

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 31 October 1979

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

## QUESTION

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## COASTGUARD

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (18 October):

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** In July of this year, licence fees for ship station marine radios were increased from \$25 to \$37 per annum by the Commonwealth Postal and Telecommunications Department to meet the increased costs of inspections and servicing. Where a radio station is maintained only for the specific purpose of safety of life, a concessional licence fee may be granted by the Minister for Post and Telecommunications. If the Coastguard has not done so, it should apply to the Postal and Telecommunications Department for consideration of such a concession. However, it is the Department of Marine and Harbors' understanding that marine radios carried in vessels attached to the volunteer coastguard in South Australia have two frequencies, one being specifically for safety of life but the second is a club frequency and may be used for purposes other than for safety of life.

## PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 365 residents of South Australia all praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs. Chapman, Wright, and Becker. Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 105 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by Messrs. P. B. Arnold and Plunkett. Petitions received.

## QUESTION TIME

## PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Premier clear up the confusion surrounding the transfer of public servants from those areas in which he has Ministerial responsibility and advise how long the Government will maintain its ban on the employment of these and other permanent public servants in the so-called "core" departments? I have been forced to return to this question, first, because of the extravagant and ill-considered statements made by the Premier in today's *Advertiser* and, secondly, because there appears to

be some discrepancy between the Premier's answers in this House and those in another place by the Minister who assists him in his Ethnic Affairs portfolio. On Thursday 25 October, the Premier told this House that transfers from the Ethnic Affairs Branch were "handled entirely by the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs".

However, this Minister, speaking in another place on the same day, was not so certain. He told the Hon. C. J. Sumner:

General discussion took place between several Ministers, and my recollection is that the Premier might have been present.

He also confirmed that the Premier approved of his actions, and later told the Hon. J. R. Cornwall that most discussion concerning the transfers was conducted in Cabinet.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader has spent about two weeks trying to suggest that there is a gross lack of morale in the Public Service. He has claimed that about 100 public servants have been moved out of their positions and between various departments following the Liberal Government's accession to office.

**Mr. Bannon:** Just answer the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is time that the Leader stopped this propaganda. It is time that the Leader realised that certainly there have been changes, and the nature of those changes has been detailed. There have been fewer than 40 officers relocated, as far as I know. If the Leader knows of more officers who have been relocated, I would like to know where they are and who they are. As far as I am concerned, the moves have been made in the interests of efficiency and a different style of Government—and that is the incoming Government's right.

To use those changes as some sort of example of a gross lack of morale (I think he called it) in the Public Service is irresponsible and totally disgraceful. We are fortunate, indeed, in South Australia in having a fine Public Service with a fine professional record; a Public Service of which we can be very proud. The morale of these people, as far as I can understand and ascertain from many inquiries, is as high as it has ever been. Indeed, there are many officers there now who say that they are in better spirits than they have been for a long time. So, for the Leader to suggest that there is a generalised malaise in the Public Service is absolutely disgraceful.

**Mr. Bannon:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am answering the question, and if the Leader does not like it he can lump it. This is the situation, and I hope, in the interests of South Australia and of the morale of our excellent Public Service, that the Leader does not go on making such extravagant and inaccurate claims in future. So far as I can tell, the only reason the Leader has had for doing this is that he is trying to take the heat off the considerable amount of embarrassment that has come to the Labor Party as a result of revelations in this House yesterday about the previous Government. So far as continuing the ban (as the Leader says), there is no ban. What a ridiculous thing to say! I can think of one example in connection with Mr. Maguire. It was suggested, according to the Public Service Board, that he might care to move because he would not like to be involved in sensitive issues where he could be compromised in some way if information were leaked out. I am not suggesting that Mr. Maguire would do any such thing but, if information were in some way to leak out of that department and Mr. Maguire were there, he might be embarrassed by that situation. There are other similar situations, but to say there is a ban and a widespread lack of morale in the Public Service is absolutely ridiculous.

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Minister of Health say what plans the Government has to make more off-street car parking available in the vicinity of Flinders Medical Centre? I have received a lot of complaints and submissions from people in that area who have pointed out, first, that the residents of the area are having their quality of life affected by cars parked in the streets, thereby causing congestion in the neighbouring Bedford Park area; also, that people visiting the hospital to see sick friends have great difficulty in finding car parking spaces. Further, the space for staff car parking is limited. The area has only a limited public transport service. A small group of shop owners near the centre have had their trade considerably restricted because there is not sufficient car parking in the area for those persons who visit or work in the Flinders Medical Centre. The saga has been going on for many years now, and the people are tired of what has been happening.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is commenting now.

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Minister reply about the action the Government will take to rectify the problems?

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** I am pleased to advise the honourable member that Cabinet has approved the referral of this project to the Public Works Standing Committee and that the likely sum required to complete the project will be made available in the forthcoming year. It is interesting to know that the total sum required for that car-parking development (which will comprise a ground-level extension for an additional 69 parking places adjacent to the Flinders University playing fields, together with an additional 188 cars above the existing western outpatient visitor car park, with access from the western roadway) is likely to be over \$600 000, which is an interesting comment on the capital costs associated with the provision of hospitals in this State or, indeed, in any other State. I am aware of the difficulties that many hospitals, not just the Flinders Medical Centre, but the Queen Elizabeth, the Royal Adelaide, and the Adelaide Children's Hospitals, have in trying to provide off-street parking for visitors and staff.

The project will be examined by the committee, and I hope that there is as little delay as possible before it proceeds, because I am conscious of the needs of visitors to the hospital. It has been going on for many years now, because phase 4 of the development of Flinders Medical Centre was not proceeded with by the previous Government; it was deferred and deferred, and I think that it can be deferred no longer. It will be proceeded with as soon as possible.

### MEMBERS' PECUNIARY INTERESTS

**Mr. WRIGHT:** What have the Premier's inquiries revealed as to any pecuniary interest by members of his Cabinet, senior members of the Department of Mines and Energy, and members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee in Western Mining Corporation or any other companies currently engaged in the exploration of uranium in South Australia? In answer to a question in this House on 11 October the Premier said that he would be making the position clear, so that members could reassure themselves that there was no pecuniary interest by members of Cabinet. A week later, on 16 October, in answer to a question about the pecuniary interest of senior Public Service advisers on uranium and members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, the Premier said that he

would inquire as to the interest of these officers. So far, I have not had an assurance that the Premier would make those inquiries and reveal them to the House. I hope that, on this occasion, we can get an answer to the question, with no duck-shoving.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Inquiries are still going on, but I have some news for the honourable member. The position regarding the Director-General of Mines (Mr. Webb), as revealed to me through the Minister, is that he was the owner of a number of shares in mining companies, but he has divested himself of those interests (I think very properly). That fact, I understand, was known to the former Administration, which was well aware of it.

**Mr. Wright:** It wasn't known to me.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It was well known to the former Administration.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There was a number of Public Service officers. For instance, I am told by the Minister of Industrial Affairs that two of his top officers (Mr. Davies and perhaps Mr. Bakewell), at the request of the previous Administration, lodged a list of their shareholdings that was freely available to the previous Government, and it was scrutinised by the Premier at the time.

The situation has not changed, and I find it interesting that the Deputy Leader should suddenly desire to bring these matters into the public arena—

**Mr. Wright:** There's been a change of policy, that's why.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:**—as though there is something really dramatic about them. The procedure that has been followed (and I recognise, as the Deputy Leader has said, that there has been a change of policy, and I am glad he has recognised that) will continue to be followed. Those lists of shareholdings, where they exist, will continue to be monitored in exactly the same way, and in what I believe to be a proper way. If there is any discrepancy at all, or any conflict of interest, those officers will be required to divest themselves of those interests that could be in conflict.

### FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTING

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Since Monday last, has the Minister of Recreation and Sport entered into any further negotiations or discussions with the South Australian National Football League and/or any other interested bodies, regarding the question of lighting at Football Park, West Lakes? If so, will the Minister advise with whom those discussions have taken place and the outcome, if any, of those negotiations or discussions? I have received a number of phone calls from constituents in my district in relation to an editorial in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "The lights fiasco", which states:

The deadlock that seems to have developed over the lighting of Football Park for night sport reflects little credit on the Government. By announcing last week an apparently firm decision, and then changing its mind in response to vigorous protests on behalf of West Lakes residents, it has placed itself in an embarrassing situation. Its possibly well-intentioned efforts to reconcile differences and please everyone have succeeded only in antagonising all other parties to the dispute.

