federal Treasurer has spoken about the submission the Government intends to make to the Arbitration Commissioner. Of course wages cannot be reduced, but they can be held. What do you think they are doing in Britain? Mr. Callaghan, in Great Britain—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is far too much interjecting.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Britain has been through all the problems Australia is going through at present and the only way Australia will solve the problem is by containing wages. From my observations, real wages and their purchasing power are far lower in England than they are in Australia, but Britain is not out of trouble yet.

**Mr. Groom:** What is your policy?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the member for Morphett has not been listening to what I have been saying, I do not intend to repeat it for his benefit. I believe that it is particularly churlish of the Minister to seek to denigrate Sir Thomas Playford. I do not interpret remarks that have been made as showing that we are pining for a return to the Playford era, but there should be fair recognition of the results of sensible economic policies for the development of this State that were marked by a great degree of success during the years of Sir Thomas Playford's Premiership. That observation is not made because of a desire to return to the social mores of those times, but an attempt at an honest assessment of what happened in South Australia during a prosperous developmental period.

I support the motion. I believe that the sooner the Government makes an attempt to come to grips with economic reality the sooner we will see a reversal of the sort of unemployment figures which are now indicated for South Australia and which are disastrous.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I find this a sad debate. It accentuates the bitterness in the community, and both the Opposition and the Labor Party are playing with the lives and futures of people of this State. Perhaps that sounds trite, so let me put it another way; we are dealing with one of the deepest and most difficult problems that faces the world, Australia and South Australia, and each side is blaming the other for that problem. I think that is absolutely and entirely wrong. I think that the Minister implied that nobody knew the answer to this problem. If there were any definite answer, it would have been acted on long time ago.

The Minister said that he does not know much about economics, but even experts do not get much real guidance from economics. I can remember while in England hearing an ex-Tory Minister say, "You cannot fine tune the economy". That is right. Government action of itself cannot put everything to rights. The prosperity or otherwise of the community depends on a myriad of individual decisions, and those decisions depend very much on the outlook of those people who must make them. It is a matter of confidence as much as anything else.

I particularly disapprove of the speech we have just heard from the Deputy Leader. It was superficial and bitter, and did not add anything to the debate (not that the debate is adding much to the sum of human wisdom about this matter). One or two things arising out of what the Deputy Leader said I want to put right. He was entirely incorrect in suggesting that the other day, when I mentioned Sir Thomas Playford and his success in this State in conning industry to come here, I was criticising him—quite the contrary.

I do not know that there were many other people who could have achieved what he achieved. I was praising him, not denigrating him. What I was saying was that he was able to attract industry to South Australia that he ought not to have been able to attract here. By his methods and approach he was able to attract industry to South Australia and we have enjoyed a generation of prosperity as a result. It is not his fault (it is not anybody's fault) that that is now

slipping away from us. The magnitude of his achievement was that he did those things when all the odds and every natural factor was against him. Let there not be any more nonsense talked about my criticising Sir Thomas Playford, or the Minister, following what I said: quite the reverse.

I turn now to Neville Wran. I am not a member of his Party, and my Party did not do well against him. I would not have supported him if I were in New South Wales for the past election, but we cannot detract from his achievement as Premier of that State. Industrialists from New South Wales have told me that, in contrast to the situation in this State, Neville Wran is the most approachable Premier in Australia. Indeed, he takes the initiative to make this so. One person said to me that he thinks that, on Friday afternoon when Wran has finished his work, he spends a couple of hours telephoning industrial interests and asking questions such as, "How are you getting on with the Paramatta Council?" or "Are they treating you well at Botany, can we help?"

That sort of thing does not happen in South Australia. The point that was made to me was that the Premier of New South Wales gets on the phone to industrialists to ask whether he can help. He got his reward for that at the election, there is no doubt about that. While I do not share his politics, I am obliged (whether I want to or not, and I do not say whether I want to or not) to admire the way he has gone about his task.

The Deputy Leader said something about the State Unemployment Relief Scheme: he called it a "short-term, stop-gap measure". I do not agree with him about that. The SURS scheme provided employment for some thousands of people over a period, and it is still operating in a modified form. I have two things to say about that: first, there is no doubt, however much we try to hide this and the Government denies it, that there was a hell of a lot of waste in the SURS scheme, simply because Government departments that were given money to spend were not able to provide the supervision to ensure that the money was all spent wisely.

It is just like the Army dreading the thought of National Service coming in, because there were simply not enough instructors to instruct the lads. SURS was similar to that; there was a huge injection of money (almost an artificial injection in some sectors) and departments were expected to spend it, but they really were not able to control it. I have heard horrifying stories of lads being told to go down in a gully and sit there all day, because work could not be organised for them. It happened at Cleland National Park; we have had some dust-ups about that, concerning the way they messed up the place in connection with SURS work, and so on. There are many other examples of that, and it is deplorable. On the other hand, some projects that are most creditable have been completed, and that would not have happened if it had not been for SURS. So, I do not criticise it as short-term stop-gap. The concept was very good.

The second point that I want to make is not as flattering to the Government, but I do not criticise this Minister particularly. I guess he fought hard to get more money for it, but I think it is most unfortunate that the Government has reduced the allocation for SURS so drastically and chosen to spend the money in other ways. The allocation for SURS has gone down from \$24 000 000 to \$7 000 000. So, less than one-third is now being spent on that scheme, yet money can be found for what I termed last week the Premier's pet projects. I am sorry the Government has not, even if it could not keep it up to that level, found more money for SURS, because it deserves more money than it is getting.

I turn now to the debate overall and where I stand in

relation to it. Before the debate started I raised in the general debate on this line the question of the survey done in August. The Minister said he would reply to me, and he has told me since privately that he will give me a written reply. To me, this survey is a far better way of finding out what is happening in South Australia and what people are thinking here than the nonsense we have heard from some members on this side and the rather Party-political reply attacking the Federal Government we have had from the Minister. If I had to come down and give a judgment on the question of the debating, I would give my marks to the Minister, because he made a far better fist of it than members on this side did, and at least he seems to care genuinely about the distressing situation. The only concern of Liberal Party members is to have a crack at the Government politically about it. Twelve questions were asked in the survey. Those that are relevant show the situation in South Australia. These are the things we ought to be grappling with, not just slinging mud at each other. Incidentally, if ever there was an example of the need for a third Party, we see it in this debate, with each of the major Parties calling itself white and the other Party black, and being insanelly obstinate.

*Mr. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I hope I can take a more balanced view, free of insane Party loyalties, than can the member for Mount Gambier and Government members. The summary on the third question is as follows:

As expected, the interest of manufacturers is focussed overwhelmingly on market prospects in the Eastern States. We have always had to sell our products in the Eastern States; that is why it has been so important to keep our cost advantage. We have to have a hefty cost advantage in South Australia to overcome the freight differentials. The summary continues:

(a) 70 per cent of respondents indicated that the Eastern States represented the best prospects for sales growth in the next three years.

(b) New South Wales and Queensland—

So, there is no politics in this. New South Wales has a Labor Government, and the Government always ridicules Queensland—

were specifically mentioned as the States with the best market potential.

The fourth commentary shows that companies are moving away from traditional product lines. The fifth commentary shows that half of the respondents are planning to commence major projects in the next three years. The sixth commentary states:

An overwhelming majority of respondents believe that rationalisation of manufacturing facilities throughout Australia will continue and possibly accelerate over the next three years. Many respondents were far more cautious about the pace of any structural adjustments in the economy.

(a) 70 per cent of respondents said that the manufacturing sector in this State would decline as companies rationalised their operations over the next three years.

I do not know whether members on this side of the House are suggesting that that rationalisation is occurring as a result of the weakness of the present Government; if they are, that is utterly absurd. There is going to be a rationalisation of the manufacturing sector in this State. It has something to do with the Government, but not everything to do with the Government. The commentary continues:

(b) Almost 80 per cent of respondents believed that employment in manufacturing in South Australia would continue to decline with the reorganisation of manufacturing activities.

There we have what manufacturers themselves believe is

going to happen. The seventh commentary is as follows:

The majority of respondents see no change in the scale of their involvement in South Australia. However, some companies are planning to reduce their activities here through consolidation of their Australia-wide activities in the Eastern States.

*Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McRae):** Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I know that the honourable member has been dreaming about this moment of glory of his: the moving of a no-confidence motion, but I propose to speak on it and use this document to reinforce what I am saying. The seventh commentary also states:

(c) Federal Government policy, State Government legislation, elimination of any wage cost advantage, and the freight cost burden were the major issues raised by those respondents who are planning to reduce their involvement in South Australia.

The tenth commentary states:

The labour cost structure in Australia, State Government legislation, and other cost disadvantages associated with location in South Australia are the major concerns expressed by manufacturers.

(a) 40 per cent of respondents mentioned high labour costs and the overall wage structure as the major problems confronting manufacturers.

I agree with that a remark reportedly made by the member for Davenport at the weekend with regard to penalty rates. We can say what we like in Australia about wage costs, wage justice, and all that sort of thing, but the stark fact is that in overseas markets our problem is that we are not competing, because of high labour costs. The matter to which the honourable member referred, penalty rates for weekend work, is certainly one of the ingredients in those high wages. Of course, it is unpopular ever to suggest that anyone should take away an advantage that others have, but in the long run we are going to have to accept that things like penalty rates, overtime, and holiday loadings will have to go; otherwise, we will never be able to compete in overseas markets, where Australia has to compete. I thought the member for Davenport was correct in what he said on that matter. I thought the Minister just said something abusive because he could not think at the time of anything else to say; he knows that the member for Davenport was correct. The survey report continues:

There is evidence of widespread belief amongst manufacturers that high labour costs and the present wage structure will force many manufacturers in the State to pursue plans to automate their operations and to close down facilities which cannot be automated.

Almost all of the respondents—  
and this comes to the point I made about Neville Wran before—

see a critical need for improvement in the relationship between State Government and manufacturers.

Whether the Government says that they are right or wrong, that is how they feel about the Government. From my experience in discussions with manufacturers, at present they dislike two things about the Government. First (and it may be just their bad luck), most manufacturers are politically opposed to the Labor Party, and the very fact that there is a Labor Government, even if it is as moderate as the one in New South Wales is a handicap. There is a natural and instinctive reaction against any Labor Government by those who own and control industry and commerce.

That is something that we cannot get over. The Labor Government may say it is irrational; it may say that it gets

money from them at election time, and so on, but that is a fact. One of the specifics that manufacturers in South Australia are frightened about (and I find this curious) is that they are intensely suspicious of the Attorney-General. I think that they overrate him, but his name crops up again and again as someone of whom they are frightened. They are suspicious of him; they think that he is dangerous and they wish that he was not in the Government. They are frightened that he will be the next Leader. I think that is nonsense, and I tell them so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Interjections are out of order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It is one of the hang-ups that manufacturers in this State have about the Government. The Labor Party can do what it likes about it, or it need not do anything. It will probably not do anything. Secondly, undeniably (and the Leader of the Opposition, who has played a very minor part in this debate, said something about this) there is this question of worker participation, industrial democracy. I agree with the concept of industrial democracy. I think that everyone should have the maximum opportunity to order his or her own life, in the work place as much as anywhere else. That is not an absolute. If, through trying to encourage or force these concepts into industry we lose industry altogether, we are worse off than not doing it at all.

Again, the Government may say it is irrational. The Premier may say, "We have changed; we have abandoned this, that and the other thing. We are not going to force it." However, manufacturers in this State are deadly frightened of the idea of industrial democracy and, if it is not driving them away, it is certainly one of the factors that will keep them away from South Australia. I do not want to say any more than that: I am in a dilemma over this one, frankly. It has turned into a Party-political debate, and I wish that it had not.

I think that we would be far better off looking at a survey such as the one to which I referred, to the irritation of the member for Davenport, rather than at the sort of things he has been saying. Many of them were trash. Incidentally, the survey showed cynicism directed at politicians in general, both State and Federal. God knows, they have got plenty of reason for that, too.

I am in a dilemma over this one. I do, however, intend to support the motion for the reason that I was thinking of moving for a reduction in one of the lines or items that is included here, the Industrial Democracy and Research Division. As I had that thought in mind, and as I have to come down on one side, in all fairness and honesty I ought to come down on the side of the censure of the Government, because here we have an enormous increase in the sum of money voted, and we had a very large increase in actual payments last year.

Last year we voted \$86 408, and we actually spent \$245 765 on this Industrial Democracy and Research Division. This year we are voting \$312 000. In my view, it is one of the keys to the distrust. A lack of rapport exists between the Government and industry. This money is not only wasted but it is also doing active harm. For that reason, I intended to move to reduce that item, if the member for Davenport had not given notice of what he was going to do. Because I have to come down on one side or the other, I have to support the motion, but I do it reluctantly, realising that there is not too much merit on this side. Conversely, there is much merit on the other side. They are closely balanced. It is deplorable that on a matter like this one side is saying "black", the other side is saying "white", and neither side knows the answer.

**Mr. BECKER:** I support the motion. I am disappointed

at the Minister's reply to a degree. He attacked the Opposition, in his usual phraseology, for knocking South Australia and destroying industry. I recently helped an interstate company to try to obtain a factory in the Hindmarsh area, which would increase employment opportunities to 14 people by the end of this year, and hopefully the company will be looking for about 22 employees in 12 months time. A member of the company went to a Government department, not necessarily this one, and was fiddled around for three weeks, whereas then, within 24 hours, action was taken.

I have been involved with an organisation that has created two permanent jobs this year without any Government assistance at all. We are all doing what we can for South Australia; we are South Australian. We have all got to work together as a Parliament to create employment opportunities in this State.

I have a letter from a constituent, the Mercury Scale Company which wrote to the Attorney-General regarding preference and protection for South Australian manufacturers. It simply implied in part that this company was suffering a disadvantage in tendering interstate, that it had to compete on a national market, which included 2½ per cent freight charge. Part of the letter reads:

... which in fact means that our tender price interstate has to be 20 per cent less than the respective State oppositions product for us to win the contract.

The letter also states that, if the company is successful in this, it has to undergo rigorous inspections and verifications by the Standards Branch. The letter continues:

In the case of some imported hospital scales which do not have an Australian National Standards approval, there would of necessity be a different testing procedure with different tolerances, yet the instrument is still stamped the same as a trading scale. This would mean we would have to re-design and tool up for a range of cheaper and inferior weighing machines specifically for some Government departments in order to compete. We have noted only hospital scales but this same technique can apply to all State Government departments.

Here is a company that wrote to the Attorney-General on 17 August asking for assistance and help to increase its opportunity and to continue to stay in business. The reply from Mr. Bachmann, the Acting Director-General of the Premier's Department, is dated 30 August, acknowledges receipt of the letter and states:

Your correspondence has been forwarded to the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs for a report and a reply will be sent in due course.

Yet, at 28 September my constituent had not received a reply from the Attorney-General. What the member for Mitcham says is quite right, in some respects. We must co-operate and move quickly to assist people in the State. That is one of the reasons why I support this resolution.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I was very disappointed that the Minister of Labour and Industry at no stage in his entire speech tackled the figures that I had given on the unemployment problems in this State. It is disappointing, because the purpose of this debate is to talk about the extent of the problem here and the extent to which it is a State problem and not a national problem, yet the extent to which something must be done in South Australia was not touched upon by the Minister.

Secondly, regarding the survey raised by the member for Mitcham, an objective assessment of the number of working people in industry in South Australia is a far better guide as to how industry is progressing than some completely subjective survey on a limited number of

companies.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It doesn't suit your purposes.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That survey result demonstrates what I have been talking about this afternoon, but the member for Mitcham is two months out of date. The survey was read in this place by the Leader of the Opposition about two months ago; the member for Mitcham has only just realised it exists and is making political capital out of it.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope that the honourable member for Davenport will address the Chair, not the honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He's deliberately provoking me.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Mitcham should acquaint himself with some of the things said in *Hansard* previously. The pertinent point that both the Minister and the member for Mitcham missed when commenting on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme was the complete failure of that scheme in 1977-78 to overcome or even hold the unemployment situation in this State. Although South Australia is the only State to have a State Unemployment Relief Scheme, on which \$24 000 000 was spent in 1977-78, there was a 50 per cent increase in unemployment compared to a national increase of only 18 per cent. Those figures speak for themselves; they cut to ribbons the argument put forward by the Minister and the member for Mitcham.

Articles by overseas authors on unemployment relief schemes in other countries say that the best scheme of all is job-subsidy, as the Federal Government implemented through the "sweet pea" scheme. These authors point out that few Governments in other countries have implemented what they call Government artificial schemes to create jobs. Generally, these schemes have been unsuccessful, as experience in South Australia has shown. It is far better to give a person a permanent job than to create an artificial job on a short-term basis with little flow-on to the rest of the community. The "sweet pea" scheme has given almost 60 per cent of the people involved permanent employment, a far better figure than under SURS, which has given permanent employment to only about 20 per cent of those involved, as revealed in the Auditor-General's figures. The figure of 60 per cent came from the Federal Minister's office, which quoted two figures to me: an earlier figure of about 61 to 62 per cent and a later figure of about 70 per cent.