It is understandable, in the circumstances, that the South Australian National Football League has lost patience with all the dithering that has gone on. The league was justified last week, following the announcement from the Minister of

Recreation and Sport, Mr. Wilson, that the Government was prepared to accept all the recommendations of the Royal Commission except that relating to the permitted intensity of the lights, in believing its plans could proceed without further hindrance. Now it is uncertain about what will happen, or when.

Much of the trouble appears to stem from the Government's mismanagement of the whole issue. While little was heard outside the electorate of Albert Park on the lighting of Football Park during last month's election campaign, the Liberal candidate there, either with or without the full authority of the Party, gave the impression to voters that a change of Government would bring with it a modification of the Royal Commission's recommendations.

**The SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member kindly indicate how much longer this editorial is?

**Mr. HAMILTON:** A couple of minutes. The editorial continues:

It seems probable also that since the election at least one Minister assured West Lakes residents that further consultations would take place before any final decision. It was therefore not surprising that there was such an outcry last week following Mr. Wilson's announcement. The best that can be said of the Government's effort is that it misunderstood the situation and then decided it had to change course in a belated effort to appease aggrieved parties.

There will be much public sympathy with the football league's contention that there is no need for further technical studies after the exhaustive Royal Commission inquiries. The league, however, will have to swallow its pride and resume negotiations with the Government if it hopes to have the lights operating next year. There can be little doubt that lights will be installed at Football Park at some stage. A little rational discussion should be enough to settle remaining differences.

Will the Minister enlighten me as to whether any further negotiations have taken place since last Monday?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I am not sure what line the member for Albert Park is taking.

**Mr. Keneally:** He's just asking a question.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I will get to the question. Members opposite can just wait; they will get the answer. We do not know whether the member for Albert Park is asking this question on behalf of his constituents. If he is taking a line on behalf of the residents of West Lakes, he is acting contrary to the stated policy of his own Party. That should be made plain. Nevertheless, he has asked a question and I shall answer it. He asked specifically what has happened since last Monday, when the league withdrew from the negotiations. Yesterday, I spoke to Mr. Ray Kutcher, Senior Vice-President of the Football League, and he told me, referring to the headline in the *News* of that day, that the league had not walked out of the negotiations, but would be prepared to return to the conference table under certain conditions. Only half an hour ago, I received a letter from Mr. Roach, General Manager of the Football League, repeating very much what Mr. Kutcher had to say, but laying down certain conditions for the league's return to the conference table.

I hope I may be forgiven for not stating those conditions at this stage, because, before doing that, I should inform the other parties to the dispute to see whether I can get them to the conference table. With my colleague, the Chief Secretary, I have tried to keep emotions out of this situation so that we can get people to the conference table; in fact, last Friday, when we got them to confer, was the first time they had spoken to each other for 12 months. I am delighted to have the letter from the league expressing

its willingness to return. Certain conditions have been laid down, and it will be necessary, first, for me to communicate those conditions to the other parties concerned. I will be doing that today and tomorrow.

### ARSON AND VANDALISM

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Education inform the House of the total cost of the replacement and rebuilding programme which has been undertaken by the Education Department and which is the direct result of vandalism and arson to educational establishments that have been attacked over the past five years? I believe that the public generally is alarmed at the amount of vandalism and arson occasioned to educational establishments in this State. In isolation, such facts may raise a few eyebrows and produce sounds of disapproval, but, if taken in total over a period of time, I believe the situation would be a revelation which would shock us into realizing the extent of the problem and the need to look realistically at remedial measures and which would indicate how much money and action was needed to combat the problem.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The figure made available to me for losses to the Education Department generally over the past five years for arson is \$2 008 936, quite a substantial sum. For vandalism, including theft, the sum was \$417 669, representing losses over five years that were incurred over almost 1 000 schools in total in the South Australia education system. The Department of Further Education has estimated that the total cost of vandalism and arson in its educational establishments is only about \$10 000. It has been found hard to itemise precisely, probably because not all cases are reported to head office, but the estimate is of a relatively insignificant sum. The department puts it down partly to the fact that it employs caretakers in its establishments. I am not suggesting that this is an adequate remedy in primary and secondary schools, because, with so many schools involved, the cost of accommodation and employment of caretakers would be \$7 000 000 to \$8 000 000 a year, at a conservative estimate. I am not suggesting that the Education Department generally look at that as a possible solution.

### WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICES

**Mr. PAYNE:** Will the Premier indicate whether the Government will be increasing charges for water and sewerage services in country areas so that losses on the provision of these services are eliminated? In 1978-79, the loss in respect of country water services was \$17 100 000, while \$2 400 000 was lost on country sewerage services. The Premier's policy speech contained the statement that a Liberal Government would "terminate failed Government projects and cut our losses". The Liberal Party's works and water resources policy statement reads, "The Liberal Party will review the method of charging for water and sewerage services with a view to correcting existing anomalies."

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There is no change in the policy which was originally instituted, I believe, in the time of Sir Thomas Playford, which was adopted by the previous Government, and which has been adopted by this Government. Certainly, there are anomalies in the individual charging of some consumers in the metropolitan area. There is no question at all of changing the policy which relates to metropolitan and country areas.

## WHEAT STABILISATION PLAN

**Mr. LEWIS:** Will the Minister of Agriculture say what the effect will be on South Australian wheatgrowers, for the coming harvest, of the delay by the Commonwealth and the States, in finalising details for the wheat stabilisation plan?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It is proposed to introduce legislation into this House this session to complement the Commonwealth legislation, and it is not expected that there will be any detrimental effect to South Australian growers as a result of the delay to date. The new home consumption price for wheat has to be fixed by 1 December, and the pricing policy for industrial wheat and stock feed wheat has yet to be resolved on an Australia-wide basis. I can tell the member for Mallee that the South Australian Government believes that the price of these wheats should be subject to the normal market forces. I am satisfied that the Australian Wheat Board will apply sound commercial sense when fixing the prices for stock feed and industrial wheat in the future.

It is important to say that I am aware of the need for protection of stock feed and industrial wheat clients. A section was built into the previous Wheat Stabilisation Act that gave the Minister for Primary Industry certain specific powers in order to act should the Australian Wheat Board be found to be exploiting and/or overcharging its clients. Those powers were incorporated in section 18 of the old Wheat Stabilisation Act, and I have been assured in recent days by the Acting Minister for Primary Industry that the contents of that old section will be preserved and incorporated in section 8 of the new Act. I point out that early deliveries of wheat in Queensland are protected in the meantime by a Commonwealth provision to provide for the first payments to the growers in that State.

## GAS PRICE

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy to state the policy of the Government regarding the recommendation of the National Economic Advisory Committee Report on the "Exploration of Oil and Gas in Australia" that "natural gas prices reflect alternative energy values and the special properties of natural gas, in particular the potential for conversion into liquid fuels and for international trade". I understand that it is proposed that there be negotiations between the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the Cooper Basin producers in relation to the price of natural gas to operate from 1 January 1980. The implications of the recommendation of the National Economic Advisory Committee are very serious for the domestic and industrial consumers in this State, and we must have a clear undertaking from the Government as to its policy on the recommendation made in the report. Does the Government contend that that recommendation is reasonable or unreasonable? Can consumers in South Australia expect more expensive natural gas, with more expensive industrial and domestic costs, or can they expect to receive a proper benefit from this State's natural resource?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** As the honourable member has said, negotiations will take place between the producers and the Pipelines Authority in relation to the price of natural gas. If, in fact, those negotiations do not lead to an agreement, the matter will have to be referred to an arbitrator. I hope that there would not be a significant increase in the price of gas to the Adelaide consumer.

## DEPARTMENTAL AMALGAMATION

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Is the Minister of Environment aware of speculation concerning a possible amalgamation of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs? Has the Minister considered a possible amalgamation, and can he say whether he has taken any action about this matter?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I am aware that there has been some speculation recently about a possible amalgamation between the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. I think I need to say that I have given much consideration to the possibility of such an amalgamation. I am now able to put the speculation to rest by saying that I have decided that an amalgamation will not take place. There are, of course, many arguments for and against such amalgamation, but I believe strongly that, because of the number of changes in the Minister, the permanent head and senior officers in both departments, what is required now is a period of real stability.