The key point is that the Government has no alternative policy or strategy whatsoever to tackle the unemployment problem. The Minister has accused the Opposition of not coming forward with solutions. On Sunday, I gave a half-hour address to the Young Liberals conference. That was widely reported. I spent the entire half hour putting forward alternative strategies to solve the unemployment problem. When this half-hour speech was reported, all the Minister said was, "It's about time Mr. Brown put forward some ideas as to how to solve the problem."

The other point I make, also taken up by the Minister, is the complete lack of diversification of industry in South Australia. The Minister claimed in his speech yesterday that there had, in fact, been diversification. The so-called diversification has occurred only because the metals manufacturing area has declined; new industries have not been developed on a broader base. The one area of concentration has retracted to such an extent that the other marginal industries have taken on a greater percentage of the workforce but they have not expanded as would be required if diversification took place. I ask members to support this motion. It would be unfortunate

if Labor Party members simply voted against it in blind support of their Cabinet and Labor Party policies that have failed so miserably over the past 12 months.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes—(20)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes—(25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Minister of Labour and Industry, Miscellaneous, \$4 837 000.

**Mr. EVANS:** I refer to the sum of \$4 700 000 allocated for advances and grants for unemployment relief projects. In my areas of responsibility in sport and recreation, some projects have been carried out through unemployment relief money (and I take it that that will happen again this year) that have been of benefit to the community. However, I am concerned that, because of the way in which the money is used, we are not getting full value for money spent. It is possible that some projects could be let out for tender and that the contractors who took on the work, if they had more work than they could handle with their normal labour, would have to employ some people who are at present unemployed. If they had sufficient work for their staff through obtaining extra contracts, they would not have to dismiss people, so the pool of unemployed would not be increased from that source.

I could point out to the Minister building projects which have cost 30 per cent more than they would have cost if done on a contract basis. This means that, for every 70 projects, if the work were to be done under a different system, we would have 30 more projects of the same size completed, providing more facilities for the same amount of money spent. Just as many people would be employed, perhaps more gainfully, and many would learn the necessary skills more quickly than under the present methods. I hope the Minister is conscious of the fact that the money is not being used properly, and I hope that he will take a keener interest this year in how projects are let out, how the labour is handled, and the effort put into the finished project.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am surprised, amazed, and nonplussed by the honourable member's statement. It would be almost impossible for me to take a keener interest, except if I were to become the complete overseer, and I have not got time for that. I personally look at every project with a committee of Cabinet. We research it and examine it before we make any recommendations to Cabinet. That is done by a committee which researches the projects and decides which are the best ones. Officers continually visit projects once they are commenced. I get reports on their progress, and on rare occasions I have had to interfere.

The whole idea of the project is not for contractors, but for people who are unemployed. On occasions, it has been necessary for contractors to do work where people were unable to provide the necessary equipment. I object to the statement that there has been an overall waste of money and that a contract system would have provided more value for the dollar. I have opened 25 or 30 projects, and I have visited probably hundreds of them. On every

occasion I have asked council officers, community welfare people, or whoever has been involved in the organisation, control, and welfare of the project to compare for me what the cost of the project would have been had it been done through private enterprise rather than through the council, with the labour obtained from the C.E.S. or from the districts. On all occasions, including one in the honourable member's district a couple of months ago, I have been told that the projects have cost many thousands of dollars less than would have been the case had they been put out to tender.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** They are conning you.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** They are not. The honourable member is the one being conned. I have checked to find out the tender price. I am not sufficiently foolish to say that it might not have been better to go to tender on the odd occasion, because no system is perfect. I speak on the projects as I know them, and on the overall situation. My officers are continually policing the projects to see that they are operating as they should be, that the overseeing is being done properly, and that the council work is being done. I get reports almost daily. I object quite strongly to the suggestion that private enterprise tenders or contractors could have done a better job in the past three years with these projects.

**Mr. EVANS:** I do not wish to argue. I know enough about the areas where this money has been spent. I could show the Minister the buildings, the stone walling done, and the money spent. What he has just said is ludicrous. I know the projects are designed to utilise the labour of unemployed people, but the people would still be employed if the projects were done through the contract system, or people would be saved from unemployment because of the necessity to have extra labour to carry out the work. If the Minister thinks what I have said is ridiculous, I say that his comments are ludicrous. I would be happy to spread the word among people who have seen the work in these areas so that they could be asked for their views. The Minister's credibility is at risk because, if he understands fences, walls, and buildings, he must know that the costs in many cases have been 25 per cent to 30 per cent higher than they should have been. Perhaps that has had to happen in the past, but in future, as money is tight, it could be done in another way. We need qualified foremen to keep the pressure on. I can give one example. If a person cannot lay more than 180 or 200 bricks in a 7½-hour day on a project, I would be amazed. If that is economic use of money, I am even more amazed.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I assume that the provision for advances and grants for unemployment relief projects includes the continuation of SURS. On this line \$22 000 000 was voted last year, but \$24 000 000 was actually spent, and only \$4 700 000 is voted this financial year. What is the reason for this? Is the SURS scheme included under another line as well?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The \$4 700 000 allocation here, together with a further \$2 300 000 held in the department's deposit account at 30 June, is all that can be provided in 1978-79 under SURS.

Line passed.

Agriculture and Fisheries, \$17 642 000.

**Mr. RODDA:** The South Australian Egg Board has indicated that, as from 1 July 1979, egg pulping and marketing will take place under the auspices of the Government, operating from a new pulping centre to be established at Keswick. Much correspondence has been exchanged between the board, which intends to take over this operation, and Red Comb, which presently runs the egg-pulping process, and a ballot conducted amongst egg producers has indicated that they are against such a

change. Can the Minister give the reasons for this proposal and say whether it is still expected to take effect as from 1 July 1979?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

**Mr. RODDA:** Earlier this year the committee dealing with financial assistance to producers was replaced by another committee, and I understand that members of the original committee have not been paid for their services. As \$245 000 has been allocated on this line, can the Minister say what remuneration committee members get, and what is the mode of their payment?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I am sure that it would not be dealt with under this line, which deals with departmental officers. I will have to get a report regarding the payment of fees to committee members. I presume that the honourable member means non-Public Service members of the committee. I will obtain the information he seeks, but the payment in question would not be under this line.

**Mr. RODDA:** Although I do not wish to cast aspersions on the bovine brucellosis campaign, I refer to a case involving stud cattle where much dissatisfaction has arisen. My constituents have had discussions with officers of the department and the Minister, but much of the dissatisfaction seems to emanate from the tests that are carried out. Following a positive reaction, my constituents sought to have the animals retested by their private veterinarian, and there were some arguments about that. From subsequent tests undertaken by both the private vet and the department, it appeared that there are some grey areas. The cattle involved are extremely valuable (one animal is worth \$45 000) and the grazer or studmaster concerned does not want to send in such a valuable animal for a slaughter fee of only \$300, especially if the animal was only reacting to a brucella strain 19 inoculation. In this area practice and theory seem to part company. Has this complex question been drawn to the Government's attention?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get a detailed answer for the honourable member.

**Mr. RODDA:** I understand that the Government intends to establish five agricultural regions in the State: as only two regions are listed (South-Eastern and Murray Lands), can the Minister say where the headquarters of the other three regions will be, and when the agricultural public of South Australia can expect the full decision on regionalisation to be taken?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

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

**Mr. RODDA:** Regarding the item "Subsidy to Samcor for meat carcass classification", for which \$18 000 is allocated, the Minister will not be unfamiliar with the large sums that have been spent on up-to-date stock-selling centres throughout the State. Can the Minister give any information about this item, which, in effect, sets the stage for an efficient marketing operation?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I have no information on the basis on which the subsidy is paid. It is a subsidy for the inspectors employed on carcass classification. I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know how many inspectors are involved in the process.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Minister ascertain, first, whether this allocation is strictly related to Samcor only and, secondly, if it is to be a classification system, why the system has not been applied to other meat-processing works?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Yes.

**Mr. RODDA:** The sum of \$158 000 has been allocated for the control of pasture aphids. Can the Minister ascertain what progress has been made by the Agriculture Department in introducing the insect vector to control this recently introduced pest, with special emphasis on the blue-green aphid? The spotted alfalfa aphid caused great ravages on this important industry, closely followed by the blue-green aphid, which has wrought havoc on the lucerne industry. This season, we have seen it make its attack on other pasture species, although its main target is lucerne. I am pleased to see that \$158 000 has been allocated for these control measures. Coupled with the control are the aphid-resistant cultivars that have to be introduced with the strictest of quarantine regulations and practices, otherwise we could introduce pests equally as damaging as those we are seeking to control. Can the Minister provide me with an overall report on results thus far of aphid control and say what the experts are going to practise and recommend in the forthcoming year?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** This is just a contingency item under this heading. It is only for the operating, travelling and capital expenses involved in aphid control. Regarding wages and salaries, the honourable member will notice that \$10 000 was voted last year, whereas \$313 994 was spent, and \$410 000 is provided this year. This allocation, which is for the full year's salary and wages of people employed at the end of June, is up significantly. The reason for the slight reduction in the item involving the control of pasture aphids under "Contingencies" is that the capital expenditures required this year are somewhat less than they were last financial year. Regarding the overall success of what has been done thus far, what confidence the department has, and how much further the programme is expected to be developed, and so on, I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Regarding the item "Bovine brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication programme", I notice that it is proposed to almost double the allocation. Can the Minister say why approximately twice the sum is required to complete the programme at a stage when I understand that the two diseases are virtually well on the way to being under control? If that item happens to include other diseases in stock that are not specifically listed, could the Minister ascertain what those other diseases are involving this increased expenditure? Further, when is the blue tongue ban on the export of live cattle likely to be lifted as regards South Australia?

A prominent breeder of Murray grey cattle based on Kangaroo Island (the proprietor of "Yakilo" stud) has been seeking for some time without success to receive dispensation or authority to dispatch cattle from South Australia overseas. During the past few days I have inquired on his behalf at the Agriculture Department to try to determine the position with respect to export of live cattle from South Australia, but I have not received a reply. In the meantime, although this apparent blue tongue ban applies to beef cattle in South Australia, about 80 dairy cattle are going from South Australia to Victoria tomorrow to link up with a further consignment of about 200 to be dispatched to India. If beef cattle are banned from export because of a blue tongue ban, I wonder why that same ban does not apply to dairy cattle.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get a report for the honourable member about milkers from my colleague. The honourable member will notice on page 64 that \$677 000 is provided for wages and salaries of those engaged in the Bovine Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Programme. As that allocation was provided under an earlier line in last year's Estimates, the



honourable member cannot see a figure for the amount voted in 1977-78. The actual figure voted was \$360 000 and the amount spent was \$492 000.

The amount shown under Bovine Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Programme on page 66 is the same as for last year, and also provides for compensation payments for the destruction of diseased stock. It is expected that substantial compensation payments will be made this year, but we recover those payments in full from the Commonwealth Government and the Cattle Compensation Fund. The eradication campaign is jointly funded by the Commonwealth and State Governments in a ratio of 2.4 to 1, so there is a substantial increase in the amount of Commonwealth subsidy that will be available under both the salaries and wages item and under the contingencies item for this financial year. I hope that the greater part of the eradication programme will be completed this financial year. However, I will ensure that the honourable member receives a detailed report as soon as possible.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I appreciate the Minister's efforts to explain that point. I find it difficult to understand why the compensation factor should be so high in the forthcoming period, because compensation has been paid for all diseased cattle since the programme commenced.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Although there is an expected increase of about 35 per cent for operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries under "Plant Industry", the figure for wages in the same category is similar to that of last year. What is the reason for that considerable increase, as it seems that the number of staff has remained the same?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** This year \$150 000 is included that was previously included under "Research Centres", and \$37 000, which was previously included, is now shown under "Murray Lands Region". The difference is a net \$113 000 and, as the item has increased by \$108 000, the provision is about the same as last year.

**Mr. GUNN:** During the Address in Reply debate I was critical of the appointment of Mr. Winter as Chairman and Principal Officer of the Rural Assistance Branch. I make clear that, if I reflected personally on Mr. Winter during that debate, I retract any personal criticism of him. I am sorry if I have caused him or his family any distress by my criticism. I make clear that in no way do I condone his appointment, and I made that clear to Mr. Winter when he spoke to me about this matter.

I believe that the Minister of Agriculture erred in this appointment in overlooking officers of his department who had acted as Director and who were involved in the setting up of that department and who had had wide experience in it. To say the least, it was unfortunate that the Minister did not show better judgment when he filled that position. While the member for Napier is in the Chamber I point out to him that in no way do I retract from what I said in this House recently about the Minister of Agriculture and the assistant to the Premier.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that we are dealing with the line "Agriculture and Fisheries" and the assistant to the Premier could not appropriately be discussed under this line.

**Mr. GUNN:** I will have an opportunity in a few moments to make the comments I want to make.

**Mr. BECKER:** I understand that the dung beetle has been extremely successful in improving soil structure; could the extension services be encouraged to extend the use of the beetle?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not think that the extension services has anything to do with the dung beetle, but I will ascertain what report my colleague is prepared to

give about this particular matter. Referring again to bovine brucellosis and tuberculosis, the statement of Estimates of Revenue, page 9, shows the estimates of receipts from the Commonwealth under the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication campaign, and also the recoup amount from the Cattle Compensation Fund. The amount received last year, either from the Commonwealth or the Cattle Compensation Fund, was less than expected, and there is an increase expected this year in revenue.

Obviously, some of the work that had been expected to take place last year had to be shifted over to this financial year; that is part of the explanation for the large increase in revenue.

**Mr. BECKER:** Several of my constituents are beekeepers who are concerned about the problem of European foul brood. The department does not have a sufficient number of trained men to be able to inspect South Australian hives. European foul brood first became evident in this State in the South-East. The member for Flinders and I asked questions about this matter in December 1977 and September 1978, because we feared that the disease would not be contained in the South-East. From recent reports in the *Advertiser* it seems that the disease has now spread through the Mid North and to the West Coast. Beekeepers in my district are concerned because salvation jame is prevalent in the Virginia, Gawler, and Victor Harbor areas. Beekeepers want to move their bees to these areas, but they do not want their hives to be affected by this disease.

However, the department has made little information available. Surely it would be in this State's interests to keep the parties fully informed of the situation. The Western Australian Government wants to ban the import of South Australian honey into Western Australia, and we do not want bans to be imposed elsewhere. Because this industry is an important dollar earner, will the Minister obtain a report on what the department is doing to co-ordinate the various beekeepers associations, to contain the disease, and to work toward its eradication?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will obtain that report for the honourable member.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** The items under the heading "Fisheries" seem to be the only items to which I can relate a question about the training of fishermen.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** I do not think there is any provision at all.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I am informed by the department that provision was to be made, but I cannot find anything that specifically relates to the matter I want to raise. At a training seminar at Adelaide University on 30 August, the Minister said four scholarships would be sponsored for sons of fishermen, so that those young men could attend the Australian Maritime College at Launceston. Can the Minister give further details of that scheme, and can he state how the young men can qualify for the scholarships?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I shall be pleased to obtain the information.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister obtain a detailed report on the way in which the department intends to spend the allocation for the item "Transfer to Fisheries Research and Development Fund"? Can the Minister give a breakdown showing the specific fisheries involved?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The transfer of \$730 000 covers salaries and wages in fisheries research; operating, travel, and capital expenses; and publicity and promotion for the fisheries research programme. I will get a report from the department on the details of the programme for this financial year.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Will the Minister obtain information about the future use of the vessel *Joseph Verco*? It was

originally understood that that vessel was to trawl South-Eastern waters and explore for new fisheries. However, it seems that the *Joseph Verco* has been within a short distance of Port Adelaide since it was commissioned. About \$70 000 was recently spent to rig it as a commercial prawn trawling vessel. Why was money spent for that purpose? The types of rig required for prawn trawling on the sandy bottom adjacent to the gulf waters are not the types of rig necessarily required for leather-jacket trawling and other trawling ventures in the South-Eastern waters and for deep-water long-line trawling. That expenditure seems to have been wasted. The 53 licensed prawn vessels have all been used from time to time to assist the department free of charge in its prawn research programme. Offers have been made to take officers out and to assist them in collating data. Yet the department, for some unknown reason, has spent an incredible sum to equip this vessel commercially.

In the meantime, is it intended to advance other research programmes from the fish or prawns caught by the *Joseph Verco* in South Australia while she is competing with the commercial fishermen? In accordance with the undertaking, and the agreement with industry, will the Minister find out for me when she is likely to leave these inner port areas and go to the South-East, coastal, and outer zone areas where it was intended she go in the first instance?

In particular, will the Minister obtain from his colleague some indication of when research is likely to enter the jacket fishery that is apparently wide open to exploitation and, according to the South-Eastern fishermen to whom I have spoken, will be captured by the Victorians if we do not do something about determining what is there. What is the best method to catch these fish, and will the Minister get a guide as to the best methods of disposing of them?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get a report for the honourable member. An amount of \$38 000 is provided for the replacement of seven patrol vessels, and \$10 000 is intended for the replacement of outboard motors and equipment for existing vessels. I do not know whether anything is provided in that for replacement of the *Joseph Verco* equipment.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** On the point raised by the Minister about the equipment for patrol vessels, it is understood that about 15 patrolling inspectors are employed by the department, of who a few are out in the field station adjacent to the fishing ports around the coast of South Australia. The remainder are based in the Fisheries Department. Would the Minister ask his colleague to reconsider the administrative attitude of the department with respect to its policing officers or its inspectorial staff, in particular?

Those that are based in Adelaide are, I understand, required to report to the department in the morning to seek authority to take vehicle keys (they obtain them from the Senior Inspector, Horrie Fairbanks). They then go to a suburban depot near metropolitan Adelaide, obtain a vehicle, go to another depot to link with a trailer vessel, and take off to whichever beach site or port area they intend to patrol.

If the area is on the south coast (Victor Harbor or Goolwa) or down the sunset strip (Aldinga, Sellick Beach, or Cape Jervis), some hours are lost in the morning before they get to the site. It is invariably morning tea time. I also understand that they are required to report back to the office after having delivered the trailer, boat and the vehicle before 5 p.m., knock-off time. Their effective patrolling time is limited to but a few hours a day. That is, of course, after they get their daily instructions or authority to proceed on that type of venture.

To further aggravate the situation regarding city-based inspectorial staff, it seems that there are no metropolitan inspectors after-hours numbers available to either the commercial industry or the public, so, if an offence or a suspected offence occurs after 5 p.m. and before 9 a.m., there is no-one to whom the public can have access to call an inspector. To me, that is ludicrous, but is the position as reported to me by the fishing industry.

I draw the Minister's attention to what occurs in Western Australia, where there is a model system of administration that should be considered for adoption in South Australia, or at least in those ports that can be dovetailed into this system. The department has about 200 employees, covering wildlife as well as fisheries, and about 12 are employed within the department. The remainder are stationed in the field, where they belong. However, in this State we have a few inspectors at port sites, and otherwise the whole research, licensing, inspectorial, administrative and associated staff members are congregated at the State Administration Centre and its adjacent offices.

It is rather disturbing that the research section has shifted three times in the past three months. I understand that it is going to rest now on the 16th floor of the State Administration Centre; it recently moved from the Economic Development Unit section in Pirie Street. Prior to that it was in Gawler Place. Hopefully, a little stability will enter the administration area of that department so that at least the industry knows where it is, and hopefully the officers learn to know where they are.

I speak with a degree of criticism, but it is only from what I have gathered from the field. Most of my remarks this afternoon, with respect to the administrative role of the department, were made at the A.F.I.C. conference on 5 October in the presence of the Minister and, following that, in the presence of his senior officer, Mr. Kirkegaard. The message had been conveyed from a number of sources and, on behalf of the industry, I draw the Minister's attention to those comments.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Following the point made by the member for Alexandra relating to fish caught by the *Joseph Verco* and other research vessels, the Minister gave an undertaking that he would find out just where that sum was offset in the lines, if that was the case. If it is, what extra research programmes are undertaken by it, and where and how are the fish disposed of?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get that information and specifically draw the comments by the member for Alexandra to the attention of the Minister.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** The matter of the formula for the fixing of prawn licence fees has been hawked around in the press for some weeks now. I do not presently intend to canvass the details of that, but I ask the Minister—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I rise on a point of order. We are dealing with Government expenditure, not income. The honourable member has raised a revenue issue that is not covered by any lines with which we are dealing. We are dealing here with votes made by Parliament for the expenditure of funds, not issues relating to collection of revenue. I suggest that he raise that question on some other occasion.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I uphold the point of order.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I accept that point. The Minister, however, has said clearly in recent weeks that, in future, research by the Fisheries Department will have to be financed by the fishermen. It was the basis on which he set out to increase the fees for the purposes of financing future research work in the prawn industry, particularly. How I can dissociate that subject from research, and intended expenditure in the forthcoming period, I do not know. As

long as I confine my remarks to that, it would seem to dovetail quite clearly into the category of fisheries expenditure in the research area.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I think it would be in order for the honourable member to discuss fisheries research, but it would be out of order to discuss the method of determining licence fees or the expenditure on those licence fees, or the value of those licence fees.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** The industry is very keen to know where its money is going and how it is being spent on research. Without venturing into that area, in accordance with your instruction, clearly the interim fees and future fees will be expended on research.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will obtain a report for the honourable member about future projected research expenditure and whether recent administrative action will lead to increased research provision being made available in 1979-80 over and above what is proposed in the \$730 000 for the transfer of Fisheries Research and Development Fund for this financial year. If I obtain the other information for the honourable member, I think that will give him the answer he wants.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I thank the Minister and I appreciate his assistance in this respect. Research generally is of much concern to the industry. At this stage fishermen do not receive a breakdown of where moneys are expended, and they believe (this is general, not relating specifically to prawn fishing or any other particular type of fishing) that if a licence fee is paid which is being used for the purposes of research, they are entitled to an annual financial statement, because they directly contribute to that fund, as they are required to do.

The same thing applies to the Wool Commission, where Australian woolgrowers subscribe a levy and receive an annual financial report on the activities of the Wool Commission. The same applies to the bulk handling organisation in which the member for Rocky River is involved. Where an industry pays a levy, fee or a contribution earmarked for a purpose, it is entitled to a breakdown of the expenditure. If the department proposes to continue extracting money through the licensing system to finance research, a financial breakdown specifically related to research expenditure for the previous year and in each subsequent year should be supplied.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I recall that about six or seven years ago the provision for fisheries research was only about \$50 000. It has been expanded very significantly; an amount of \$714 000 was paid into the Fisheries Research and Development Fund last year and this year the amount is \$730 000. I draw the attention of the honourable member to document 23 on the report file, where he will see that fishing licences and registrations will bring in a revenue for this year of \$190 000. Therefore, the total revenue for fisheries is \$190 000 at this stage. That does not relate to any increases, because the Budget was prepared before that matter was determined. Expenditure on fisheries research is about four times the amount being extracted; if the amount being extracted increases, presumably the Government will be able to expend more on fisheries research than would otherwise be the case.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** That relates to what I was saying, namely, that the industry is concerned that, if expenditure is to be directed towards research, it be directed to an area of research where it is required. For example, not one of those 53 fishermen wants the *Jospeh Verco* involved in a commercial venture and taking prawns from the area where they know they are. They know how to catch them. They want the vessel in the South-East, the area for which it was purchased and where it was understood it would go. It is not an area of research that requires an expensive and

over-equipped vessel. All of the research for the prawn industry can be done by the commercial vessels offered free of charge to the department for that purpose. Irrespective of whether the fund for South Australian fisheries research is to be increased, decreased or whatever, if the fishermen have to contribute, they want to know what is happening to the money.

**Mr. EVANS:** Recreational fishermen have told me that, when they are fishing in other than metropolitan areas and they see something they believe is contravening the regulations or the law in relation to fishing, the inspectors, in the main, are available by telephone after hours. In other words, it appears their home is connected direct to the office number. However, in the metropolitan area that is not the case and they ask whether the Minister could examine having after-hours numbers available in the metropolitan area so that, when people see a breach of the law, the inspector can be in time to apprehend.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** This matter has already been raised by the member for Alexandra.

**Mr. EVANS:** Secondly, the matter of millipedes comes within the Minister's responsibility. The Federal Minister for Science (Mr. Webster) offered to make moneys available for a joint research programme that would have cost about \$165 000 over a three-year period. The State Minister does not wish, at this stage, to contribute in monetary terms. He is offering other assistance, but it does not match up to what the Federal Minister is asking for. The person who is most expert in the field of the millipede pest has taken a post in Ireland but he would be available if the money was made available. The amount being sought from the State over a three-year period is not large: it is only about \$80 000. The millipede problem is now becoming more widespread. I have been told it is prevalent now in Magill, in the Norwood area, and in an increasing number of local government areas. Members who do not have this pest in their area can laugh and say, "What does this multi-legged thing have to do with Parliament? People can put up with it." It is a real pest, it costs people much in loss of property value, and it interferes with quality of life.

I ask the Minister whether he will ask the Minister of Agriculture to bring before Cabinet the need to make money available to begin a research programme to find some sort of biological control. If we do not find this control, the problem will still be on our hands, but surely we should try. By the time we find the solution we may find it is a bigger problem. I ask the Minister whether he can get his colleagues to face up to the responsibility and co-operate in the joint venture. I believe this problem will be brought up at the next meeting of the State and Federal departments that deal with entomology. The entomology group can decide whether a joint venture throughout Australia can be established in South Australia as has been done in the Blue Mountains in New South Wales and in Victoria.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will take up the matter personally with the Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister a problem which relates to a Mr. Swincer, of Kidman Park. I take this up because Mr. Swincer has interviewed me. The matter relates to the staffing of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and therefore to the policy of the department. In 1975 the department advertised for prawn fishing permits to be made available for the area in Investigator Strait immediately south-west of the line joining Cape Jervis Light and Troubridge Light.

Mr. Swincer was one of several people granted such a permit on a special basis to fish for prawns. Owing to a court decision, it was decided that the southern boundary

of St. Vincent Gulf would be moved to a line between Troubridge Point and Cape Jervis light, moving it further to the south-west. As a result, the triangular area in which 50 per cent of the prawns had been caught previously by Mr. Swincer and other people who received permits to fish for prawns was lost. The new boundary between Troubridge Point and the Cape Jervis light became the new official boundary between State and Commonwealth waters in the gulf.

The Minister moved the official area in which these people were allowed to fish three miles outside the new line; therefore, the only area in which they were allowed to fish in State waters was in the three-mile strip on the new line, an area not so plentiful in prawns as was the original triangle, which had contained 50 per cent of the catch. A number of fishermen, because of the policy change made by this Government, have been given a raw deal.

**Mr. Chapman:** They've been locked out of the golden triangle.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** They have, and they have had 50 per cent of their potential catch taken from them. They have only a permit, which I understand needs to be renewed on an annual basis. The member for Henley Beach is smiling, because I think he knows something of the circumstances, as I understand Mr. Swincer has been to see him.

Will the fishermen involved, including Mr. Swincer, get an authority for the three-mile strip? I say "authority" as opposed to a permit; currently they have only a permit, and obviously they want some long-term stability if they are to continue to invest money in fishing vessels. This decision is important, because it affects at least five prawn boats and 15 people working on them. Will the Government reconsider the decision initially taken by it after approval was sought from AFIC to change the southern boundary of the gulf from the Troubridge light to the Troubridge Point line and so delete this triangle?

Mr. Swincer used a State Bank loan to purchase his boat. If he is not given an authority, he cannot use that boat in South Australian waters, but would need to fish in another State. He has been told that he cannot take the boat interstate to fish when it carries a State Bank loan. He is in a catch 22 situation: he is not allowed to fish in South Australia, and he cannot take his boat interstate and fish with it, at the same time keeping the loan on the boat. He cannot sell the boat in South Australia unless someone has an authority to fish for prawns, and no new authorities are being granted. He is in a predicament.

If the Government is not willing to grant him an authority (and I hope it will be) to fish in the three-mile strip and to review the triangle to allow fishing within it, I hope it will at least reconsider allowing the boat to be taken interstate, although it carries a State Bank loan; otherwise Mr. Swincer will be in a position of having to liquidate his \$80 000 asset, simply to try to pay back the bank loan. He is in a position, under Government policy, where he cannot win. I ask for a review of this unfortunate situation.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I shall take up the matter with the Minister of Fisheries. I doubt very much whether the question of the boundary between State and Commonwealth waters would be reviewed.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** The boundary doesn't have to be reviewed.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** You wanted the triangle altered.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It is a matter of whether the Government will give him approval to come back into those State waters to fish.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not think that would be so unless he qualified for a prawn authority in the normal way when they were issued.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** He has a permit.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** From what the honourable member says, he has not had a normal prawn authority to fish in State waters. I will take up the matter to see whether the Minister of Fisheries, if he is not prepared to review the matter, will take up the issue with the State Bank to see whether or not the gentleman can fish in another State if he wishes.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I am grateful that the member for Davenport has brought this case before the Minister. It is an example of where a man quite innocently has become the victim of circumstances following this Government's convenient use of the decision against the Government in the Raptis case. The State Government has adopted a line—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are providing for expenditure. I do not see anything in these expenditure items that has anything to do with the Raptis case. If members want to be out of order, that is their business, but there is no item here which would enable the honourable member to discuss the Raptis case.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I uphold the point of order. If the honourable member wishes to discuss any specific case he must relate it to one of the items.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** All these expenses are connected with administration and finance, which is administered and expended on the basis of the policy laid down. That was the item under which the member for Davenport drew attention to the Swincer case. I do not intend to refer to the Raptis issue but, on a matter of policy, I should like to know, when the Minister is in contact with his colleague, whether he will find out the Government's policy in relation to annual permit holders at the bottom end of the gulf. Quite apart from the 53 authorised prawn fishermen in South Australian waters, there are others, some of whom are State and some Commonwealth permit holders. State permit holders have been fishing in the golden triangle area between Cape Jervis and Troubridge Light, on the upper gulf line, and Cape Jervis and Troubridge Point on the lower line, and have had access to it under their permit for years. Suddenly they have been denied access to the area as a result of the case to which I am not allowed to refer.

It was clear that the case related only to fixing the State-Commonwealth boundary, and it had no relation to whether people fished on one side of the line or the other. It is as a result of State departmental convenience that these few permit holders have been excluded from the rich resource area to which they had had access all this time. It seems proper and reasonable that they should be allowed to re-enter. In the meantime the upper St. Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen have not been fishing the area, because it is too far from Port Adelaide and they have had no need to go there. They have not made a practice of going so far south to fish. At this stage, the permit holders from the south who have been fishing there are not permitted to do so, and those from the upper gulf waters have not been fishing there, anyway. I believe that the proposition put up by the member for Davenport should be fully supported.

In this Chamber, referring to the taking of Blue Groper, I asked the Minister the following questions:

1. Does the Minister recognise that Blue Groper caught by fishermen while netting sharks in deep water die from internal rupture and are therefore wasted if returned to the sea after surfacing?
2. Does the Government intend to make the sale of Blue

Groper illegal and, if so, on what grounds does the Government justify that action?

The Minister's reply confirms that some Blue Groper caught in shark nets may suffer an over expanded or ruptured swim bladder if hauled quickly to the surface from an excessive depth. Such fish would not survive if released. The Minister goes on to say that the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has circulated a proposal to amend paragraph 9 of the proclamations under the Fisheries Act, 1971, to totally protect the Blue Groper.

Will the Minister express my concern to his colleague? Blue Groper are caught in shark nets. They are not caught by design—they just get caught in the nets when they are set for shark fishing. Consequently, some are brought to the surface. The Minister proposed in his reply to make it illegal to use fish caught by that method. On that basis, Blue Groper would be completely wasted. Will the Minister convey my concern about such foolish wastefulness involved in continuing with that sort of policy?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will take up the matter.

**Mr. RODDA:** I move:

That the vote "Agriculture and Fisheries, \$17 642 000" be reduced by \$100.

It does not give me much pleasure to move this motion while the Minister is out of the country. Much concern has been expressed about the Minister's occupancy of his office. Indeed, the national press this week referred to it in a lengthy article, and this is the first time that the Premier has had to step in and imply that there had to be some settling of accounts in relation to the Minister.

Since the Minister has held this portfolio he has been described as a wonder boy because of his approach to agriculture. We saw this in his lead-up to Parliament by his articles on agriculture. We saw his definite views on agriculture. The Minister was not in office long before reference was made to an article written by him and his wife about "What should happen in the farming sector." Reference was made to a communal-type farm, and lip service was paid to the syndication farm and hobby farm.

Agriculture in South Australia has a long history involving the concept of the family farm, and all this talk is alien to it. There is no place in the farming community for such talk, and the Minister did not get away to a good start with the people to whom he was privileged and honoured to minister. The Minister had an abysmally low profile with the farming sector. Although I do not want to be unkind to him, in his early meetings he seemed indifferent to people in the farming sector. He again got on to an indifferent stand regarding the live sheep issue, which is now history and which has developed further in regard to what has happened in Queensland today. That dispute could have been resolved; rather, we had much hurly-burly of farmers coming to Adelaide and loading sheep.

There was then the long-standing dispute over the funding of drought relief, and that argument went back and forth between the Minister and the Federal Government. There was a reluctance by farmers to put in their applications and, when agreement was reached, there were long waits for assistance. I pay a tribute to officers of the State Bank and the department. The healthy sum allocated in relation to disasters is to meet any exigencies that might arise.

There was argument between the Minister and the Federal authorities on the taking up of the amount to be spent, and it seemed to the rural sector to be part of the Minister's modern but controversial approach. The citrus fiasco has also been referred to in this Chamber, and I pay a tribute to the member for Chaffey for his closeness to his industry and for the manner in which he raised this issue.

This is one of the areas in which the Minister is alleged to have been rebuked, according to the national press this week.