I believe that within the next year or two the advantages of a possible amalgamation would be outweighed because of the problems that have been associated with changes in Ministers and senior officers. I have told the staff of both departments concerned of my decision not to amalgamate and that is my strong intention, as the Minister responsible, that the two departments should co-operate to remove any areas of duplication or overlap which exist, because I am genuinely concerned about the amount of duplication that is taking place in those two departments. I have advised the members of those departments that there will be no amalgamation.

## LOW-GRADE COAL

**Mr. PETERSON:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy state whether the Government has considered actively supporting the conversion, where possible (or the replacement), of domestic and industrial heating appliances for the use of low-grade coal and, if it has not, why not? In South Australia we have large reserves of coal, some of which is low grade, which cannot be used in industry at this stage because of the problems it creates. Since being in the House I think the major problem raised has been in relation to energy conservation. It seems to me that, if we could use this source of energy and conserve the oil, gas and good quality coal we are using at the moment, we would be creating employment for people supplying the extra resources and making better uses of the other resources.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I think I can reply to the honourable member in general terms. I thank him for his question, because, as I have said before, he seems to ask the most sensible questions asked on the other side of the House. If the Labor Party had any brains it would have embraced him weeks ago. There is a research arm of the Government called SENRAC, the organisation which investigates a whole range of matters, including matters of energy conservation. Extensive investigations are proceeding now relating to the Port Wakefield low-grade coal seams. There are tremendous reserves of low-grade coal in the Port Wakefield and Balaklava area. If that coal can be proved up as suitable for use for the generation of electricity, it will involve fairly heavy capital expenditure to build a powerhouse, but South Australia will, in the

long term, be well served in relation to the generation of electricity using that coal.

If coal from that source was used to provide electricity for a period of 100 years, we would have an indirect access to heat by use of that coal. When I think of direct use of that coal I think, also, of the London experience with smog, the emission that comes from the burning of low-grade fuels. There was a concerted effort in London to get rid of the smog by converting heaters to oil usage, which solved that problem. However, the reverse problem is now merging because liquid fuels are fast disappearing. I thank the honourable member for his sensible question. I will certainly refer it to the appropriate research committees. I would be surprised, because of the emphasis on the use and conservation of fuel (which is so apparent to me and my division, and also to research bodies) if this matter is not being considered. Certainly, I will pass that valuable suggestion on and ascertain what is happening at present.

### RURAL YOUTH

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has any plans to upgrade Government support to the Rural Youth Movement and, if it has, what form will that support take?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The Government has not determined specific plans about this matter. The services that have been available in the department will be maintained. I am in the process of discussing the needs of the Rural Youth Movement, and the extent of extension services that my department might be able to provide. We recognise the role of rural youth in South Australia, and propose to promote and assist that movement at every level that we can. I have had discussions with officers in the department, part of whose responsibility is directed towards the extension service assistance of rural youth. I discussed this subject with the Advisory Council of Agriculture of South Australia at its last meeting. I have held discussions with a nominated representative of the Rural Youth Movement on matters implied in the question asked by the members for Flinders. As soon as possible, I will bring a report back to the honourable member showing precise detail surrounding the identified needs and showing what we are able to do for that worthy organisation.

### HEALTH COMMISSION

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Before addressing my question to the Minister of Health, I congratulate her on throwing off the medical affliction she had yesterday. Has the Minister intervened to prevent the transfer to the Health Commission of any public servants from other Government departments?

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I will have to ask the honourable member to repeat the question—apparently, not having thrown off my common cold sufficiently, my ears were not sharp enough to catch what he said, because of the noise at the time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member please repeat his question?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I will repeat my question, but I will not pass on my congratulations again, because I might get the kiss of death from my side. Has the Minister intervened to prevent the transfer to the Health Commission of any public servants from other Government departments?

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** No, I have not intervened

to prevent the transfer of any Government servants from other departments, but I have said that there is a ceiling on employment in the Health Commission and that no further additional appointments will be made; that was made clear early in the piece. Subsequently, the commission was asked whether it would accept employees from other departments and, without knowing whence, the names of the employees, or the nature of the appointments, I simply said that the ceiling stands and that there would be no additional appointments until I had had the opportunity to review the whole structure and to see where the needs were and when and if they could be fulfilled.

### URANIUM

**Mr. WEBSTER:** Does the Minister of Mines and Energy intend to table the report "Hazards of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle", which the former Premier's Press Secretary (Mr. M. Rann), who is now, I believe, an adviser to the Leader of the Opposition, said that he intends to make public?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I thank the honourable member for that question, because it gives me the opportunity to put the status of that report in proper perspective. I also observe that it appears that Mr. Michael Rann (former Press Secretary to the then Premier Dunstan and now adviser, although I do not quite know what is his status), appears to be the front runner for the Labor Party in relation to the uranium question—everyone else except Mr. Rann seems to have ducked for cover.

In answer to the question, I will satisfy the House as to the status of that report which, apparently, was one of those leaked to the *Advertiser* on Friday. I did not become aware of that report until I was walking up the stairs yesterday to a press conference, and someone suggested to me that there was a report in existence which had something to do with the hazards of the nuclear cycle.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Do you think the press already had it?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. I will detail to the House the status of that report. I have made some inquiries since yesterday as to the origins of that report, and its history appears to be as follows: it was prepared by the Policy Division of the Premier's Department, without any reference to the Department of Mines and Energy, and I observe that the report is dated March 1977. I am further advised that it was submitted to the former Minister (Hon. Hugh Hudson) for submission to Cabinet for adoption as Government policy on uranium. Before submitting it to Cabinet, Mr. Hudson asked Messrs. Webb (head of the Department of Mines and Energy), Dickinson and Wilmshurst, to comment on the document. Their comments were extensive and suggested that the report, even then, was out of date and inaccurate. Even back in March 1977, the experts, Messrs. Dickinson and Wilmshurst in particular, who were engaged by the Government and who undertook the overseas tour, along with Premier Dunstan last year, advised that the report was out of date and inaccurate.

These comments were presented to Cabinet when the report was considered. As a result of these comments, a minute was issued by Mr. Dunstan indicating that the "Hazards" report should not be further proceeded with but that a new report should be prepared by the Policy Division and the Department of Mines and Energy. This directive resulted in the two yellow covered reports I tabled yesterday. Honourable members will recall that yesterday I tabled two reports, which were prepared as a joint exercise between the Policy Division and the

Department of Mines and Energy. The advice of the experts, whose reports I also quoted yesterday, was to the effect that the 1977 report was quite inaccurate and, in fact, virtually worthless.

**Mr. Duncan:** Are you saying that report was not upgraded this year, as you said before?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will come to that. Mr. Rann, adviser and spokesman-in-chief for the Labor Party, would have been aware of this. He obviously has that report in his possession, and apparently he intends to make that outdated report public. It is understood that, while these two new reports were being prepared, Messrs. Smith and Guerin decided to obtain the services of Professor Kerr, a Commissioner in the Fox Inquiry who was known to have anti-nuclear views (which could be easily sustained, I think), to review the "Hazards" report, again, independent of the experts who were commissioned by the Government. This course of action was not referred to the Department of Mines and Energy, and my department was never given copies of the so-called revised report, which is why it was not brought to my attention.

The text of the body of the report was not altered, except in very minor aspects, by this consultancy. Honourable members may be interested to know that, to the extent to which we have been able to examine the report since yesterday, at least some of the revisions tend to confirm the assessments of Messrs. Wilmshurst and Dickinson; for example, at page 147, it is suggested that procedures for vitrification of wastes are progressing, although he refers to French rather than Swedish techniques. Because the report is both out of date and was not prepared by experts, I have no intention of tabling an inaccurate report. I also draw the attention of the House to the recommendation in Mr. Dickinson's memorandum to former Premier Corcoran. He warned Premier Corcoran when he pointed out that in the press statement issued by Mr. Corcoran there were false and misleading statements (Dickinson's words) to the public. Mr. Dickinson also warned against the issuing of reports prepared by the Policy Division, which prepared this report.