Another matter raised in this Chamber concerns the function of the Rural Industries Branch, and the establishment of its office. I raised this matter in Parliament, as did a couple of my colleagues, indicating that many farmers must attend the branch as part of their operations in the rural sector, yet conversations between farmers and assessors can easily be overheard. The question of confidentiality and privacy is most important. Certainly, it is not a comfortable situation for one to be in when one's private affairs have to be discussed virtually in public as a result of the arrangement of officers in the branch. Although I understand the Minister did examine the problem, and although there are some private rooms for senior officers of the branch, that has only happened recently; subordinate officers are still carrying on their administration matters within hearing of the public. I recently attended the office and observed that private conversations could be overheard if one cared to listen. The Minister should take some blame for that. The draft dairying industry legislation is not yet before Parliament, but it was drawn and submitted to selected areas of the industry. It has caused much confusion.

I submit that this matter could have been handled much more diplomatically. I understand that the South Australian Dairymen's Association and other organisations are holding meetings. The draft Bill puts a nasty taste in many dairymen's mouths, because of its socialistic aspects. This controversial Minister has absented himself from the State, possibly on important business, but Sir Thomas Playford always ensured that his Ministers were present in the House when the Budget was being discussed. The Minister of Mines and Energy, who is now in charge of the Committee, is not an incompetent Minister, but he has to obtain reports on many of the matters referred to him in this debate, and that is unusual for him. A statement in the press indicated that the Acting Minister of Agriculture is the Minister of Community Welfare, so why is he not handling these matters? This is a high-handed way in which to treat the rural community, which earns about \$700 000 000 for the economy of the State.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I support the motion, the mover of which has been kind to the Minister of Agriculture in describing him. Since his appointment, the Minister has bungled almost everything he has been given to handle. I think that the most important matter that has emerged from his involvement with his portfolio of agriculture and fisheries is that he has never been close to the rural industry or the fishing industry. He has never received the sort of respect or regard one would hope a Minister would—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that he may criticise the Minister in his role as a Minister, but he cannot reflect on him as a member of the other place. If the honourable member wishes to be critical of the Minister of Agriculture, it must be in his portfolio as the Minister. I should be pleased if the honourable member would be careful to ensure that that is the area in which he criticises the Minister, namely, in his Ministerial activity. As a member of another place, he is not allowed to be reflected on.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I have no respect for him as a Minister (it has nothing to do with his affiliation with the other place), and I believe that this is the feeling of the community at large. It is with that view that I support the motion. I believe that the Minister ought to be replaced. He is an embarrassment to the rural community, and there

is no question about his becoming an embarrassment to his own Government. The *National Times* report by Dennis Atkins this week wrapped it up in a few paragraphs. He referred to the Dunstan Government's eight years of stability, which has now gone out of the window, because in the past month the Premier has twice had to use his office to prevent embarrassment to the Minister. It has been a most embarrassing situation for the Government, and it must have been for the now absent Minister. The first occasion concerned increases in the licence fees for prawn fishermen, and I do not intend to rehash that matter but, since 14 August, when Cabinet approved increases of up to 2 800 per cent, the Minister has bungled every move applicable to that exercise. First, he said to the industry, "You'll pay or get out, and we'll put someone else in." That was the message he was seeking to get across; it was true dictatorship. The industry reacted as naturally as it should have, with the Opposition's full support, and away we went with a whole series of events.

Finally, the Minister had to back down and let the Premier take over and exercise his powers to smooth the waters, and move the Minister to India. I do not know the circumstances applicable to that move, but someone said that the Minister was over there advising the Hindus on dry-land farming, when much of the country is flooded. Since his appointment, the Minister of Agriculture has been a serious embarrassment to the rural community and the fishing industry and to his Government in recent weeks, and that has been made patently obvious by the steptoe dancing the Premier has had to do on the Minister's behalf both here and at industry meetings in the presence of the Minister's own officers. It is incredible that the Minister should hold his position through this bungle exercise both over the issue of prawn licences and the matter raised in the House by the member for Chaffey regarding the citrus industry debacle where the Minister, according to the reports and what I could glean from the embarrassed Premier's replies, sent a report to the I.A.C. in Canberra without first seeking Cabinet approval. I am not sure what he has over the Premier.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** What do you mean?

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I do not know what the relationship is. I do not know what the guarantees or hand shakes are, but I know of no other Minister who could make the mistakes this Minister has made and still hold his position. To make the situation worse and more aggravating to us, we have, as pointed out by the member for Victoria, the present Minister acting for the absent Minister of Agriculture. I, too, was under the impression that the Minister of Community Welfare was the acting Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He is.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I tried to confirm this on Saturday. I was down on the South Coast when the Minister of Lands opened the local agricultural and horticultural show. I presumed that he was Acting Minister of Agriculture, so after the opening I asked the show society representative present there last Saturday whether the Minister of Lands was introduced in his capacity as Minister of Lands or Acting Minister of Agriculture. The representative said "Neither"; he had asked to be introduced as the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. That seemed to remove any impression that he may have been there as Acting Minister of Agriculture. What I have heard this evening seems to confirm that the Minister in this Chamber who is Acting Minister of Agriculture is the Minister of Community Welfare. Where is he?

**Mr. Millhouse:** In the library.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** This whole bungling effort by the Minister of Agriculture since he was first appointed in

1975 has been a blight on agriculture and a back-hander to the rural community of South Australia. Despite his having made all those mistakes and having been helped out of the mire, and despite the embarrassment he has caused the Government and having been shifted carefully and in a most cuddly fashion across to India until the matter cools off, the rural industry has again received a kick in the guts because the Minister who is supposed to be carrying that acting portfolio, and who one would expect would be involved in this debate in the Budget lines, has chosen to be elsewhere. On behalf of those sections of the fishing industry and the rural community that I represent, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Victoria, who I believe has been extremely kind in his description of the bungling by the Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Deputy Premier has traditionally represented the Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber. If the Deputy Premier had been fully fit, he would have been here this evening and would have handled the Agriculture Department lines, as the Deputy Premier has done in every Budget discussion since 1970. The Deputy Premier, who has represented the Minister of Agriculture in this place, is too busy at present with his other responsibilities to be able to take on the docket load of the Minister of Agriculture. I can assure honourable members that the Minister of Community Welfare as Acting Minister of Agriculture will, if there is any issue that is controversial in any way, bring it to Cabinet. Honourable members opposite direct their questions on agricultural matters, as they do their questions on land matters, to the Deputy Premier. They have done that for years and know that traditionally the Deputy Premier has endeavoured to inform himself in relation to those matters as a member who formerly represented a rural area. The Deputy Premier is absent this evening, and he requested that I look after these lines for him.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Where is the Acting Minister?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Acting Minister is not in charge of these lines. He is not in any better position than I am in relation to answering any questions about these matters. Honourable members opposite are talking a load of nonsense about this matter. It is ridiculous to suggest that this is an insult and a kick in the guts (to use the words of the member for Alexandra) to the rural industry.

**Mr. Chapman:** Of course it is.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Does the member for Alexandra mean to say that, if the Deputy Premier had handled these lines tonight, that would have been a kick in the guts to the rural industry, when he has handled them in each of the previous seven years because he has represented the Minister of Agriculture in this place over that period? The Deputy Premier is not fit enough tonight and has asked me to look after these lines, and that is what is happening. That's not a kick in the guts to the rural industry.

**Mr. Venning:** We don't accept that.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** You can accept what you like. The member for Rocky River would not have the nose to accept anything, and I suggest that he keep quiet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Alexandra and the member for Rocky River are interjecting rather persistently, and I hope they desist.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I did both the member for Victoria and the member for Alexandra the courtesy of not interjecting during their remarks. The Minister of Agriculture is supposedly an embarrassment to the Government because, according to the member for

Alexandra, the Premier became involved in certain matters. I think every honourable member is aware that as a general rule people in this State have a right to go to the Premier about important matters. That right has been exercised in relation to matters that are the responsibility of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Labour and Industry, me, and every other Minister in the Cabinet. That is not something that is unusual regarding the current Premier; it applied when Steele Hall was Premier, when Frank Walsh was Premier, and when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier.

It was the Minister of Agriculture, as Minister of Fisheries, who suggested as a compromise an interim fee of \$2 000, and that was fairly early in the proceedings. I have no doubt that, in the discussions that the Minister of Fisheries had in Cabinet about the matter, the compromise of \$1 830 could have been worked out through representatives of the prawn fishermen seeing the Minister of Fisheries without the Premier ever being brought into the matter.

**Mr. Chapman:** Absolute rubbish!

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** That is not rubbish. I was present at and involved in all the Cabinet discussions about this matter. It is a significant reduction from \$2 000, the compromise first suggested by the Minister, to \$1 830.

Whatever members want to say as to who gave in, we have the situation where the previously existing fee was \$100, the interim suggestion of the Minister of Fisheries after the first proposal was rejected was \$2 000, and the compromise—

**Mr. Millhouse:** What about the figure of \$9 000?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** That may be so. All we have now is an interim fee, and the final compromise was \$1 830, which was somewhat closer to the \$2 000 suggested by the Minister than to the previously existing fee of \$100. Every member who has dealt with fishermen knows that every time there is a policy change, it does not matter who the Minister is, he has a fight on his hands.

**Mr. Chapman:** Why?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Because there is always conflict of interest in the industry, and always people with different viewpoints.

**Mr. Max Brown:** Fragmentation.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Yes. There is always argument between those doing well and those who are not doing well. Every member who has had dealings with fishermen knows that what I am saying is the truth. I am sure the member for Victoria will confirm that the fishing industry has always been highly controversial, and it has never been unanimous on policy questions.

**Mr. Chapman:** They were unanimous on this question.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** They may have been fed the personal garbage put around by the member for Alexandra and the member for Eyre. We know that those members indulged in personalities and abuse, and that they did not discuss the policy questions. Because prawn authorities are restricted, large incomes are being made. If prawn authorities are to be restricted in future, the question is whether or not it is reasonable that those who have authorities and who get a boost to their incomes because the number of authorities is restricted should pay a greater contribution than they have paid in the past. The case made out by the member for Alexandra and the member for Victoria is simply not valid.

It has happened before in relation to controversial matters that people have gone to see the Premier, and no doubt it will happen again. If the media and the Opposition want to represent it as an embarrassment, that is their business, but that does not make it the truth. I do not want to deal any further with what the member for

Alexandra said, because he indulged in mud-slinging, and his speech is not worth replying to. The member for Victoria said that the first reason for the motion was that the Premier stepped in: I have already dealt with that. The second reason was an article written three years ago that in some way alienated the rural community. Now, three years later we get a no-confidence motion in the Minister of Agriculture. Surely that is not a very substantial argument. The third matter raised by the member for Victoria was the live sheep issue. If anyone in the Government was actively supporting the export of live sheep it was the Minister of Agriculture. The member for Victoria went on public record in relation to his attitude to this matter. He is completely wrong.

The next point he raised was drought relief. The Federal Government has adopted a much tougher attitude with respect to drought relief than was the case previously. We have to spend the same amount in South Australia to qualify for drought relief from the Federal Government as they do in New South Wales, which has four times as many people, and as they do in Victoria, which has three times as many people. We certainly argued with the Commonwealth Government about those conditions, and we had every right so to argue, because the Commonwealth Government was penalising the smaller States. Surely the member for Victoria wants this Government to stand up for South Australia's rights. Let us examine the record. Actual expenditure in this connection last financial year was \$13 400 000, and the provision for this financial year is \$10 790 000.

I suggest to the member for Victoria that a two-year expenditure of about \$24 000 000 is at least double the expenditure in any two years previously by this State on drought relief. We would not find that more than \$2 000 000 was spent on drought relief in 1967-68. More has been done in connection with drought relief from State sources before we qualified for assistance from Commonwealth sources this time than has ever been the case previously: that evidently is one of the bases for lack of confidence in the Minister of Agriculture! The member for Victoria is talking nonsense.

The question of citrus was raised. Certainly that was a controversial matter. The original submission made (and the Premier said it did not go to Cabinet) was for 6 cents, as a minimum, or 25 per cent: 6 cents at a level of 10 cents is 60 per cent assistance, or tariff. So, the proposal was for a tariff variable from 60 per cent down to 25 per cent, depending on the price of imported juice. That has subsequently been adjusted, from memory, in the revised submission to 7 cents and 35 per cent; and 7 cents is 70 per cent. So, again, it would involve a scale of tariff protection running from 70 per cent down to 35 per cent, depending on the price of imported juice. As stated previously, at the higher prices, if 60 per cent was provided, the full measure of protection would not be required.

The next point made by the member for Victoria related to the Rural Industries Branch: he alleged that there was not full privacy and confidentiality. A proposition in this connection was taken up by the Minister of Agriculture. The member for Victoria admitted that there are now some private offices there. So, something has been done to ensure that interviews can take place privately. If a Minister wants something done in connection with accommodation, he cannot order it to be done, because it does not come under his department, assuming he is not the Minister of Works. The problem of ensuring that appropriate accommodation is provided is always difficult and always involves delays. Surely the member for Victoria should be generous enough to give the Minister of Agriculture credit for the fact that some privacy was

provided in the form of private offices where private discussions could take place. The fact that a period elapsed after the matter was raised earlier is no basis for criticism of the Minister of Agriculture.

The next point raised by the honourable member related to the dairying industry. We cannot win with these cockies! We introduced a Bill without providing for consultation, and they tear strips off us. We put a proposal out for consultation, and they still tear strips off us. If we do not do anything at all, they tear strips off us. The member for Victoria is not being reasonable in regard to this matter. The inquiry was held and certain conclusions were reached as a consequence of it.

**Mr. Nankivell:** You took no notice of any of it.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Some legislation was drafted and put out to the industry for comment. Is that not right?

**Mr. Nankivell:** That is right, but you took no notice at all of the—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member is surely not complaining that it was put out to the industry for comment, is he?

**Mr. Nankivell:** No.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member is in disagreement with the member for Victoria.

**Mr. Nankivell:** I am complaining that we had no knowledge of it except through the back door.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The member for Mallee is complaining that the Minister of Agriculture did not go directly to him and say, "Your Lordship, here is a document that I am going to put out to the industry."

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** What are you saying?

**Mr. Nankivell:** You by-pass Parliament the whole time on these issues.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** If one does not consult with industry, Opposition members scream their heads off about not consulting; if one consults, one by-passes the Opposition. For goodness sake! The member for Mallee is a director of Southern Farmers. I suppose he ascertains some things through Southern Farmers. From the way the honourable member carries on and the stupid arguments he goes on with, it is a wonder anyone is prepared to consult with him about anything.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! Honourable members should not by-pass the Chair.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will consult with you, Sir, but I am staggered at the kind of attitude that Opposition members display.

**Mr. Nankivell:** Opposition shadow Minister, that's all.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You should get a copy, surely.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** That is not what the member for Victoria said. Did the honourable member ask the Minister for a copy? Of course he did not.

**Mr. Gunn:** Did he ask his wife?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member for Eyre, with his dirty, gutter snipe attitude, is wanting to sneer at somebody's wife all the time. Get out of the gutter, for goodness sake. Ordinary people are listening to this debate. They do not want to go away with an impression that members of Parliament are in the gutter all the time. The position on this point is patently ridiculous. Apparently Opposition members are so sensitive that they are not prepared to ask the Minister for a copy of something that he happens to have put out for people in the industry, and they abuse him. They are not prepared to ask him for a copy of it; they have to go to somebody else.

**Mr. Wotton:** Let us see what the Minister is prepared to do about the submissions that come in.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It will be interesting to see what happens as a consequence; but that is not the argument of the member for Victoria. His argument was that the Minister put this out to the industry, but that he did not like what was put out. The Minister was giving the opportunity to industry to react and to complain about it. The member for Mallee now says that it was all because the Minister of Agriculture would not give a copy to the member for Mallee, or perhaps he forgot, and the member for Mallee's dignity was so offended that he would not ask the member for a copy. I have never heard so much rubbish. The final point alleged against the Minister of Agriculture was that he happens to be in India at present. There is an important matter in which he is engaged in India, relating to his Ministerial responsibilities.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What is it?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Members will find out in due course. I am not in a position to give that information. It is in relation to a negotiation that is involved, and the giving of information relating to that might cause difficulty.

**Mr. Millhouse:** This is a good example of open Government!

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I cannot hear the Minister.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I have never heard such specious nonsense as was implied by the honourable member for Mitcham's interjection. If one has some kind of negotiation with another Government, apparently unless one details what that negotiation is, one will be accused of government in secrecy and not allowing open Government, even though one may well be in a position in which, if full information is given about negotiations, they are prejudiced. The honourable member for Mitcham is dishonest to take that kind of debating point, because he knows full well that there are often situations in which one is involved in negotiations and, if those negotiations are completely open to public scrutiny, they fail. The member for Mitcham has been involved in similar negotiations himself.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** In plenty of situations relating to industrial disputes and the Redcliff petrochemical scheme, matters raised in negotiations demand that they be kept confidential.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You leak them when it is convenient.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** In relation to matters concerning companies like Dow or the Cooper Basin—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Come on! You are not saying that Chatterton is doing anything about those things, are you?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. Like the Chairman of Committees, I am prepared to treat the debate liberally and fairly. Interjections have been quite profuse since I have come into the Chair. I hope that the Chamber will control itself a little more.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Whilst the mover and seconder of this motion were speaking, I listened in silence, but the Opposition rabble is not prepared to extend the same courtesy. I know what the Minister of Agriculture is doing in India but I am not in a position to inform honourable members.