**Mr. Duncan:** Do you say—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, the former Government was prepared to engage Dickinson as a consultant, and he was engaged up to the time of the change of Government. Mr. Dickinson warned, in the memo I tabled yesterday, against letting the Policy Division have its head. The Premier has now decided that the Policy Division is unnecessary to vet the decisions of this Government. Mr. Dickinson warned against reports prepared by the Policy Division being published without their being vetted by experts. Those comments were contained in the minute I tabled yesterday. If Mr. Rann decides to publish the report, honourable members should be aware of his credentials. Mr. Rann, who is now the spokesman for the Labor Party on uranium, was described by Mr. Dunstan in his 6 February statement as "a leading anti-nuclear campaigner for years". That is front-runner Rann, now that the politicians have ducked for cover. Mr. Dunstan also described him as follows:

... a leader of the Green Peace Movement in New Zealand when he was there, and one of the organisers of New Zealand's intervention in the French atomic test area in the Pacific.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am still quoting former Premier Dunstan.

**Mr. Duncan:** Why don't you get off his back?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, that gentleman has been on my back for a day or two—fair is

fair. Mr. Rann was further described by Mr. Dunstan as follows:

Consequently, he is constantly in touch with people in the anti-nuclear movement.

I ask honourable members to judge for themselves the status of the report prepared by the Policy Division (the Propaganda Division, if you like) of the former Government, without its being vetted by experts. I ask them to judge the *bona fides* and the expertise of the leading proponent for the Labor Party in his recent public statements.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SWINE DISEASE

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** In view of the earlier disquiet over the reported outbreak of a swine disease in Tasmania, I should like to inform the House of the latest developments in the matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WRIGHT:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what do I have to do to withdraw leave?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Sit down and be quiet, and listen to the important message.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will resume his seat. It has been normal practice with previous Governments for a Minister who is in receipt of important information to make it available by way of Ministerial statement, if necessary after the completion of the laying on of Ministerial papers. In seeking leave, the Minister has done no more than has been done in the past, and he is performing a duty, on behalf of the Government, to the people of this State. If the honourable Deputy Leader should want to withdraw leave, he may put that to the test, but I point out that it would be an unusual move under precedents of this House. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I regard the subject as an important one, and as brief as it is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will please come to the subject matter of the statement.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Therefore, I would like to inform the House of the latest developments in the matter.

First, Pirbright Viral Research Laboratory in the United Kingdom has received and tested initial specimens from the affected pigs. Further specimens were due to arrive on Monday 29 October, but I am pleased to say that, even at this early stage, the laboratory has advised that the organism is not foot and mouth disease. The probable infection is either a variant of swine vesicular disease or other enterovirus. I might add that, unlike this morning's press, my department has not been informed that swine vesicular disease has been discounted. It is pleasing to note also that up to Monday 29 October there has been no extension of the disease reported from Tasmania.

#### GLENELG TRAM LINE

**Mr. TRAINER:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government plans to proceed with the upgrading of the Glenelg tram line and, if it does, what form will this upgrading take in the light of the decision apparently to abandon a compatible and complementary l.r.t. scheme for the north-eastern suburbs?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The matter of the upgrading of the Glenelg tram line is under review. If it takes place, which is likely, and if the north-east l.r.t. does not go ahead—

**Mr. Trainer:** —which is likely, or unlikely?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I am not commenting on that at this stage. If the north-east l.r.t. does not go ahead, we would not need to put on the Glenelg tram line rolling stock that would require pantographs on top. We could use the ordinary trolley-line, which means that the upgrading would be considerably cheaper.

### HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

**Dr. BILLARD:** Will the Minister of Planning ascertain from the Minister of Housing whether the comments relating to the placing of Housing Trust homes in outer suburban areas that were included in the report of the South Australian Housing Trust released yesterday indicate a change in the percentage component of the South Australian Housing Trust in the Golden Grove development? The policy of the previous Government with respect to the Housing Trust involvement in the Golden Grove area was that it should be fixed at the level of 20 per cent. That was stated at the time that the Bill came through Parliament and also was published in the Golden Grove draft study early this year. Further suggestions have emanated this year from the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs that this may be further increased to 25 per cent. That policy was strongly criticised by me earlier this year in submissions to the Golden Grove Development Committee.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is now commenting.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I was relating to the House things that have happened, Sir. The terms of my submissions are now reflected in the report that was released yesterday. I quote from that report, as follows:

Fringe development can place considerable economic and social impositions on some low income groups, particularly those which are likely to be affected by the rapid increase in journey to work costs.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am very much aware of the honourable member's interest in the Golden Grove area, and I believe that it is proper that I ask the Minister of Housing to bring down a report as early as possible.

### REDCLIFF

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Does the Premier still believe that the proposed petro-chemical ethylene dichloride plant would be better sited at Two Wells, Port Adelaide or Port Stanvac, rather than at the present Redcliff site? Like the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Premier seems to have had a number of second thoughts about Redcliff. In August 1975 the Premier suggested that Port Adelaide or Port Stanvac should be considered as sites for the proposed complex. In March the following year he again repeated that new sites other than the proposed Redcliff site should be examined, and said that the negotiations on the establishment of a petro-chemical plant should not be restricted to the Redcliff site near Port Augusta.

In December 1976 the Premier said he had been informed that the costs of establishing a plant at Redcliff, were estimated at 15 per cent greater than in an area closer to Adelaide (for instance, north of Two Wells), and said that the Government's insistence on the Redcliff site was a

major factor in the abandonment of those proposals. In March 1977 the Premier said:

I further predict that Redcliff is unlikely to be built. He went on to say that Redcliff was an election gimmick raised at great expense to the people of South Australia. Strangely, two months later the Premier said:

Dow Chemical is obviously quite convinced that the establishment of a petro-chemical complex near Port Augusta is a goer.

The following day he supported the then Government's submission on Redcliff to the Federal Treasurer. He took the opportunity to charter an aeroplane to fly over Redcliff from a distance of about 5 000 feet.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is now commenting.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am giving an explanation, Sir. The Premier said that it was an ideal site for a petro-chemical plant. He ought to tell the member for Mallee. Does the Premier now believe that the Redcliff site is the most suitable for a large scale petro-chemical industry, or does he still believe that a smaller plant should be built within the Adelaide industrial area?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** During the course of the negotiations that have taken place over the years from 1973, when the Labor Government lost the project for the State in the first instance, and again in 1974, when the Federal Labor Government, with the help of the State Labor Government, again lost the project for South Australia, there have been various discussions about the site, but the discussions have always been centred on the Redcliff area. Proposals for the Two Wells or the Virginia areas have been put forward, and I understand that this was one of the reasons why the second proposal with I.C.I. did not get off the ground—as I say, that was only one of the reasons. Quite obviously, the negotiations which will be entered into with Dow Chemical once the decision has been made will include all of the items that the honourable member has covered in his question, including the question of site.

### SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICE

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Will the Minister of Health say whether the Government intends to extend into high schools a dental service similar to that which now exists in primary schools?

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** No, the Government does not intend to extend the school dental programme beyond primary schools, and this was stated in the Liberal Party health policy prior to the State election. At the same time, the value of that dental programme was acknowledged, as was the necessity to encourage in young people, particularly adolescents, their sense of personal responsibility for their dental care by establishing a good patient relationship with their local dentist.

I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with an up-to-date report on the operation of the school dental programme, which by all accounts is an extremely effective and efficient programme. I have recently given approval for a development allocation to establish the final five units in the metropolitan area, which will complete the establishment of the school dental programme operations for primary schools and enable the total coverage of every primary school child in the State which was envisaged by the Federal Government when it initiated this programme in consultation with the States and on the basis of equal financing between the Federal and State Governments.

### NOTICE OF MOTION

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I give notice that, contingently on a motion being moved pursuant to Standing Order 144a, I will move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable such motion to be debated.

### DENTAL HOSPITAL

**Mr. SLATER:** Can the Minister of Health say what improvement to existing services at the Adelaide Dental Hospital can be expected in line with the policy statement made by the then Liberal Party spokesman for health matters prior to the State election?

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** I am presently examining ways and means by which services provided by the dental hospital can be improved. One of those is to relieve the enormous pressures on the dental hospital by making the provision of services available at other places, and that is already in train. A service will be available at the Parks Community Centre and at other metropolitan centres. The Health Commission is examining the provision of services in country centres which have previously been responsible for a considerable number of patients being required to come to Adelaide. As the honourable member would know, their fares have been financed but they have had the inconvenience of coming to the city. I shall be very pleased to provide the honourable member with specific details of exactly what is being done. The honourable member can rest assured that I regard this as a matter of priority, because the provision of proper dental care, particularly dentures, to older people has implications which go beyond their dental health and which affect their whole physical health, and indeed their emotional health and their ability to function effectively in any social situation. I regard this as a matter of high priority, and I would be very pleased to provide the honourable member with full details of what the Government proposes to do in the forthcoming year.

### COUNTRY HOSPITALS

**Mr. OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Health give an assurance that representations from the various hospital boards which have shown cost efficiency will be given due consideration in the reconsideration of this year's Budget allocations? I have received several representations and inquiries from hospitals within my district expressing concern at the reduction in available funds to support the services they provide, despite the fact that they have a proven track record of cost efficiency compared to their counterparts.

**The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:** I assume that the honourable member for Rocky River is referring to country hospitals in his own district. I can assure him that representations from all hospitals will be considered on the basis on their merit. However, on a matter of general principle I think it is extremely important that any Government which wants to create, maintain and continue efficiency in hospital management or, indeed, in the management of any other area of a public enterprise and the Public Service should provide incentives and not create penalties for people who have proved to be cost efficient. I am well aware that some of the country hospitals have demonstrated a high degree of cost efficiency, and I would

not want to see them penalised for their good housekeeping in the past by being deprived of sums of money that would enable them to maintain that good housekeeping. I can assure the honourable member that representations made by country hospitals that are based on their record of cost efficiency in the past will be looked at very sympathetically when they are received by me.

*At 3.5 p.m. the bells having been rung:*

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Continued from 30 October. Page 533.)

### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

(Continued from 23 October. Page 315.)

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the time allotted in connection with these Bills be as follows:

- (a) for the remainder of the Committee stage of both Bills, until 4.45 p.m. on Thursday 1 November; and
- (b) for the remaining stages of those Bills, until 5 p.m. on Thursday 1 November.

**The SPEAKER:** In the true spirit of the Committee, a contingent notice having been given, although it does not yet appear on the Notice Paper, does the honourable Deputy Premier wish to give way to the mover of the contingent notice?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Standing Order 144a—

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could you please explain under which Standing Order your ruling was made which invited the Deputy Premier to decide whether he would give way or not on this matter? Would you explain under which discretionary power he can decide whether or not this very important matter can be debated, in view of the fact that notice of a contingent motion has been given and is before the House. I am not quite sure under which Standing Order the Deputy Premier can simply say "Yes" or "No" to the possibility of a debate on that issue. After all, 10 minutes is allowed for a speaker on both sides—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader is now tending to debate the question. It was a courtesy offered by the Chair. It is not covered by Standing Orders. It is clear that a contingent notice of motion does not become the property of the House until such time as it appears on the next Notice Paper, but it has been a precedent in the past that, where a contingent notice of motion has been given during the day's session and that business comes forward during a later stage on that day, an opportunity is given to the Minister either to allow the mover of the contingent notice to be heard or not to be heard. It was out of courtesy to the honourable Leader who put the notice before the Chair that I sought that concurrence from the Deputy Premier. Under the terms of Standing Order 144a, it is quite clear that there will be no debate and that, the Deputy Premier having refused the provision which I offered, it is now necessary that the vote be taken.

**Mr. BANNON:** I move:

That the notice of motion given by the Deputy Premier be



opposed.

**The SPEAKER:** For the benefit of all members, I will read the provisions of Standing Order 144a, as follows:

(a) On the reading of a message from the Governor recommending an appropriation in connection with any Bill, on the calling on of a motion for leave to introduce a Bill, or at any stage of a Bill or on the consideration of Legislative Council amendments or suggested amendments to a Bill, a Minister may forthwith, or at any time during any sitting of the House or Committee and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, move a motion or motions—no amendment or debate being allowed—specifying the time which shall be allotted to all or any of the following:

The conditions are then set out. It is a fact that no amendment or debate being allowed precludes any further debate on this issue.

**Mr. BANNON:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to clarify the situation as to the position of the courtesies of the House to which you have just referred and which have been rejected by the Deputy Premier. If, in fact, there is a courtesy, a traditional practice or precedent, not covered by Standing Orders specifically (and you have already said, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot cite a particular Standing Order), surely that precedent, that courtesy, should be observed in these circumstances.

**The SPEAKER:** I take the point raised by the Leader. There is no point of order. It has been a courtesy that has been extended on some occasions and not extended on others. On this occasion, as with precedents set in the past, it has not been extended.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Rodda. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

Schedule.

Trade and Industry, \$1 370 000.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I trust that the Government will give the Opposition ample time to ask all the questions it might need to ask about the lines. The decision just taken by the House would indicate otherwise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member must not comment on decisions made by the House. He must refer directly to matters under discussion.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I will abide by your ruling, Sir. As the member for Mitcham would say, I have already made my point. Will the Minister explain the reason for the increase from \$28 779 to \$61 000 for the Redcliff project team? I am always pleased to see an increase in funding for committees dealing with the Redcliff project. What role does this committee play within the Minister's department?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Redcliff project team now comprises three full-time members, including a full-time officer from the Department of Trade and Industry,

an officer and I think I am right in saying this) from the Department of Mines and Energy, and an officer from the Department for the Environment. It is obvious, now that the team has three full-time officers, that an allowance of about \$61 000 a year is required to meet expenditure. It shows that there has been a significant upgrading of the workload of that committee, as does the fact that it now comprises three full-time members.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am pleased to see the upgrading of the project. What specific tasks will the project team perform?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The project team is basically a co-ordinating body which prepares background data that the Government requires about ancillary facilities relating to the petrochemical plant, should it proceed. This includes examining problems such as housing, public utilities and other community services that would be required. In addition, it will examine transport and other needs. It is there, as I understand, partly as a body to negotiate with Dow on what one would describe as the lesser details of the petrochemical plant. In sorting out those lesser details, it also co-ordinates activities so far as various Government departments are concerned.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I do not question the information that the Minister has provided, and I am thankful for it. It is strange that this project team is in the Minister's department, when we have already discussed matters of a similar nature with the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would it not be sensible to have all Redcliff project teams within the one department? I am not suggesting that those teams do not already work together, even though they are situated in different departments, but it would seem to be efficient if they came under the control of the one Minister in one department. Why is this team responsible to the Minister in charge of the Department of Trade and Industry while the rest of the committees involved with Redcliff are responsible to the Minister in charge of the Department of Mines and Energy?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** During the various early stages of negotiating for the Redcliff indenture agreement with the Dow Chemical Corporation, it is the primary responsibility of the Minister of Mines and Energy to carry out those negotiations. The actual committee, not the project team, is under the same Minister's responsibility. The project team, for which \$61 000 is allocated, is located in the Department of Trade and Industry, even though two of its officers come from other departments. This is where the Leader is slightly confused. The reason why the allocation is here is that it is located within the Department of Trade and Industry but is under the responsibility of the Redcliff Project Team. A recent change of Chairmanship of that committee has been announced.

**Mr. Keneally:** Who's the new Chairman?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Mr. Schroder, who reports direct, at this stage, to the Minister of Mines and Energy. The task of the project team is to facilitate the drawing up of the requirements for any indenture agreement that may be necessary, which would need approval by this Parliament.

**Mr. BANNON:** I notice under the heading "Overseas Division" that no allocation has been made, and there is a notation "Now provided under Development Division", which has about \$257 000 allocated to it for this financial year and which comprises, apparently, executive, project, technical, promotion, and administrative staff. I presume that the Overseas Division has been abolished and absorbed into the Development Division, in terms of the note "Now provided under Development Division". Could the Minister confirm that that is what has

happened? If that is what has happened, if you look at the actual payments for 1978-79, you will find about \$300 000 as the combined total of actual payments for the Development Division and the Overseas Division, whereas the sum allocated for this financial year is only \$257 000. That indicates a sharp reduction in staff employed, and not so much an absorption of the division as its abolition.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Although there was a so-called Overseas Division, that division was never properly established by the former Government, so to suggest that the present Government has in some way abolished the division is not the case. Although there was expenditure under that line in the previous financial year, that division was never actually established, nor were the positions filled. There were one or two officers who were, for part of the year, allocated under that line as regards their payments. The background notes with which I have been supplied state that no separate financial provision is made for that division in 1979-80, because the establishment of this group and the filling of the various vacant positions have been postponed.