**Mr. Nankivell:** It was in the paper this afternoon.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** There are many situations in which negotiations take place in confidentiality.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I think that the matter was raised on A.B.C. News.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order. The honourable member for Davenport will resume his



seat on the Chair giving its ruling.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I am not in a position to discuss it, whatever was said on the A.B.C.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** But the article was—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Perhaps: the honourable member can say that if he wants to.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Do you know? I don't think you do.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I call the honourable member for Davenport to order. If his interjections continue against my ruling, I shall take the appropriate action.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Honourable members opposite are not prepared to let anyone speak whilst they listen in silence. To suggest that a Minister involved in any negotiations overseas has to go overseas whilst the Budget debate is on, and that that is in some way sufficient reason for moving a no-confidence motion is again, I suggest, a load of rubbish. To suggest that he must be here as a requirement of honourable members when he cannot speak in this House, anyway, is a load of rubbish. Those are the reasons of the honourable member for Victoria for this motion. The Opposition case is not substantiated in any respect. Members of the Opposition, to a significant extent, are indulging in rumour and nasty back talk in a personal vendetta.

The honourable member for Davenport would not know what a personal vendetta was: he would not know what gutter tactics were, because he is unable to make the distinction, unfortunately for the general standards of debate in this House. Some Opposition members are willing to attack a person in the personal way that the Minister of Agriculture has been attacked several times, less so by the member for Victoria, and I at least give him credit. He tried to list several reasons without indulging in personalities, but that was not done by the member for Alexandra, and would not have been done by the member for Davenport, the member for Mitcham, or the member for Eyre.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Come on! Do you want to try us out?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Are you trying to ignore the ruling of the Chair?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will decide what rulings will be given.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** One gets continuous inane interjections from the member for Mitcham who, as he gets older, is becoming more juvenile in his approach to everybody in this Chamber. Of course, all other 46 members are out of step, so we must make allowances for him. I do not believe a substantial case has been made out. Several instances have been referred to and I have given a detailed answer to those. Obviously, several arguments used have been without foundation.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am surprised at the comments made by the Minister of Mines and Energy. Members on this side of the House have been accused of spreading rumours about the Minister of Agriculture, that we have launched some sort of personal vendetta against him. If any Minister in this State has brought criticism upon himself, it is the present Minister of Agriculture. It is embarrassing, to say the very least, to travel in agricultural circles and see how the Minister is regarded. He is a laughing stock. The actions not of the Opposition but of the Minister have caused that. The Premier has been quite foolish in his own actions in this particular matter.

The Minister has placed himself in the position where he has brought ridicule on himself on occasion after occasion. It is very foolish, in my view, for any person in public life to involve his own wife in a Government department, particularly in the capacity in which this particular Minister is operating. It is foolish; the Premier has not

done it on any other occasion. Members on this side are surprised that the Premier would allow this situation to continue. It gives members on this side no pleasure to attack the Minister or his wife, but the current situation must be highlighted.

It is all right for the honourable member who is laughing. I suggest he do a trek around the country and talk to people involved in agriculture and fisheries to find out what they think of the current situation. The Minister said fishermen were a difficult group of people and no-one could satisfy them. In my view, the Minister has not set out to get the confidence of the industry. He has failed miserably. The appointments he has made to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department have done nothing but cause problems. He brought in a person from outside the State who had no background knowledge of the industry and that person set out, unfortunately, on a course of confrontation.

If the Minister wants to get the fishing industry on his side, he should talk common sense. It is quite clear to anyone with any knowledge of the fishing industry that the first thing the fishermen want and are entitled to is the ability to transfer their licences. That is their right and it should be done. If the Minister does this he will get on the wave length of the fishing industry. Why will not large organisations even discuss matters with the Minister? The member for Alexandra and I discussed the matter with the head of a large organisation in this State who was quite open in saying he or his directors would not discuss the fishing industry with the Minister. They would discuss the problem with the Premier or the Deputy Premier, because they knew if they gave their word they could be relied upon, but not so with the Minister of Agriculture.

Let us consider other areas of the fishing industry and the problems there. There has been indecision. One of the problems about which fishermen complain is that they cannot get answers from the department. They make inquiries; one day they are told something and the next day something different. Correspondence is not answered. The Minister should solve that problem, and if he does he will certainly create better understanding in the industry. I suggest that, if he really wants to put the department right, he should go to Western Australia to second officers from that State to show him how a Fisheries Department is run properly. He will not successfully run the department while he exercises a socialist philosophy. Taxpayers' money has been wasted in this State. Professor Copes, from Canada, has been brought out to South Australia. He produced one large document that was a prescription for disaster, and it was totally rejected by the industry. The previous report is collecting dust. The Copes Report was to be the complete answer to the problems of the rock lobster industry. However, it has only caused more problems, deflated the industry, and caused further lack of confidence in the Minister and his department. The Minister does not have to go any further than Western Australia to solve the problems.

I believe that the Government of South Australia should seriously examine the complete operation of agriculture in South Australia. It has set out to completely get rid of the Lands Department and to downgrade what was the Agriculture Department. The Minister has been a failure, and anyone with any knowledge would admit that. The Premier has indicated that he has a lack of confidence in his Minister, which was seen when the member for Chaffey moved his motion on the citrus industry. The Premier and Deputy Premier dissociated themselves from the Minister of Agriculture. Anyone who reads *Hansard* for that day would come to the conclusion that the Premier had no confidence whatsoever in his Minister and his

actions following that particular debate proved this.

It suits the Liberal Party for the Government to leave the current Minister alone; he can only do good for the Liberal Party wherever he goes and we do not mind. However, for the sake of the industry, I think he ought to be replaced by someone who can listen and can make firm and positive decisions.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I support this motion. The two specific issues I wish to raise are the class B licence dispute and the prawn industry dispute. Any Minister who tries to justify his actions by producing facts and figures that are totally misleading and out of date deserves to be dismissed from office. When the Minister of Fisheries tried to justify his massive increase in fees for prawn authorities, he used figures that were two years old. He tried to justify his actions by stating that the prawn industry was earning \$9 700 000. He did a little bit of mental arithmetic, divided that by 53, and said they were all earning \$150 000.

That was the story which he sold to the press, and by which he tried to con the people of South Australia. At the very same time or immediately that happened, I put some questions on notice, and they brought out some very revealing figures. The case as presented by the Minister to the public was wrong by about 33½ per cent. Instead of the average prawn income being \$150 000, it was \$102 000.

We are talking of an enterprise which involves \$250 000 to \$300 000 in capital, which is paying wages for at least three crew plus one shore-based man, and which has a gross turnover of only \$102 000. The Minister did not have an argument. He could not go to the public to justify the claim by hitting these 53 prawn fishermen with massive increases. The argument was swept from under his feet. He tried to tell the public that he had liaised fully with the prawn industry. I challenge the Minister to table any document setting out where any such discussion took place. I believe that no such discussion took place. This is the action of the Minister whose dismissal is urged by the motion.

It was reported that licence fees would be up to \$9 000. The *Tecoma*, an 84-foot vessel, under this proposal would have paid a licence fee of \$10 400. What is in print is only part of the story. The intention was to double the fees in the following financial year. That was the first point of negotiation which the fishermen had to take up with the Premier. Fortunately, the Premier said the doubling of the fees was not on. That was one of the first assurances he gave. That is the way in which this Minister has handled his portfolio.

**Mr. Gunn:** Total incompetence.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Total incompetence. He is handling an industry which involves \$41 000 000-worth of vessels and which is being treated like dirt. The editorial of the *Advertiser* on 21 September sums up the story, as follows:

The Premier himself, in Parliament the day before—that would be on 20 September—

also seemed little disposed to mollify the industry saying the Government's stand on the matter was "perfectly reasonable".

It should be apparent, however, that Mr. Chatterton's arbitrary action in increasing prawn licence fees by up to 2 800 per cent only a fortnight before the licences had to be renewed was neither perfect nor reasonable. It was ham-fisted. It was also, regrettably, typical of much of the Minister's administration of his portfolios. Once again, Mr. Chatterton is being attacked by one of his constituent groups for not communicating with those affected by his department's actions.

I have seen most of the correspondence with the prawn industry representatives in the liaison with the Minister since this issue arose on 15 August. The Minister has tried

to push his story through, to use every tactic, but certainly not to use negotiation. The headlines of the *Advertiser* on 15 September tell the story: "Men told: pay fees or lose licences". If that is not ham-fisted, I do not know what is, but it is typical of the Minister's attitude.

The B-class fishermen's dispute is far from over. The scale fishing industry has problems, but the Government has failed to accept its responsibilities to manage the industry, and now it has pushed the problem aside, saying that it will give all B-class fishing licences back, and allow natural attrition to occur. From the brief inquiries I have made, and taking into account the natural attrition that has occurred in the past 12 months, I say that it will take 40 years to rectify the problem. No-one can manage the fishing industry with such a timid approach.

I shall be seeking further information on the number of licences and on the number of licences voluntarily given up to justify that situation. It is another reason why I believe there is just cause for this motion of no confidence in the Minister, because his handling of the industry (and I have quoted two examples) justifies his dismissal. On the evidence presented, I fully support the motion.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McRae):** Before I call on the member for Fisher, and then the member for Alexandra, the member for Flinders, in his most recent contribution, said something on which perhaps I should advise him. It has been the ruling of the Chair that, once this amendment moved by the member for Victoria is put, the vote is put. I think the member for Flinders indicated that he sought information on a topic that seemed to be in the vote under consideration.

**Mr. BLACKER:** No, the point I referred to comes under "Miscellaneous".

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** If the honourable member is happy with that, I call the member for Fisher.

**Mr. EVANS:** I shall be brief in my criticism of the Minister. When Dr. Baker told me of his appointment to Dublin, I contacted the Minister's department and asked whether he would give me an appointment in the following week, even for only 15 minutes. He is the only Minister who, in my 10 years in Parliament, has refused, during a whole week, to give me 15 minutes to discuss a matter of importance to me, to my people, and to others within the State. For that, I believe he stands condemned. In no way do I resile from any of the comments made by my colleagues. I believe the Minister is a failure in the way he has operated and that he is not capable of holding the portfolio in a proper way. Proof of that is his refusal to see me, even for a short time.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I do not wish to recap on the issues raised, except to list some of the points that have been identified as having been bungled by the Minister. The live sheep issue was the first mentioned, followed by the scale fishery issue, the prawn fishing licences, the citrus issue, the Rural Industries Assistance administration, drought relief, the dairying industry, and the matter of why the Minister is in India. I am surprised that the Minister who is representing the Minister of Agriculture this evening did not say why the Minister was in India, saving all the argument and interjection that occurred. A question directed to the Premier last week on this matter was replied to today, with the information that the Minister is in India for the purpose of finalising potential sales of South Australian forestry products. He is there, with his Director of Woods and Forests, and the tour of India is likely to cost about \$3 200.

There is one other matter in which the Minister involved himself to his own detriment early in his career as Minister of Agriculture. Honourable members will recall his involvement with the wool industry dispute, soon after his

appointment. A report in the *National Times* today states:

The focus of attack for Chatterton was middle-level management, which, as far as the overall running of agriculture in the State was concerned, was on target. However, every move seemed to upset the cockies.

Chatterton and the man on the land have never had any real communication. The rural power in South Australia lies in the hands of two groups: the Stock Owners' Association of South Australia and the United Farmers and Graziers. The Minister has always been keen to improve relations between primary producers and the unions involved in the industry.

Their differences came to a head in early 1976, when storemen and packers refused to move export wool. The Minister urged producers to press brokers to give in to the unionists' claims. The woolgrowers responded by calling for the Minister's resignation.

That is an example of his handling of matters pertaining to the rural industry since his appointment as Minister. That same offside attitude is reflected in each of the areas cited by the member for Victoria and others in this matter.

The Minister of Mines and Energy made great play about the compromise figures that the Minister had arrived at in relation to the prawn fishing industry and the interim fee, but the position outlined by him is incorrect. The Minister of Fisheries put forward a schedule of fees to apply for the current period, involving \$5 000 for the St. Vincent Gulf and \$9 000 for Spencer Gulf. Those fees were approved by Cabinet on 14 August, and the Minister intended to enforce them, with the threat that if the fees were not paid the prawn fishermen would be replaced by others.

The \$2 000 fee referred to by the Minister of Mines and Energy tonight was not an interim sum floated by the Minister of Fisheries—that sum was floated by the Premier at the first meeting between the Premier and the fishermen. The Minister of Fisheries was present at the meeting with his wife, the Director (Mr. Jim McColl), the Assistant Director (Mr. Kirkegaard) and others described previously by the Deputy Leader as hangers-on. There were other representatives from the fishing industry. It was at that meeting that the \$2 000 interim fee was put forward, and those representatives were requested to go back to Port Lincoln and ask the prawn fishermen whether that was acceptable. Following that meeting the fishermen came back for a second meeting with the Premier on 5 October, when the final interim fee was decided on the formula outlined by the member for Flinders, the sum involved being \$1 830. Interestingly, on 6 October there was a further example of the Minister's incompetence and misleading attitude. Under the heading "Prawn Freeze" to be a percentage", the following report appeared on 6 October in the *News*:

All South Australian prawn fishermen would pay the new annual licence fee by September 1, 1979, Fisheries Minister Mr. Chatterton, said today. "The new fee would not be based on 1 per cent of the gross catch; we will look at a range of percentages," he said.

He completely denied the body of agreement between the parties at the meeting the previous night. The report continued:

He said the Government had not agreed that the interim fee would be based on 1 per cent of the gross 1976-77 catch.

I refer to the inconsistency that existed within 12 hours of the meeting, to the report given by the member for Flinders and his reference to the *Advertiser* editorial, and to a whole host of reports that have come forward subsequently in both the *News* and the *Advertiser*. What happened at the AFIC conference on 6 October?

The fishing representatives attending that meeting reported the position, yet their understanding was the

complete opposite of the information the Minister was feeding the press. As can be seen from the *National Times* today, it is clear that the media and the industry throughout South Australia have recognised the agreement to have been that the interim fee was based on 1 per cent of the 1976-77 catch, and that subsequent fees will be fixed on that productivity return basis, whether it be 1 per cent or 0.75 per cent, which is consistent with the West Australian system, or otherwise.

Even now the Minister is still at variance with what was agreed that night and what was understood by fishermen and media representatives. How the Minister of Mines and Energy can defend the activities and practices of the Minister of Fisheries that we are saddled with is beyond me. He does not deserve the position that he holds, and it is a backhander to the rural community to maintain him in this position.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON** moved:

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I would like to make just one point. The Premier put up the figure of \$2 000 at the meeting held with the fishermen's representatives, because the Minister of Fisheries had made that recommendation to Cabinet as an interim fee. Every member of Cabinet who was there can confirm that fact.

**Mr. RODDA:** The Minister of Mines and Energy has given an exhibition of the closing of the ranks, and we have seen that happen before. The coincidence of the Minister of Fisheries being overseas and the Minister who regularly represents him in this Chamber being absent tonight has been explained by the Minister in charge. It was reassuring to hear the Minister say in regard to the live sheep export dispute that the Minister of Agriculture was keen to have sheep exported. The perambulations at the time made many people in South Australia wonder about that. Regarding drought relief, people were concerned about getting to the qualifying sum of \$1 500 000, although there was no limit on the Federal funds. The Minister was able to spend much money on drought relief, and it was appreciated by those concerned.

During the hiatus, the situation looked fairly ugly. However, it got off the ground, and we are all pleased that there is a season in the offing which will offset the expenditure. My criticism of the dairy Bill was the form in which it had been drafted. I would like to see my motion have the Committee's support, because it involves a matter with which the Opposition and the rural industry are deeply concerned.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson (teller), Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dean Brown and Venning. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and Dunstan.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests and Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous, \$14 268 000.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister obtain for me the number of fishing licence appeals that have been held during the past 12 months, together with the number of

appeals that have been upheld? Comparing this year's allocation with last year's actual payments, does the Minister anticipate a large number of appeals? Has the Government changed its present policy of freezing the number of fishing licences?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will ascertain the number of appeals for the honourable member. The reason for the under-expenditure last year was that the appeals held were less costly, because the proposed sittings, expected to be held in the country, were held in Adelaide. The honourable member would appreciate that, if a fishing appeal is held in Port Lincoln, and we would have to provide the expenses for people to go to Port Lincoln to hear the appeal, it is considerably more costly than it is if the appeal is held in Adelaide. Regarding the \$8 000 allocation, I am not sure whether more appeals are expected to be held this year.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Is it intended that appeals will be held in the country? This is the first I have heard of such a policy. I know many of my constituents lodged appeals at their own expense. Should those appeals be heard in Port Lincoln, it will be of considerable advantage to those people.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** There is a proposed amount of \$798 000 for "transfer to the Country Fire Services Fund". I realise that part of that sum has been transferred from other lines amounting to \$466 000: where has the additional money come from?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** There were additional items under "Police Department" last year. In 1977-78 separate allocations were made for the salaries of Country Fire Services headquarters staff and contingencies under the Police Department lines. We should look back under those lines and add those figures which appear in the two left-hand columns in order to get the correct comparison between last year and this year.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** There are 69 sections in the Country Fire Services Act, of which only 31 have been proclaimed. These are concerned with interpretation, the board, its composition and activities, and with finance and regulations. Has the Minister any idea when the remaining sections will be proclaimed? There is concern in country areas about some of the provisions in the legislation, which passed this Parliament about two years ago. Now that the legislation has come into effect, some people are concerned about the inequitable terms of some sections, especially as, largely, only the people who take out insurance policies will be assisting the financial provisions regarding the administration of the Country Fire Services. The member for Victoria asked a question on 10 October as follows:

I refer to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board, for which \$1 681 000 is allocated. Regarding the levy which policy holders now have to pay in addition to premiums and which I understand is to be disbursed between the Fire Brigades Board and the Country Fire Services, I should like to know how much is proposed to be raised from this levy across the State. I do not expect the Minister to have that information now, but I should be grateful if it could be supplied.

The Minister replied:

That figure would amount to about \$9 500 000, because under the formula 75 per cent is provided by the levy on insurance premiums, 12½ per cent by local government and 12½ per cent by the State Government.

Some people who will be paying heavily because of that formula have already made generous contributions towards the establishment of the C.F.S. and plant.

I see in the Auditor-General's Report that a fund is being retained under its old identity of the Bushfires

Equipment Subsidies Fund. Until section 4 of this Act is proclaimed that fund will remain a separate entity and will not take its place in the C.F.S. Fund. The repeal of the Bushfires Act has not taken place, because section 4 of the new Act has not been proclaimed. When is it likely that the Act will be fully proclaimed and come into force?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get a report.

**Dr. EASTICK:** For "Country Agricultural and Horticultural and Field Trial Societies" the allocation is \$13 000, which is the same figure as last year. As committees associated with these organisations are questioning what method of distribution will apply in future, I should like some details about this matter. There is a massive reduction from \$783 000 to \$480 000 on the item "For payment of subsidies and grants to boards and councils" (under the Pest Plants Commission Fund). What has caused this drop, and what significant effect will it have on the workings of the various boards that have been created?

Why has there been a decrease in the allocation for subsidies to local government and work on Crown lands, what proportion of the total allocation will be made available as subsidies to local government, and what remainder will be for use on Crown lands? I point out that some of the vertebrate pests boards and pest plant boards have not yet formally got under way. I suspect that increased subsidies will be required if the original Government commitment is to be met.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The \$13 000 provided for grants to country agricultural and horticultural and field trial societies is for subsidies on prize money paid out by country show societies. I presume that the basis on which that is done will be the same this year as it was last year. I refer now to the sum of \$480 000 provided for the payment of subsidies and grants to boards and councils in connection with the Pest Plants Commission Fund. The reason for the reduction is that the figure last year included intitial grants for setting up as well as salary subsidies. The amount provided was greater last year because of "setting up" grants paid to various boards. So, the figure paid includes a capital item as well as a running cost item. In the main, the capital items were paid for and provided for last year. Regarding the rabbit control subsidy, \$132 000 was provided last year. It was presumed that almost all councils would involve themselves in the programme but, in fact, a number did not do so. The estimate this year is that nearly all councils will involve themselves in the programme, but perhaps the number will not be as great as what was expected last year. However, it will certainly be greater than what happened this year.

**Dr. Eastick:** What proportion of the allocation is for Crown lands?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Will the Minister ascertain who are the members of the Working Party on the Entry of Meat into the Metropolitan Area? Is that working party seeking public evidence and, if it is, has the opportunity for giving such evidence expired? When will the working party's report be completed, and will it be made available to members? Can the Minister say where the South Australian Fly Fishers' Association is based, and how does it qualify for a grant of \$1 000?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The committee was established in April this year to review restrictions on the entry of meat into the Adelaide metropolitan area. The provision of \$3 000 is for costs associated with members' fees, travelling, administration expenses and preparation of the report, which, as far as we know, is to be submitted late in 1978. The members of the committee are the

Chairman (Mr. J. C. Potter), and Messrs. N. Lawson and R. K. Lindner. I am not able to say whether or not they are still receiving submissions. I will ask the Minister about that and check on the publication of the report. The subsidy to the Fly Fishers' Association is to provide it with funds to assist with the purchase of trout eggs, hatching and the distribution of fish to streams in South Australia.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I assume that \$5 000 is allocated for the Apiculture Congress held some months ago at the Festival Theatre. If not, is it intended to assist as regards a future congress?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The provision is to cover losses associated with the holding of the 26th International Congress of Apiculture held in Adelaide in October 1977. Apparently, it was not paid last financial year, and has to be reprovided this year.

Line passed.

Environment, \$6 672 000.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I wish to move to reduce this item by \$1 000 because it is so bad. Should I do it now?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I should follow the precedent set by the Chairman of Committees this afternoon and ask the honourable member to give all other honourable members the opportunity to make their contribution on this line.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am happy to do that, as long as I do not lose my chance.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I give the assurance that, that having been done, the honourable member will get the call to move his amendment.

**Mr. GUNN:** What happened to the previous Director of the Environment Department? The Committee would be aware that he was somewhat unceremoniously shoved sideways. We had him replaced by the whiz kid from the Premier's Department.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I rise on a point of order. Dr. Inglis's salary is provided for under the education line, which has already been discussed and passed, and it is not proper to discuss that expenditure under this line.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** It is reasonable to uphold that point of order. I ask the honourable member for Eyre to proceed without referring to that person.

**Mr. GUNN:** I understand that that gentleman has involved himself with the Botanic Gardens and the Museum. Is that correct?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I rise on a further point of order. The provisions for expenditure by the Museum and the Botanic Gardens were dealt with under the Minister of Education's line, which has already been discussed and passed. Nothing is provided under this line; therefore, the honourable member's remarks are again inappropriate.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I uphold that point of order. As the honourable member for Eyre will see, there is a notation on that paper.

**Mr. GUNN:** The Museum board is referred to here.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** That line has been transferred, too.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! This point cannot be pursued.

**Mr. GUNN:** Can the Minister say whether the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Division is to be increased on Eyre Peninsula? I have been told that it was the policy of the department to place another officer in the Streaky Bay area in order to give better service to landholders who adjoin the national parks by programmes of weed control and other necessary actions.

There seems to have been a drastic increase in staff in the Environment Department and many people have been seconded from the Premier's Department. One could suggest that this was only because of their political allegiance and not because of their ability. A more

practical action would be to have more field staff. As I understand that the increase in staff for Eyre Peninsula has been postponed, I should like to know what is the present situation.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I cannot say what the position is on Eyre Peninsula, but I will obtain that information. The item allows for existing staff and for an increase in field staff.

**Mr. WOTTON:** The staffing and administration of this department is of concern to me especially with respect to the Co-ordination and Policy Division. It is all very well to create 18 new positions in this division, but I believe that it is highly debatable whether suitably qualified people have been engaged to undertake the co-ordination between Government departments. Overall, it seems that their qualifications lean more towards social science and economics than to environmental expertise, when the emphasis should have been the other way.

When advertisements were placed in the press on 11 February 1978 for a senior co-ordinating officer, a senior policy officer, several positions under the essential resource group heading, and several positions for project officers, only projects officer required environmental experience. All other positions required essential tertiary qualifications in the social sciences, law and the arts. How will such people be able to advise the Minister and the Government on environmental policies and programmes and be able to foresee long-term environmental problems and other proposals that this department is asked to evaluate, if they have not had strong environmental grounding?

In a recent report in the *News*, the Minister indicated that the new division had been set up basically to advise him as Minister and to advise the Government on future policies. These people may have qualifications, but whether they have suitable qualifications is another matter.

On the opening day of this session, the Minister stated that he intended to set up more trusts. I see the initiation of a system of trusts for individual parks as having many pitfalls. In New South Wales, the Environment Department rejected this concept some years ago, and that has been the case in Victoria to a large extent. Perhaps parks visited by many people (Black Hill, for example) need close management, but such a policy would have a detrimental effect upon the more remote parks, which have been reserved to protect and maintain the fragile ecological environment. A localised system of management, which could occur with an individual trust, tends to disregard overall conservation principles.

More importantly, who would service these loans of up to \$1 000 000? Will it be the Treasury, with taxpayers' money? Who will pay off the loan? I see the effect of these trusts being placed under Ministerial control as further weakening Parliamentary control of the Executive.

Does the Minister genuinely believe that morale within the department overall, not just in the National Parks and Wildlife Division, has improved, as the Minister for the Environment would have us believe? Since the present Minister took over the portfolio, there has been a thinning out of people with practical experience who were dedicated to building up the department to its present position. Members on this side have continually referred to the low morale within the department, and we are told that it has improved, although I doubt that that is so.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I think morale has improved. Inevitably, if there is a large shake-up within a department, one or two people's noses are put out of joint. Overall the department will be significantly stronger and more effective as a consequence of what has occurred. I

think it is recognised by many people associated with the department that they will be able to get the wherewithal to do the job more effectively. Inevitably, in any reorganisation, not everyone is pleased about it.

I know of no reorganisation of any Government department, private company or political Party that ends up with that organisation becoming more effective and with everyone left happy. If one or two people have their nose out of joint, it is not to be taken as fair evidence that there has not been a significant improvement. This year's Budget is evidence of the Government support. Proportionately, the Environment Department, regarding additional appointments to the Public Service, is getting the biggest share of any department. It is getting about 25 positions from a total of 160 positions. While other departments are being reduced so that over the full year there will be a zero change in the manpower employed within the Public Service, the Environment Department, while in most other departments, especially the larger ones, numbers are decreasing, is getting a significant increase in its basic size. That will show up in a further impact on morale, as the people involved in the department will more effectively be able to do their job.

Regarding project officer qualifications, it is clear one will need specific qualifications in certain areas, but that does not mean that the department does not need one or two generalists. Much depends on the applications. I will ask the Minister to provide a detailed report, but I have little doubt that the number of applications will be large in relation to the available positions. Apart from project officers, it is specifically indicated that more general qualifications may be considered to ensure that as many applications as possible and that there is a good field to select from.

Regarding the Administration and Finance Division, to the extent that there is any expansion in that area, one is not talking about special environmental qualifications. Regarding trusts, if we had \$1 000 000 extra Loan funds granted by the Commonwealth to spend on Black Hill Reserve, the interest payment on that loan would appear in the normal Treasury line provision. Where a special trust has been set up, we still get the \$1 000 000, but we service the debt under a special line (I think it is Premier's Miscellaneous or Treasurer's Miscellaneous). We have already dealt with that.

Regarding the Budget, it is exactly the same whether the \$1 000 000 is provided in the Loan application or whether we establish a trust to borrow it. The debt servicing must be tacked on somewhere within the Government. The problem we have had is that the Commonwealth has put a big restriction on Loan moneys. It has not expanded them this year at all. In order to give ourselves some flexibility, we have used the technique of establishing a trust or statutory authority with the ability to borrow \$1 000 000 in one year outside the control of Loan Council.

However, the fact that the overall Loan money has not been increased in the way in which it normally would have been increased means that there is room in our budgetary situation to take on extra debt servicing. I have already pointed out in the debate that the percentage of debt servicing in total to the Budget expenditure in more recent years has been declining. The question one must decide is whether the development of Black Hill, for example, has sufficient priority to justify setting up a trust in order to allow it to go ahead, or to let it wait and not make an allocation for its development, because we cannot afford to make a Loan allocation for it, as the Commonwealth has not expanded our Loan allocation. Our judgment has been that it has sufficient priority for setting up a trust.

I think the Minister's position is that trusts will be set up

only in relation to the people-intensive situation. Where the prime principle is not conservation and where we are not providing the facilities of one sort or another, it would be inappropriate to set up a trust. To some extent, what happens in relation to debt servicing for a trust depends on the nature of the situation and what sort of people use we are getting. The West Beach Recreation Trust, for example, is largely self-financing, because of the activities in the area and the income the trust is able to earn.

**Mr. Becker:** You've got to be joking.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The golf course makes a profit and a positive contribution to the trust's other activities. It is a different proposition from the maintenance of a national park like Belair, although even there some income is obtained. I think the Minister will accept the general point the honourable member made about areas that are national parks for purely conservation purposes, and that no risk should be taken, whatever happens by way of administration, to allow other than fairly close management, and well supervised management under agreed principles set out by the Government, to take place.

**Mr. Wotton:** Does he intend setting up trusts for these parks?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not think so. The trust situation applies where, in order to get the park going, there must be significant developmental expenditure arising from people use. The point made by the honourable member is accepted by the Minister, I think, but I will check it.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I raise the matter of the removal of the emblem or, in effect, the identity of the National Parks and Wildlife Division. I know that the Minister has said that the service is part of the department; that is fair enough, but I believe that the service should be the shop window for the department, as it is in other States and countries. The Minister is banning the use of this attractive emblem.

**Mr. Millhouse:** What is it?

**Mr. WOTTON:** The Sturt pea, an emblem with which people have come to identify the department and which has been important from the public relations side of the department. Most people recognise the Environment Department because of its practical association with national parks and wildlife. I agree with the Minister that it has to be part of the family and people need to realise that the department is broader than just that part, but I believe it is a retrograde step that the Minister is taking in abandoning this emblem. I wonder how the Minister will arrange this and how much it will cost to remove the emblems from the side of National Parks and Wildlife Division vehicles and to supply new uniforms to officers.

Will the Minister ask the Minister for the Environment whether the Government is satisfied with the present policing of the trafficking in native birds? This matter has gone quiet lately. Are any detailed investigations being carried out into the illegal trafficking in native birds? A newspaper report last week referred to a case where, quite by accident, a load of expensive birds was detected because the car in which they were being carried caught fire and passing police who went to offer assistance discovered them. I understand from reliable sources that the birds found in that car were some of the most expensive black market birds to come from this State.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I shall be happy to obtain a report.

**Mr. NANKIVELL:** Will the Minister obtain information as to what is the position in relation to the land known as "Tiger Country" in the "out of hundreds" area of County Chandos? There was some suggestion when the Minister

announced that this land had been transferred from the Lands Department to the Environment Department that it might be called the Tiger Country Reserve but that that name was resisted or not favourably received. What is this area now known as? Has it been attached to the Mount Rescue park? Will it be proclaimed as a national park, a reserve or a conservation park?

I ask this question because there is a major problem in that area with wild dogs. People with land abutting the area are anxious to know when some decision will be made, because they hope to make representations to the Government for assistance to fence off sections of the area concerned. While this land is not vested in any authority and remains Crown land under the control of the Environment Department, I do not think that any policy applies to work in respect of the area. I would also like to know who is now responsible for the control of wild dogs, which are prevalent in that area.

Is it partly or totally the department's responsibility, or is it the responsibility of councils administering the Vertebrate Pests Act in the area? Kangaroos and emus do not do as much damage in financial terms as do packs of wild dogs, which have killed hundreds of sheep in the last year or so in the area surrounding the park. Can the Minister say when funds will be available for fencing the area, particularly the northern side, where packs of dogs do considerable damage?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member will be amazed to learn that I have to get a report.

**Mr. EVANS:** I am particularly concerned about the problem of mistletoe in conservation and recreation parks. Only last Sunday I was in the Cherry Gardens reserve, and undoubtedly we have a major problem. Trees that are between 70 years and 80 years of age are riddled with mistletoe, some being already dead, while others will be dead within five years. There is an opportunity to control mistletoe, particularly on Government-owned land; for example, Raywood centre. Initially, the task of controlling mistletoe will be difficult but, if the task is undertaken, it will later involve only a few days a year for people with the right equipment to keep it controlled. The Minister's colleague earlier gave a ridiculous reply based largely on material supplied by a person from Flinders University who had studied mistletoe. When that person saw that part of the material that the Minister made available to me, he was not thrilled, and he made available to me full details of the information he had available on mistletoe.

I have noticed in the Goyder area between Kulpara and Moonta and Wallaroo that mistletoe is taking control of the last vestiges of scrubland on the roadsides. Those areas may be difficult to control, but we should tackle the problem in our parks. There are serious infestations in gum trees. Will the Minister refer the matter to his colleague, so that something can be done, at least initially, in our more important recreation parks?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I shall do as the honourable member requests.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I notice that the provision for the Black Hill Native Flora Park is now \$149 000, which is nearly double the sum spent last year. What is the justification for this increase?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I think the reason is that additional staff for this park was recruited towards the end of last financial year, and we now get the full year's effect of that. There is no note indicating that further staff is to be recruited, but only a note stating that we are dealing with the full-year cost of the staff employed at the end of June. I suspect (and I will check with the Minister and get a report) that a large number of staff was recruited for the Black Hill Native Flora Park in the period January to June

this year. That would be one reason why the line was underspent last year by some \$17 000. The \$75 000 spent last year covered salaries for staff for only part of the year, while the provision for 1978-79 is to cover the full year.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I refer to the provision for the Coast Protection Board. Regarding members' fees, \$4 000 is provided, yet \$10 000 is provided for the Heritage Committee member's fees. I understand that the number of members of each committee is about the same. Why is more than double allowed for the Heritage Committee?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will check this matter. Fees for various committees and boards that have not been adjusted for some time were adjusted from the beginning of this financial year. Broadly speaking, Executive Council determines fees on Public Service Board recommendations.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I refer to the provision for the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Committee—members' fees \$4 000. I understand that this committee was recently disbanded and would be replaced by a much smaller body. Nevertheless, the line has increased to \$4 000. What is the situation regarding this committee?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will check that matter.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** I assume that, under the National Parks and Wildlife Division, "improvements in general expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance" refers to vermin control and general management.