The responsibilities of the Overseas Division were taken up, under the previous Government, by the Development Division. The Leader should be questioning Ministers of the previous Government on the reasons for that, rather than asking the present Government. Certainly, the new Government intends to promote overseas trade for South Australia. I believe that the major benefit that can be obtained for our manufacturing industries, and expansion, can be obtained only by the export of our various products. To achieve that, we need a healthy, viable division within this department, which is promoting it and which will be taken on under Mr. Davies' control. Mr. Davies has previously had the responsibility for this function, and will continue to have it. He is an officer with a great deal of experience in this area, and he has been extremely successful in what he has achieved. The Development Division has always been the division that has dealt with overseas trade, and it certainly will continue to do so under Mr. Davies' control.

**Mr. BANNON:** My purpose was not so much to question the function's being absorbed into the Development Division. I appreciate the Minister's arguments there, and that sounds reasonable enough. One might get within a Development Division a group that would specialise—presumably in overseas or export projects. However, last year's Budget provided a separate line, and there was expenditure under that line. Is the Minister saying that the expenditure was made by a bookkeeping exercise, that there was no division, yet \$72 751 was spent from a Budget allocation of \$90 000? There, to me, raises a question mark. The main import of my question was to look at the Development Division allocation which, indeed, has increased from last year, but if one then adds to it the Overseas Division, which has been absorbed with it, one finds that it is considerably less than last year's allocation. That indicates either that certain positions are no longer being continued, because salaries are not being paid under the line, or that there is some sort of downgrading in the resources of the Development Division.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There is no attempt at downgrading: the Government is doing just the opposite. When I became Minister of Industrial Affairs, I found that there were a number of vacancies within the department that had existed for some time. The Director of the Development Division had been an Acting Director for about nine months; that perhaps reflects the importance given to industrial development in this State by the previous Government. The staffing of the department was

significantly below the manpower ceiling set by the Public Service Board. I began to wonder whether the previous Government thought that, under its existing policies, it would be a waste of time even appointing people to that department, because they were unable to attract any industrial development. I have already issued instructions to begin to look at those vacancies and to fill them as quickly as possible. Certainly, there will not be any downgrading. There will be an increase in staff, and they will be brought back to the ceiling established by the board.

**Mr. BANNON:** I do not think that the Minister has yet answered my basic point, which is that last financial year about \$299 000 was expended on the Development Division's overseas development function, whereas this year the Minister is budgeting for \$257 000, a reduction of about \$40 000. Could he explain that reduction?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Leader asked whether we were trying to downgrade it, and I have been pointing out that we were doing just the opposite. As regards the actual allocation, I would need to check where the so-called people allocated under the Overseas Division now come in. The responsibility for overseas trade comes under the Development Division. If the Leader likes, I will obtain detailed information so that he can see the break-down.

**Mr. BANNON:** I would appreciate that information. To make clear what information I am seeking, I point out that, of last year's allocation, under Overseas Division, \$72 751 was spent. The notation states that that amount, or any financial allocation under that line, is now provided under "Development Division". In order to see what was actually spent in "Development Division" for the current financial year, one must add those two figures. They are, in fact, added together to make about \$40 000 more than the proposed allocation in this Budget. The Minister said, in the context of explaining to us, that he intends to upgrade the functions and to fill more positions. That statement seems to be inconsistent with the facts, so I would appreciate more information.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I also point out that there has been a transfer from "Director-General for Trade and Development, Administrative and Clerical Staff" to another line. This highlights the point that different staff members have now been included under different lines. I will obtain further information. I appreciate the point made by the Leader, but I assure him that there is nothing sinister in the fact that there has been a juggle between divisions.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Regarding "Total Salaries, etc.", actual payments for 1978-79 total \$1 005 257; the proposed allocation for 1979-80 is \$1 030 000. From the subtotals for salaries, it will be found that in certain areas there are rather large increases, but reductions in other areas. This inclines me to believe that there will be reductions in the staff in some areas. When one looks at the sum total salaries, it is seen that there is an increase of only \$25 000. Taking into account the sum and the projected increases in salaries, one may feel that there could be a reduction in staff. I understand that the Minister will obtain a report for the Leader, but perhaps he could look at the total number of staff members in the Department of Trade and Industry and try to give an answer that way. I am trying to be of some assistance to the Minister, by the way.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I thank the honourable member for his assistance; however, I assure him that I do not require it. We happen to be one third of the way through the present financial year. At this stage, due to the administrative policies of the previous Government, a significant number of positions in the department are still

unfilled, and they have been unfilled for most of this financial year.

**Mr. BANNON:** There are staff ceilings.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The point which I am making, and which I hope the Leader now appreciates, is that the department is significantly below its staff ceiling. I have made that point. I think the staff ceiling is 65, and at present the department has 57 or 58 positions filled. That has been the position for about four months. I again assure the honourable member that, although the actual allocation for salaries is only marginally increased this year, the reason is that the previous Government had not gone to the bother of filling a significant number of positions, which the present Government is now filling.

**Mr. BANNON:** Regarding "Statutory Corporations Division", a fairly substantial increase has been proposed this year. Will the Minister explain what added staff or functions require that increase? Is it something to do with sunset legislation, which has been proposed by the current Government?

**The CHAIRMAN:** In answering, I hope the Minister will not go into a lengthy description of sunset legislation.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I will not, Sir. The answer to the Leader is "No". The general reorganisation of the department's establishment during late 1978-79 (in other words, just before the end of the financial year) resulted in the transfer of several officers from the Operations, Development, Research and Planning Divisions to the Statutory Corporations Division to provide a pool of professional accounting consultant skills. This transfer of staff and the creation of several new positions within the determined staff ceilings justifies the increase in financial provisions sought by this division. This again highlights the point I have been consistently making—that there has been a transfer of staff from one division to another, which accounts for the adjustment of salaries in those areas.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Regarding "Statutory Corporations Division", some rather disturbing statements have been made by the Premier in relation to the transfer of staff. Is a political test envisaged in respect of trainee directors and other people involved under the Statutory Corporations Division training section?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No.

**Mr. BANNON:** Regarding the line "Executive, Economists, Research and Clerical Staff", is the category of economist recognised in Public Service grading? How many people fill those positions, and what is the difference between an economist and a research officer in that division?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The head of that division is Mr. Milton-Smith. I think all members who know him would regard Mr. Smith as an extremely capable and competent public servant and one who I know has had the high regard of previous Premiers, and previous Ministers responsible for the then Department of Economic Development. From what I have seen of this division and its staff, I back up that high regard. The difference is that there are some people who act as research officers within that division. Mr. Smith is regarded as an economist. I think that accounts for the difference in classification between these groups. If the honourable member wishes, I will obtain more detail about that.

**Mr. BANNON:** Regarding "Contingencies—Payments to Consultants for Services", \$25 000 was voted in 1978-79 and actual payments totalled \$42 740. A 50 per cent increase is proposed for this year, the provision being \$60 000. Will the Minister indicate what sort of consultant services are involved? Are a number of consultants involved or a number of projects?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The allocation for consultants

has been increased because of studies regarding the recycling of waste products. These studies are expected to require additional finance.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Regarding the line "Publicity and information for industrial promotion", in 1978-79 \$105 000 was voted and \$80 972 was actually spent, and this year \$80 000 is proposed. In view of the election policy of the government, of which the Minister is a member, and the information that has been given to the House about the promotional effort that will occur regarding the attraction of industry to this State, I would have thought that under that line activity of that nature would be catered for by the provision of funds.