I refer to a question asked of the Minister for the Environment by the member for Murray relating to the feral goat problem in South Australia, particularly in national parks. In reply, the Minister said that at a rough estimate there would be 150 000 feral goats in South Australia. The Minister has considered the possible use of the Army in exterminating these goats.

About a year ago an eradication programme was carried out by departmental officers. Thousands of goats were destroyed and left to rot. There was a public outcry at that time because, even though they are feral goats, they are a resource, and there is considerable value in the carcass and the skin. An article in the *Advertiser* of 28 June 1978 states:

Sides of wild goat have been selling like hot cakes at the Central Market. The price is 99c a kilogram compared with lamb at \$1.55 a kilogram. The State Manager of Metro Meat, Mr. E. J. Arthur, said yesterday his firm had an established export market for goat meat to the Middle East, Singapore and Jamiaca. "We thought we should try a pilot run at the Central Market," Mr. Arthur said. "About 75 per cent of the buyers who rushed the sides of goat were Greeks. The rest were Australians who were curious or who had tasted goat before. It was a sell-out and we are hoping to have another consignment in the market this Friday and Saturday." The goats had been rounded up around Andamooka and the Broken Hill district.

With a feral goat population of something like 150 000, surely the Government could give further consideration to making better use of this resource rather than just destroying it and leaving it to rot. There are probably individuals in the community who would be prepared to round up these goats. I recognise it is a difficult job, particularly in the Flinders Ranges, but there are some people looking for work where they can put their time and effort into this privately, probably under the supervision of the wildlife officer in charge of that area. The Government is faced with an eradication cost of about \$1 000 000, whereas plenty of people in South Australia would willingly take the opportunity of trying to derive a livelihood from rounding up these goats at no expense to the Government, putting them through the abattoirs, and creating additional work. I believe it is a crime that any

resource should be destroyed and left to rot in the sun.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will make sure the honourable member's remarks are drawn to the attention of the Minister, who I am sure will be interested in any possibility of solving the problem at zero or a relatively small cost to the Government.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Further to the Minister's comments, I point out that a number of persons have contacted me since reading the article in the *Advertiser*, wanting to know whether there would be any opportunity of engaging in this type of work.

**Mr. WOTTON:** Regarding the item "Director of National Parks and Wildlife, scientific, administrative, technical, clerical and general staff", would the Minister provide me with a breakdown of the salaries of these officers? I would like to ascertain how much money is being paid to those who are involved with management of the parks.

Rangers in the National Parks and Wildlife Division do an extremely important job, and their salaries should be commensurate with those of other staff. I do not believe that is happening at present, and I should like an up-to-date breakdown of the figures.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will see whether the information can be provided to the honourable member.

**Mr. WOTTON:** The sum proposed for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries is to be increased by almost \$100 000. Will the Minister supply a breakdown of this fairly substantial increase?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It arises largely because there now has to be expenses, including provision for accommodation and related expenses that previously were provided by the Public Buildings Department when the Environment Department shared accommodation in the G.R.E. building of the State Planning Office. Now, the division is paid for separately. There is provision for the extension of administrative services, including the development and implementation of a financial information system.

**Mr. WOTTON:** Will the Minister provide a report of what officers are likely to be going overseas and the reasons for their trips?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will see what can be obtained at this stage.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** If all members have made their contributions, I propose to call on the member for Mitcham, who proposes to reduce the vote of \$6 672 000.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** The sum proposed for Coast Protection Board members' fees has almost doubled; \$4 000 is proposed this year as against actual payments last year of \$2 734. The board comprises six members, not three, as suggested by the Minister: Stuart Hart; Mr. Correll, from the Tourist Bureau; Bronte Edwards, from local government; Roy Culver, a well-known professor; Mr. Morgan; and a nomination from Marine and Harbors, Mr. Kinnane. Mr. Speechley was deputising for Mr. Hart during his absence. Does the Government intend to further extend the board? If not, what is the reason for the increased expenditure?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not know of any plan to extend the membership of the Coast Protection Board. It could be done only by an amending Bill, and I know of no amending Bill on the matter. The fees were adjusted as from 1 July. Whether the \$4 000 is the appropriate figure for these new fees, or whether it includes any carry-over expenditure for delays incurred during the previous year, I do not know. I will check it.

**Mr. WOTTON:** In the report in the *News* last week to which I referred earlier the Minister is reported to have said that much more emphasis was to be placed on the

actual management of parks. It is imperative that the Government should expedite management plans, which have been extremely slow in appearing. Will the Minister ask his colleague how he intends to improve the situation regarding the introduction of management plans?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will get a report on that.

**Mr. WOTTON:** The sum allocated for the purchase of motor vehicles has doubled from about \$140 000 to about \$288 000. Many extra staff could be employed with that extra \$140 000, including more rangers. Where are these new cars being purchased, and what is the reason for their purchase?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The provision is for the replacement of field staff four-wheel-drive vehicles and others now due for changeover; additional vehicles that will be required because new positions have been created in the National Parks and Wildlife Division; and also additional vehicles for new services; for example, Dingley Dell. A large part of the change is associated with new positions that are being created, and that means another vehicle in most cases.

**Mr. WOTTON:** In the same report to which I referred the Minister made great play about "a huge slab of Crown land near Pinnaroo" for which the Government was responsible to make into a national park. As this land was put aside in November 1977, why has this area not yet been dedicated or named?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I will see that the report for the member for Mallee also goes to the member for Murray.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I move:

To reduce the vote, "Environment, \$6 672 000" by \$1 000. This is a vote of no confidence in the Government, which I believe thoroughly deserves it for its overall handling of the environment. While I have been grateful for the comparative brevity of members of the Liberal Party on this matter, I have been surprised at the nit-picking way in which they have gone about such a serious matter.

**Mr. Wotton:** We have achieved most of what we have learned through questions—you obviously have not been noticing the questions that we have been asking.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The honourable member is a little bit sensitive about this. I remember last year that, before he had the chance to ask many questions, he let the line go through without asking any at all. I refer to three areas in which the Government has been lacking. The first is the extraordinary changes of personnel that have gone on, from Ministers downwards. The second is what I believe have been grave irregularities (and I use that word as a euphemism, because I think there has been downright dishonesty) regarding bird trapping and confiscation of reptiles, and I have raised that matter here previously. The third is the quite scandalous way that the Government has promised legislation with respect to environmental impact statements and for off-roads vehicles.

Not a thing has happened, except that the Minister has said that it is too hard and that he will think about them again. I am glad that at least one of the former Ministers who has now retired from the Ministry is in the Chamber, because what has happened and the implication of many things that have been said this evening are poor compliments to him and his successor, the present Chief Secretary, in the handling of their jobs. I think the member for Henley Beach was the first Minister for the Environment.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Probably the best one, too.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not know about that. The department was set up with a beating of drums and claims of how this State was going to take the lead. Nothing has happened since then, except many words, and much



confusion and muddle. What has happened during the past year? First, immediately after the 1977 election, a change of Ministers took place. The present Chief Secretary was moved from his job as Minister for the Environment, and the Premier (and this was a poor compliment to that Minister) announced that the portfolio would be upgraded, taken away from Simmons and given to Corcoran.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must resume his seat. He should refer to the honourable members by their correct titles, and I hope that he will refer to the honourable Premier or the honourable Chief Secretary.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was about to correct myself. The job was taken away from the present honourable Chief Secretary and given to the honourable Minister of Works, Minister of Marine, and whatever else he is. This was called an upgrading. Then, within a week, the Permanent Head of the department (Dr. Inglis) was given the chop, and given a sinecure as Director of the Museum and Botanical Gardens. This meant nothing, and there was no problem about it. A few questions were asked about the matter.

**Mr. Wotton:** Do you think he was sacked?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** There was no doubt he was sacked. He had not a high reputation for administrative skills, and never had had. On 29 November 1977, in a Question on Notice, I asked the following:

Why was Dr. W. G. Inglis transferred from his position as Director of the Environment Department?

The Minister replied:

The logic behind this move was that the work of these two divisions was primarily scientific in nature but with a large educational component in so far as services provided by these two divisions—

that is the Botanical Gardens and Museum—

extend to advice to the public at large and to education to very many schoolchildren.

Not a word has been heard of him since. So far as I know, he is drawing a salary, but not taking any significant part in the workings of Government. I also asked the following:

Why was the Hon. Donald William Simmons removed from his position as Minister for the Environment?

The Premier replied, as follows:

The honourable member will be aware that a Premier has a perfect right to allocate portfolios within the Ministry as he sees fit.

The reason why he was sacked was that he was no good at the job.

*Mr. Max Brown interjecting:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Let any honourable member deny that. It is patently obvious, from every indication one has, that it is foolish to try to deny it.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You wouldn't have made these personnel changes?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I would not have made the appointments in the first place. We then had the most staggering number of resignations from the department and I asked some questions about that. I was first put off when I asked the following:

How many persons holding positions in the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Environment Department have resigned in the past 12 months and—

The answer was as follows:

In terms of the Environment Department's definition of senior officers, nil.

I had to try again and we found that that was not quite so, that 12 or more senior officers had gone and that (and I received this information on 28 February) more new positions had been created in the department at an annual

cost of \$400 000 for salaries. Then there was the question of Mr. Eves, who first resigned, then had not resigned, and then disappeared (page 2376 of *Hansard*). Mr. Eves disappeared, and there was much confusion about that. That was on 21 March this year. This is the first chance I have had to debate this matter and I have been waiting to ask questions about it ever since.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Stop dissimulating, tell the truth, you dreamed it up yesterday.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Minister may regret that I will show I did not dream it up yesterday. I asked a number of questions about Mr. Eves and all I got from the Minister was abuse. I received no support from members of the Liberal Party when, on the last day of the session, 21 March, I wanted to move an urgency motion asking for a full statement about the unrest, and so on, in the department arising out of Mr. Eves' resignation, other resignations, the moving of others, and the appointment of Mr. Dempsey (who is bitterly unpopular, I understand, with his staff and certainly with outsiders) and the new permanent head of the department.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He was a bit pompous, was he.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not know what he was, but he is certainly not well regarded by many people as the Permanent Head of the department. I wanted to go into this matter in the House, but the Liberals would not have it at the time, so I have had to wait until now. Since then there has been the resignation—transfer—kicking sideways, whichever way you like to put it, of Mr. Lyons the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Division. That happened only a couple of months ago. It is referred to on page 314 of *Hansard*. One of the ironies of that occurred when the member for Murray asked a question about Mr. Lyons on 3 August as to what had happened to him. In the course of a fairly loud answer (as we are used to from the Minister), which was mainly sound and fury without much substance, he denied that Mr. Lyons was being pushed out, and he said:

If he was being railroaded out of the department, he would have been gone today.

I could not help thinking, when I heard the Minister say that about Lyons, that that was exactly what happened to Inglis. He went in a day, yet there had been denials a few months earlier that Inglis had been pushed out. Dicken he wasn't railroaded out! That is the situation that has existed in South Australia regarding changes in personnel in that department.

Dr. Inglis had been the Permanent Head of the department, and no-one can tell me that these things happened simply, as the Minister tried to say, as a result of a sort of rearrangement to make the place more efficient. There was something very seriously wrong with the department, and it must have happened under the first Minister for the Environment, the member for Henley Beach, and it must have got worse under the second Minister, now the Chief Secretary, for such drastic action to have been taken. What I object to is not trying to clean up a mess that others have left but that the Government has consistently refused to give any information as to what was going on, why these things had happened, and so on. That is quite reprehensible. We are entitled to know what goes on, and that is one of the reasons why I am moving this motion now. In my time I have had a number of clashes with Ministers of all persuasions about various things, and I must say that I had a very unpleasant clash with the present Minister arising particularly out of my questions about Mr. Eves and also the question of the seizure of Darryl Levi's reptiles.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You blamed the Minister for the Environment for your being suspended.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is right. The present Minister was in it, too. The two Ministers took me aside in December outside and complained that I had reflected, they said, on the present Chief Secretary, who had lost his job. They said it was unfair; I should not have said that. It looked as though I thought he was being dishonest. I made a personal explanation.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It was a very ungracious personal explanation.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I thought it was a good one and that it cleared up the matter. A couple of weeks later, the Chief Secretary himself made some sort of a Ministerial statement about the matter. That was only the beginning of the clash I had with the Minister, and I propose to read an exchange of letters I had with the Minister following the question I asked about Mr. Eves. Even before Christmas I had asked to discuss with the Minister the question of Darryl Levi and his reptiles, but I had not got an appointment. So, on 28 March I wrote the following letter to the Minister:

I write to you for two reasons. First, it has been reported to me that in the bar during last Wednesday evening you were boasting of having "dressed me down" when speaking to me as I walked past you in the House after dinner on Tuesday, for having mentioned the name of B. M. Eves in a question to you earlier in the day. If you regarded what you said to me in a somewhat ill-mannered way as "dressing me down" I must disabuse you of that. I do not regret my question nor the explanation of it. I remind you that I wrote to you on 19 December, having seen Mr. Darryl Levi.

You undertook in your reply of 22 December to discuss the matter with me. At least from the end of January I have been looking for an opportunity for the discussion. I waited until almost literally the end of the session before raising the matter in the House. Had you done me the courtesy of discussing the matter with me, as you undertook nearly three months ago, I would not have asked the question nor given the explanation which I did. Therefore, any embarrassment, etc., to Mr. Eves is your responsibility. Secondly, I write to ask whether you are now prepared to have the discussion with me concerning Mr. Darryl Levi.

I received the following reply, dated 3 April, from the Minister:

I refer to your letter of 28 March 1978 regarding inquiries you have made about Mr. D. Levi, and your question without notice in the House regarding Mr. B. M. Eves. First, I want to make the point that, irrespective of your views on the matter, my intention was to "dress you down". It is regrettable to me that a Parliamentarian with your experience and knowledge of procedures in the House should see fit to bring forward the name of a public servant in such a way, knowing that whatever is said about that public servant is then a matter of public record, and with the knowledge that the public servant would not have the right of reply.

I note with some dismay from your letter that, even at this stage, you do not regret your question without notice in the House, nor the explanation of it.

I certainly did not and I do not. The letter continues:

As you are aware you wrote to me on 19 December regarding correspondence which Mr. D. Levi had addressed to both me and my predecessor. I replied to you on 22 December saying that I would be pleased to discuss this matter. In the New Year you telephoned my office and informed a member of my staff that you would be seeking an appointment with me at a future date. You say in your letter that you have been looking for an opportunity for the discussion. Since that telephone call you have not, to my knowledge, sought an appointment, despite my offer to discuss the matter with you.

I fail to understand how you could make such a claim since

at no stage have you approached either my staff or myself personally to make an appointment for such a discussion, and despite the fact that there are many occasions while the House is sitting for you to make an approach to me. Therefore, I do not accept your claim that you had to wait until the end of the session before raising the matter with me.

It is of considerable concern to me personally that, when a Minister makes an offer to discuss a matter with a member, that member should raise the matter in a question without notice without seeking an appointment with the Minister. That the question without notice names, under privilege, a public servant is of greater concern to me.

Under the circumstances, the raising of the question is clearly your own responsibility and cannot be attributed to anyone else. I now consider that, since you have already raised the matter in the House and since it is still under investigation, rather than the two of us having a discussion, you should submit any evidence you may have to the Investigating Officer concerned, Mr. F. H. Brohier, Crown Law Department.

I answered that much more briefly on 7 April, as follows:

What you say in your letter of 3 April is, of course, quite incorrect. You overlook my letter to you early in the New Year, in which I explained that I would not be able to make an appointment until the beginning of February. I did not get in touch then as it was so close to the resumption of Parliament, but you must have also forgotten that as soon as the House did meet again I spoke to you asking when it would be convenient to make a time for the discussion. You then explained, at some length, that you preferred to wait until you had received the Crown Law investigator's report. I remember that well because you went on to say how hard you had been trying to get the man to finish it and had even suggested that he stay home for the rest of the week to do so! You were to tell me when you had the report and were ready to talk to me. You never did, but you did refer in the House to my request when answering a question from another member.

That was the member for Murray. My letter continues:

What I do find quite distasteful is your conduct in the bar on the last night of the sittings—and your lack of reference to it in your letter to me confirms the accuracy of the report I had been given of that conduct.

That is the end of that correspondence. I regarded that as an example of poor conduct on the Minister's part. He refused to give information and it was typical of the way in which he has tried to cover up what is obviously a very unsatisfactory situation in the department, and one that Parliament was entitled to know about. We have never known about it.

Let me leave that general situation of unrest, dismissals, sackings, replacements, and so on, and come to more specific things: first, bird trapping. This, to me, is of very great importance. Mr. John Cox, who was a temporary officer in the department as far back as August 1977 raised the matter because he was doing some investigations for the department, making a study of parrots. He made a report (of which I have a copy here) to the Minister.

It was months and months before any action was taken on it. Then there was the Crown Law investigation of the matter. The birds involved, I understand, were of considerable value.

The conduct of the five officers concerned, who were eventually dealt with, was quite unsatisfactory. They were merely reprimanded and transferred to other departments. The investigation report has never been made public. There has been an attempt to conceal the whole thing from start to finish. Bird trapping and trafficking overseas has been going on for years; there is quite a big trade in it. At least one South Australian man has been

before the District Criminal Court and sent to goal for such offences, yet officers of the department were engaged in this for their private gain, apparently. All that happened to them was that they were reprimanded and transferred. This is not good enough. The Minister should make the report available, or at least there should be a full report to Parliament.

I regret that the Minister responsible is not here tonight. There has been no explanation, and I presume he is sick but, whether he is sick or not, it would be preferable to put off his line until he is here.

The other matter involves reptiles. Darryl Levi is a herpetologist; he is a collector of reptiles and was co-operating with the department, at its invitation, to catch people who were involved in illegal trapping. All that happened to him was that his own reptiles were seized and confiscated. It took about seven months until a decision about what was to happen to those reptiles was made. The present Minister eventually decided last December that these reptiles should be confiscated. He justified the tremendous delay in making a decision by saying that close consideration was being given to this matter by the department. This matter was most reprehensible; it demonstrated practices in the department over a considerable period, and apparently very little effective action is being taken once illegal practices are discovered. When this department was first set up in 1973, we were told that there would be environmental impact statements whenever necessary, as well as legislation introduced to control vehicles that are doing a tremendous amount of damage in many parts of the State, yet no such measure has been introduced.

To me, it means that, after five years and repeated promises, if we have not got the legislation, and I do not believe we will get it in this session, the department and the Government have failed absolutely on matters of considerable concern to the public and of considerable significance to the State. We have never had any explanation of why we have not had them. The only explanation I can think of is sheer and utter incompetence on the part of those responsible for policy, if not for the drafting of the detailed provisions.

In my view, these three matters—and there may well be others—thoroughly justify a vote of no confidence in the Government and the way in which it has handled matters of environment and conservation in this State. It is a comparatively new concern of people all over the world, and certainly in South Australia. It is rapidly becoming of paramount concern to the community, and all we have had from the Government are talk, muddle and a waste of money.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not really know that it is worth replying to the member for Mitcham on this motion. I do not think I have ever heard the honourable, learned and gallant gentleman to less effect.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why don't you stick to the subject instead of going on with that nonsense?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The bird-like interjection! The trouble in this State is that there is one bird around that has not been trapped often enough. He should be trapped and exported: little Robin Red Breast.

*Mr. Whitten interjecting:*

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The member for Price thinks the member for Mitcham should be plucked, if he were a bird to be exported. We were entertained, or bored to sobs, with an out-of-date recital of events and a weary reading of correspondence, all arising from the absolute nit-picking nonsense the honourable member goes on with. He has to justify the previous stances he takes. He was going to raise a certain matter on the last day of the

previous session, 21 March, and he has not had an opportunity until today to do something about it. That is what he said about one matter. That is hogwash, and he knows it. He has had other opportunities, and he has done nothing about it. He just wants to have a go at the Deputy Premier, because he has a snout on the Deputy Premier at the moment.

His recital of changes in personnel was quite extraordinary. I am not sure whether he is expressing no confidence in the present Minister, the previous Minister, or the one before that. I could not make out whether he was trying to say Dr. Inglis should still be the Director of Environment and should not have been shifted, or that he should have been shifted more quickly or a year earlier. Apparently, he is not happy in some way. I could not work out the honourable member on that, and it was much the same with the position in relation to Mr. Lyons. I think he just wanted to have a grizzle and a gripe.

I am not familiar with the bird-trapping matters that he raised or with the reptile case. Where there are situations where charges have had to be brought against public servants, they have been so brought. There are plenty of situations where not everything can be proved, where there is not sufficient evidence to stand up in court. I have little doubt that, when the honourable member was Attorney-General, there were situations where he, as Attorney-General, on the recommendation of Crown Law officers, decided that a prosecution could not proceed because the necessary evidence was not available. One would prosecute in such circumstances, where one did not have the evidence, only where, for some reason or other, one wanted to be vindictive and to get at the person involved.

I recall that, as Minister of Education, there were about three cases a year involving accusations against teachers, in some of which nothing could be proved. In such circumstances it was not possible legally to take disciplinary action. Where something could be proven, disciplinary action was taken.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why were they reprimanded?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I imagine that it was possible to demonstrate certain things that were sufficient for a reprimand but not others that would require more serious action. I assume that the investigation was undertaken by the Public Service Board, which is careful and assiduous in relation to disciplinary matters.

Regarding the last point raised by the honourable member, there is not much point in going into it in detail. Concerning environmental impact legislation, where there has been any major State Government projects, E.I.S. procedure has been adopted. As it is a complicated procedure, it is important in relation to Government projects that we should not be too bureaucratic about it. For example, it would not be appropriate to have an E.I.S. every time we built a school. For Government projects, one problem in legislation is to define the circumstances in which an E.I.S. should be adopted. The second problem concerns whether the E.I.S. is a separate decision after the planning decision to proceed has been taken, or whether it is part of the input in the planning decision. How do we work the environmental assessment procedure so that it is at its most effective? That problem has to be sorted out.

The third problem is that of extra staff and cost. The department would have to have significant additional staff if it were to take on detailed environmental impact statement legislation, both with respect to the public sector and the private sector. Finally, for the private sector, where E.I.S. procedures are often necessary, there is also the question of imposing additional costs on development proposals, especially in circumstances in

which we are not getting as much development as we might like.

The question of effective environmental impact legislation to which the Government is committed is a complicated and difficult question. It involves cost and, in relation to E.I.S.'s imposed on private developmental proposals, it involves a cost to private development as well. It is by no means a straightforward matter.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You didn't support it when I introduced it.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** At times I can be fond of the honourable member, but he must be joking. The whole matter is one of considerable difficulty, and it is important that we get it right. I think that every honourable member would agree on that point.

**Mr. Millhouse:** How long will it take?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I cannot answer that. The honourable member will have to ask the Minister for the Environment. There are considerable drafting difficulties and difficulties with respect to administration and cost problems, both within the Government and as regards the private sector. The honourable member's motion was petty and unnecessary. It demonstrated his characteristics at their worst, not at their best. I hope that the next time he gets stuck into us it will be a better performance, but I ask the Committee to reject his motion.

**Mr. GUNN:** The Minister has failed completely to answer any of the charges levelled at the Government, particularly at the Ministers who have been responsible for this department. The department was hailed with a fanfare of trumpets, and great things were to take place in relation to the protection of the environment. We were told by the Premier that we would have something which would be the best in Australia and which would lead the way, but there has been one disaster after another. If there has been one department that has failed to carry out its responsibilities in even a reasonable manner it has been the Environment Department. First, the personnel appointed were totally unsatisfactory. Officers appointed to the National Parks and Wildlife Division had no knowledge of land management, and the management of our national parks is important. Having no understanding in co-operating with adjoining landholders, the department alienated the rural industry. There have been personnel changes but, unfortunately, they have been replaced with the whiz kids from the Premier's Department who had even less knowledge than did their predecessors. Dr. Inglis was dumped. Mr. Lyons, I understand, has had to take a crash course in forestry, in New South Wales. Although the department is to acquire more land, it cannot manage what it already owns. It should not acquire more land until it gets rid of the hobos in the department, and sends its officers into the field to ascertain what is taking place.

There was a lack of administration. Many of the field officers are doing an excellent job and are conscientious officers. They have not received the support of the Government or of senior officers. It is not good enough for the Minister to try to treat this matter as a joke. I have had case after case brought to my attention by local government and private individuals who are concerned about the operations of this department. Some of the advice Mr. Lyons tendered to local government bodies in my area was laughable. To appoint this person to advise the Forestry Department is beyond comprehension. Obviously, he has no experience in that field.

All the Government has done is maintain Mr. Lyons in a highly-paid position. It is unfortunate that the taxpayers of this State should be taken for such a ride. If these officers were inefficient and could not carry out their duties, why did the Minister not have the courage to tell people what

was wrong with the department? I believe it is quite wrong and improper to continue to compound the problem, because the situation has not been rectified. All that has been done is an attempt to sweep the matter under the carpet. It is a sorry state of affairs and certainly not in the interests of the people of the State. I will not be satisfied about the administration of this department until the Government comes clean.

There ought to be a full-scale public inquiry into the dismissals and transfers in this department. The department will not operate successfully until this suggestion has been put into effect. I am concerned that the Government is now talking about acquiring large tracts of land in the Flinders Range, when it cannot manage the land it has. Obviously, hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money will be involved.

The Minister talks about making reports available; my office has been trying to get a copy of that report for the past couple of days, but it has not arrived. On every occasion honourable members read about a Government report in the press, it is difficult to get a copy of that report; one has to keep ringing and ringing the department. The press can get a copy of reports or a doctored version can be given so that it hits the headlines, but members of this House representing the areas involved should be given a copy as top priority.

This is the sort of discourtesy members are facing, and I am perturbed that the Government is going to continue on its merry way, acquire more land by kicking some private individuals off their land (and in most cases not giving them the compensation they require or the sort of money they would get if the land were auctioned), and rudely threatening them.

When the Hon. G. R. Broomhill was Minister, he was at least reasonable on the one occasion I dealt with him. The Chief Secretary was a complete ponderer and would not make decisions. He was under the complete control of officers of his department, because he did not understand what he was about. I hope action is taken to put the department right before any more land is acquired. Much of the land the department has is unsuitable, but there are areas of the State that should be acquired for national parks. The whole matter should be aired publicly. I support the motion.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I am pleased that the member for Mitcham has come out in support of what we have successfully been doing over the past 12 months. He made the point that he requested that we should move an urgency motion about this matter. I remind him that the Liberal Party saw the matter as sufficiently serious to move a vote of no confidence in the Minister. Most of the matters that the honourable member has raised were raised in the no-confidence motion. On that particular occasion, I stated

My first point is the Minister's continual refusal to listen to the problems of his officers and staff, resulting in unrest and frustration as a result of the lack of job opportunities following the Ministerial appointment of the new permanent head of the department over well-qualified South Australian public servants.

My second point relates to the witch-hunt involving innocent individuals within his department which is taking place in an attempt to bury the mismanagement and unrest within the department and which resulted in the gagging and intimidating of officers and staff of his department. My third point is the Minister's refusal to accept any responsibility with regard to the problems associated with his department. So, the member for Mitcham really has introduced no new material this evening but, on the basis of consistency, the Opposition will support his motion. We are certainly not

satisfied with the Minister's handling of his department. Our main attack needs to be on the present Minister, on previous Ministers, and on policies. I have asked about 120 questions concerning this department, and many of the replies have explained the department's problems. Earlier this evening I referred to a press release setting out the so-called success of the Minister in handling the department during his first 12 months in charge of it. I doubt very much that this Government, with the present Minister in control or any of the previous Ministers in control, has "set a strong foundation for the future" in regard to the environment; that is my primary concern. I am not particularly concerned about personalities, but I am concerned about conservation and the environment.

The National Parks and Wildlife Division worries me particularly. Morale in the department has been very low for some time, particularly after the ruthless thinning out of experienced people that has occurred since the present Minister took over. Those who remain cannot hope to carry out all the duties. I refer now to the present Minister's statement on 8 March that his department lacked proper policies, proper objectives, and proper aims. He said that the department was going through a minor reorganisation. His remarks implied a lack of complete confidence in the departmental officers, but I point out that they have been working hard for the good of the environment. The Minister of Mines and Energy and the member for Mitcham referred to the legislation dealing with the environmental impact statements and also to the legislation affecting off-road vehicles.

The long-awaited E.I.S. legislation is still not available. We are not certain how far the department has reached in its preparation. It may be ready to present, but the Minister may not want to present it. It has been promised many times, since the member for Henley Beach was the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and in a statement on Redcliff on 31 October 1973 the Minister referred to the environmental impact procedures for which the Government intended to legislate later in the session. Legislation aimed at controlling the use of road vehicles has been talked about for many years, but so far nothing has emerged. It is not listed for this session.

The Minister said, in answer to my question resulting from Harry Butler's remarks on desertification in South Australia (when opening the national conference, Focus on our Southern Heritage, on 16 September 1978), that he was in no hurry to introduce that legislation relating to off-road vehicles and things of that nature. Previously a statement had been made that the Government was studying specific areas for the use of these potentially environmentally damaging vehicles, and a decision was promised in May 1978. While the Government prevaricates, much damage is being done to South Australia's most fragile ecological areas.

I express my concern about the closed-shop attitude of the Minister for the Environment. We hear so much from this Government and the Premier about the need for open government, but the Environment Department is a perfect example of the Government's being scared to have any member of the Opposition inquire into what is actually happening in the department. I do not know whether I am particularly cynical, but I become very suspicious when that situation arises. When I make inquiries of any member of the department, I am asked to make my investigations through the Minister. This is the only Government department where that happens. I have enjoyed the opportunity of being able to discuss matters relating to my electorate, for example, with other departments, but that is virtually impossible with the Environment Department.

We are all aware of the witch-hunt that the Minister has carried out in that department, because of the accusations made against me and a member from the other Chamber. Apparently, the Minister suspected that we were seeking information about the Environment Department. I asked the Minister to provide proof. Since then we have heard absolutely nothing. I was particularly concerned then, as I am now, that the Minister should involve innocent individuals within his own department in an attempt to get back at the Opposition's success in this regard. I have mentioned time and again that the Dunstan Government set up the Environment Department, not because it felt it was needed but because it saw it as being trendy.

The department has been used by the Government purely as a rubber stamp to back up some Government policies. It is a very serious situation. This is not what an Environment Department should be set up for, and members of the Opposition are concerned about the future environment and conservation in this State. The Environment Department has a real purpose. Because we have no confidence in the way the Minister is handling his department, we support this motion.

[Midnight]

**Mr. TONKIN:** I want to speak about a totally unwarranted attack on the member for Murray. On 15 March he did a particularly fine job in bringing the difficulties of the Environment Department, particularly the National Parks and Wildlife Division, to the attention of this House in a motion of no confidence. The member for Murray at that stage covered most of the ground which has been covered again by the honourable member for Mitcham. I am very surprised that the member for Mitcham regards the material as being so fresh and new that it is worth bringing up again tonight as, virtually, a motion of no confidence.

If there had been no previous no-confidence motion, I would have agreed that this action was absolutely essential tonight, but since there has been such a motion and since the member for Murray conducted that motion extremely well and covered all the ground, I find this present exercise something of an anticlimax. I know the member for Mitcham was here during the no-confidence debate because he interjected several times, and it is in *Ha rsard*, but exactly when he was here I do not know.

On 16 March I understand that the member for Mitcham was marked off, too, and on that day the National Parks and Wildlife Act Amendment Bill was before the Chamber, and the honourable member for Murray spoke to it most effectively. It would have been open to the member for Mitcham on that day to speak on that Bill.

**Mr. Becker:** He might not have been here.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That is possible. The matter has been ventilated thoroughly indeed. I certainly would not oppose the motion, because I could not condone the gross mismanagement of the department which has been brought up so thoroughly in the past and which has been repeated again tonight.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am obliged for the support I have had, especially for the forthright statement of support from the member for Eyre. It has got more and more lukewarm as other members of the Liberal Party have spoken but I appreciate what the member for Eyre said. The Minister merely used some debating techniques to say nothing as effectively as he could and it was notable that, while he went into a long explanation as to why we have not got the E.I.S. legislation, he said not one word about why we have not had the off-road vehicles legislation. In

the meantime, places like the Coorong are being mucked up, and even the sandhills at Moana cannot be preserved. I took this matter up with the member for Henley Beach many years ago, when he was Minister, but nothing effective has ever been done.

That is one small example from my own knowledge. They have not been able to do even that. If anything were needed to show the ineffectiveness of the Government policies on this matter, it is such an example as the one I have just given.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Dean Brown, and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran, Dunstan, and Simmons.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Line passed.

Minister for the Environment, Miscellaneous, \$67 000.

**Mr. WOTTON:** The sum of \$67 000 is allocated to "various organisations and programmes". As the Government is obviously being lazy in this regard, will the Minister name the various organisations and programmes, and provide a complete breakdown of the money they receive as part of the \$67 000?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The grants are to the Australian Conservation Foundation, the Australian Environment Council Fund, the Field Naturalists Society, the Natural History Society, payment for the rewards for information in respect of environment offences, and tree-planting support programmes. As I have no detailed breakdown of how much is allocated to each organisation, I will get that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 12.13 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 October at 2 p.m.