However, a similar amount was spent last year. If the effort were to be the same as that of last year (and no doubt the Minister might try to make a political point on this), there would be no quarrel on the amount. Since the provision is of the same order, has the Minister any information for the Committee? Is money concealed in other lines for this purpose, not being readily apparent?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The greatest publicity and the greatest promotion for industrial development in this State were the result of the election on 15 September. The word has already spread throughout the boardrooms of Australia, and investors are beginning to come to the State. This morning, I had in my office the managing director of a senior large manufacturing company, which has a very significant operation in this State, which operation had declined quite significantly under the previous Government, with the number of employees decreasing from about 250 to 300 down to 150. This company had been negotiating for some time with the previous Government to establish an industry in this State, but it had given up those negotiations. It has now come back to the new Government and is prepared to reopen the negotiations. It was indicated to me this morning that the company was not prepared to proceed or to maintain its operation under the previous Government, but that it is now prepared to extend its operation.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Once again, a simple request for information, with specific facts given by the Opposition member asking the question, has been ignored by the Minister, who set out on a political exercise. I suppose he is entitled to answer in that form if he wishes, but I ask once again whether funding is provided elsewhere. If it is not, the amount proposed shows a slight decrease on the amount actually paid in the previous year.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There is no allocation in any other line for publicity and information for industrial promotion. It is believed that the amount allocated, being similar to last year's actual payments, is quite adequate for our needs.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** The amount proposed under the line relating to the officer exchange scheme is \$5 000, whereas actual payments last year totalled \$13 000. Can the Minister explain the reduction?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** An officer from what was then the Economic Development Department, now the Department of Trade and Industry, was seconded to the staff of the Prime Minister of the Malaysian Government. That officer was due to return to Australia in October or November of this year, but I have granted a request for an extension to December of this year, and I think the officer will return to Australia on 1 January and take up the office here. The allocation may have to be marginally adjusted because of the more recent extension of the secondment period.

I believe that, like the whole of Australia, South Australia has a responsibility to assist developing nations, especially those in the South-East Asia region. I know that

the Prime Minister of Malaysia holds this officer in the highest possible regard, and that his work in Malaysia has been excellent. I am delighted to have been able to assist. The fact that the amount has been reduced in no way indicates that the work has been lessened, but indicates that the specific term of appointment has now come to an end.

**Mr. PAYNE:** My second sally elicited from the Minister the information that it was believed (presumably it was his belief) that the amount proposed would be adequate. In speaking to that line, the Minister appeared to break a precept announced in this Chamber on two occasions by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, when they said that they would not make announcements or public statements about possible projects or improvements in the employment scene until they were actualities. The Minister treated us to one of those examples which, allegedly, he deplored during the term of the previous Government, when he talked of having a concerned person in his office this morning.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I have not breached the undertaking which we gave as a Government and which I supported. Surely, the honourable member sees the difference between the sort of exaggerated claim made by Premier Dunstan several days before the 1973 election, claiming that the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was about to be built, and my statement that a gentleman came to my office this morning saying that he was prepared to reopen negotiations for the expansion of business activities in South Australia. That is not a major announcement.

**Mr. Payne:** Who is it?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I am indicating, as have other Ministers, that there is a renewed interest in the State, which is most pleasing. Obviously, Opposition members are jealous that it did not occur in the time of their Administration.

**Mr. BANNON:** Would the Minister clarify the information he has given? He has said that someone came to his office and wanted to reopen negotiations. Would he specify who it was and what sort of negotiations were involved? The Opposition would welcome any such approaches, and indeed constant negotiations were going on in the time of the last Administration. It would be interesting to know whether this person was dealing with the previous Government and has not chosen to inform the Minister.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** It is the policy of this Government that it does not give details of any such programme until they are firm. The undertaking given by the Premier, which I have upheld and promoted, is that if the company has any substantial programme that is going ahead, I shall announce it. I will not make false announcements, as the previous Government did constantly, only to find itself embarrassed because it could not meet those promises.

**Mr. BANNON:** I press the Minister on this, because he introduced the topic. Had he said nothing, there would have been no point in our asking questions. We are not asking for an announcement, but simply for him to back up his statement by providing information. This seems consistent with the approach of the new Government. Projects are announced (the International Hotel, and one or two other things, for instance), accompanied by a disclaimer of its being an announcement. Can the Minister provide the details?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The answer is "No"; of course, I am not going to release any details unless it is a firm and definite programme. I point out that—

**Mr. Payne:** Forget about it, then.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member

must not conduct a conversation across the Chamber.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I point out that it was not a unique experience. The fact is that it has occurred fairly regularly since I have been Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is also interesting that some of these companies had been negotiating with the previous Government for some time, and they indicated quite clearly that they felt that those negotiations were an absolute waste of time.

**Mr. BANNON:** I will not pursue those completely baseless assertions made by the Minister. It is quite extraordinary that he simply alleges these things and gives no facts to back them up.

Has reference been made yet to the officer exchange scheme? There is a considerable reduction in the proposed payment in this financial year.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that I have already spent some three or four minutes answering this very question. Unfortunately, this is one of the reasons why we have taken so long to get through the lines. Last night I had to answer a question three times. On the third occasion the honourable member who asked it was very embarrassed.

**Mr. BANNON:** Could the Minister just refer me to *Hansard* in such a case?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Unfortunately, I had to be out of the Chamber for a few minutes, and the question I am interested in may have been asked while I was out. It relates to the officer exchange scheme. Has that question been asked?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes.

Vote passed.

Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$7 292 000.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** I refer to the advance for unemployment relief, and note that there is no provision there for 1979-80, although there is an increase of \$5 300 000 in the provision for incentives to industry. Is there any connection between those two lines?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The first line that the honourable member referred to was in fact SURS. Although the line indicates that \$9 200 000 was actually spent last year, that figure gives a very false picture. Of the \$9 200 000, \$4 500 000 was allocated by the Treasury Department at the end of the year into a deposit account, and this amount was unspent and uncommitted by the previous Government. The honourable member may recall the answer I gave to the question in this Chamber a week or so ago when I made several points about SURS. I pointed out that the practice now for at least two years had been to carry over uncommitted funds which then appeared for the previous year and could again appear on the subsequent year in the financial statements. This is what has occurred in this case.

I would be happy to go through some of the financial incentives in detail, if the honourable member would like that information. That line does not include any transfer from the SURS line. The lines relating to advances for unemployment relief and incentives to industry are two quite separate lines. The unallocated funds under SURS were granted back to general revenue from the deposit account. The amount involved there was, I think, either \$3 000 000 or \$3 100 000. Under the incentives to industry provision, one can see a number of schemes listed there. They include pay-roll tax rebates and land tax rebates for decentralised industry. A new line, proposed by former Premier Corcoran (and I would like to congratulate the former Premier and the previous Government on this provision), was an allocation of \$1 000 000 under what was referred to as the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Scheme. This was announced in June this year by Mr.

Corcoran when he opened an expansion at the Cheviot plant.

I believe that South Australia has the potential through its motor industry to play a very significant role in the world car plan under import and export complementation, which is due to take effect from March 1981. Under that plan there is the opportunity for one or two or more significant component manufacturers in Australia to supply component parts not only for motor vehicles manufactured here in South Australia or Australia but perhaps for the entire world production of a particular motor vehicle. The purpose behind this allocation of 1 000 000 was to encourage existing component manufacturers to adopt new technology, to expand, and to invest now, so that by the time there is the need for international componentry they will be able to match any component manufacturer elsewhere in the world. There are at least two such proposals before the Government at present requesting funds under that assistance area. I hope we can assist these companies so that this State can be part of the world car plan, as I am very confident it will become.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Is the money for the incentives to industry to come from general revenue?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** For the Community Improvement Through Youth programme a proposed sum of \$289 800 is provided. I hope that the Government may have a programme to help unemployed youth. In any community where there is unemployment, two categories can be observed, particularly in a decentralised community such as the area I represent. A married man with a family who has become unemployed—

**Mr. McRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** In an unemployment environment there is a real need to assist youth, as some young people may never have had employment. Will the CITY programme provide assistance for such people?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. The Community Improvement Through Youth programme is better known under its CITY title. I am sure members are all aware of this programme. The allocation of \$289 000 is an increase over last year's allocation to CITY, which was \$245 000. It has previously appeared in the Budget in the lines for the Department of Community Development. In the reorganisation of Government departments it now comes under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and it is now my responsibility.

I remind members that I have recently sent out a letter advising them of a seminar to be held in the seminar room on the second floor of this building at 12 o'clock tomorrow at which 10 people from CITY will be present to talk about the problems of unemployed people and to highlight to members of Parliament what work is carried out by those involved in the CITY programme. I hope that the honourable member can come to that session when he will certainly get a detailed answer to the question he has asked this afternoon.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** If this is in fact only a metropolitan scheme, will the Government consider extending it to country areas because we do not all live in the metropolitan areas, and there are some problems with unemployment outside the metropolitan area? From my own experience of the problem of unemployed youth, I believe it is far better to provide money for actual employment of youth in some category.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** To my knowledge all of the staff of CITY are presently located in the Adelaide

metropolitan area. A decentralisation programme is going on in the sense that they are trying to establish permanent offices in the Elizabeth and Noarlunga districts.

There is also the Youth Bureau under which the CITY programme comes. The Youth Bureau looks at the problems of unemployment across the State. As I understand it, there is a seminar in Whyalla next Friday evening and Saturday of next week at which at least some personnel from the Youth Bureau will be talking about the problems of the unemployed. I am prepared to examine the request to extend the CITY programme into large country towns. My fear is that the personnel is not available, and the need is still in Adelaide. Whilst acknowledging that, I assure the honourable member that he will have the help of the Youth Bureau to assist in unemployment problems that might exist in Whyalla or other similar towns.

**Mr. McRAE:** My query is in relation to the line "Advances and grants for unemployment relief projects". Mr. Chairman, you will be happy to hear that in accordance with your ruling I am not going to embark on a full-scale debate. The allocation for this line last year was \$9 200 000, and this year nothing is allocated to the line. I will not rehash this Party's opposition to this change in policy; I think that has been done eminently well by other members on my side. If I recall correctly, it was either the Minister or his Leader who indicated that some of the projects which were formerly funded under SURS would now be funded in a different way by the allocation of money to local government. If there is to be, on perhaps a reduced scale, added funding to local government, which would not normally obtain, on the basis of providing greater employment in particular areas and, if so, what amount is proposed to be spent this year under that revised scheme?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The statement that \$9 200 000 was expended in 1978-79 is quite incorrect. It is incorrect for the reason I have already given this afternoon, that only half of that amount was actually spent in the last financial year. The rest, about \$4 500 000, was placed in a working deposit account and was brought forward to the current year. It is not fair to say that the Labor Government of South Australia spent \$9 200 000 last year; at best it spent about half that sum. A sum of \$1 500 000 was spent this year, and was committed by the previous Government, and those commitments will be met; they are included elsewhere.

The honourable member referred to our suggestion to people who had made applications under the SURS programme—I think I am right in saying there were about \$19 000 000 worth of unvetted applications within the department when I became Minister of Industrial Affairs—that they apply under other suitable lines within the Budget. It was not just one line but a number of lines, one being special grants to local government. In considering that, members should also look at the actual allocation of grants under the grants agreement that local government received this financial year compared to last financial year. The allocation has been significantly increased, and the Local Government Association has acknowledged that in the discussions I have had with it.

Specific grants are also made under Sport and Recreation, under the Health Commission and under the Department of Community Welfare, to name just a few. I think in the letter I sent to the various bodies which had applied for SURS funds but which had not been allocated funds, that there was room for them to make applications in other areas, and I have encouraged them to do that. SURS had become a general scheme under which people could apply for funds for almost any purpose provided it

met certain obligations, in terms of labour componentry having regard to overall expenditure. In some cases that might have led to inefficiency in carrying out the work, and I know of one or two cases where it did. I would urge any organisation to apply to other areas under different lines. I cannot give the honourable member that exact information. I am sure he will find it when we come to the lines of the Minister of Local Government. I suggest the honourable member look at the different lines, make his own judgement and see where his particular organisations should apply for funds.

**Mr. McRAE:** I thank the Minister for the first two parts of the answer, although I do not necessarily agree with the first part. In relation to the third part—

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** The first part is a fact: the money wasn't spent.

**Mr. McRAE:** What is a fact, in some people's eyes is an opinion perhaps. When the Minister and his Government made the conscious decision not to repeat the expenditure of \$4 500 000 in lieu of the \$9 200 000 that is shown, did he and his Cabinet colleagues make the equally conscious decision that a sum equalling that amount, greater than it, or somewhat less than it, would be provided, on the principle that he just mentioned, under different lines and under different departments, or were those lines left intact?

Has the whole of that \$4 500 000 been taken out of circulation, or is part or the whole of it made up by additional allocations that would otherwise not have been made to other departments?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** When it was decided not to continue with SURS there was no direct transfer of that unexpended \$4 500 000 into other specific lines, or no allocation was made to other specific lines to equal what was not going to be spent if it had been allocated under SURS. I point out that there has been an increase in funds for a number of lines. For example, the CITY programme was financed largely through SURS. An allocation of \$289 000 has been made available for CITY. An allocation over and above the commitment of the previous Government of \$350 000 has been allocated this year to the home handyman scheme, and that is not shown in these lines. That is an additional allocation, too.

I understand that there has been an increase in some local government grants. Although I do not have the figures to compute how large are the grants in other areas (and that would be extremely difficult to compile because of the many areas involved), I assure the honourable member that there have been allocations under a number of lines. It would be wrong to say that some of those financial resources are not available to the community through other means.

I point out that SURS was set up as an unemployment relief scheme, not as a local government grants scheme or community welfare scheme. I think this Government has made a wise decision in saying that that scheme was ineffective as an unemployment relief scheme. We have allocated significant resources to ensure that, if we are going to help unemployment, we will do that by creating permanent jobs.

**Mr. BANNON:** Will the Minister give details of the amounts allocated for each scheme outlined under the incentives to industry line?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I cannot give the Leader that information. First, it is not available to me. Secondly, at this stage we cannot be quite precise about what some of the allocations will be. For example, the Establishment Payments Scheme depends on companies coming to the Government and requesting financial incentives to establish in South Australia. I know that a number of

recent applications have been made, but, until they are vetted and until the financial year is over, it is difficult to make any estimate about exactly what those allocations will be.

The Government has allocated, overall, an amount of \$6 000 000 for this purpose. A number of other schemes, including the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Scheme, also depend on the number of applications that are made. We might find (and I would be delighted if we did) that that amount of \$6 000 000 has to be increased, because of the number of companies wanting to develop in South Australia under the E.P.S. scheme. The Government has allocated what it considers is a reasonable estimate of the amount that might be required. I cannot break that figure down, and if I did it would be only a rough estimate.

**Mr. BANNON:** Surely the figure of \$6 000 000 has not just been plucked out of the air. There must have been some assessment of the possible cost of the scheme. It may, as the Minister suggests, be rough, but nonetheless I cannot see how the Government can provide a system of incentives to industry with absolutely no concept of how much each of those schemes will cost. If the \$6 000 000 is to have any meaning at all, surely there are amounts attached to various schemes to build up that figure.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I can give the Leader some very rough estimates. I ask that these figures be taken as rough estimates. For instance, under the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Scheme, an amount of approximately \$1 000 000 has been allocated. That was a very general allocation based on estimates made by the previous Government. If those estimates are wrong, please do not come back to me and blame me for that. Those estimates were made at the beginning of this financial year by the previous Treasurer. Under the Establishment Payments Scheme, it is extremely difficult to make any estimate at all. The Government thought that there might be a need for an allocation of \$1 000 000 to \$2 000 000 in that area. Until we know what applications have been made, it is extremely difficult to come up with exact figures.

Likewise, it is difficult to pick what will now become a blurred area between the Riverland Development Fund and rebates of pay-roll tax for decentralised industry. The reason for that is that the Riverland Development Fund is one into which pay-roll tax rebates from individual companies along the river were paid, and those funds were allocated to specific projects, under what I think they called the aggregation scheme for Co-operatives and other industries along the river. Under the Government's proposal, as from 1 January 1980 there is to be a complete rebate of pay-roll tax for such decentralised industries. The honourable member can surely appreciate the blurred area there, where one scheme ceases to operate half-way through a financial year and a new scheme is taken up.

**Mr. BANNON:** What about the Riverland? You have not assayed a figure.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I cannot give a precise figure on that because I am not sure how much money is likely to come into the fund, or what commitments there are, because matters are so blurred in relation to the rebate of pay-roll tax for decentralised industry. I have allocated \$1 000 000 for the motor vehicle programme, \$1 000 000 to \$2 000 000 for the Establishment Payments Scheme, and the rest could be seen as a sort of contributing area for the other \$3 000 000 to \$4 000 000. I again stress that it is extremely difficult when changing from one set of incentives to a broader set of incentives, and where applications are made to the Government for financial assistance, to be precise about what money will be required, until applications are made.

**Mr. BANNON:** The Minister indicated, when talking about incentives to industry, that if the various schemes were successful more than the allocated \$6 000 000 may be required. In the event of that occurring, is the Government ready to provide the extra finance, and where will that finance come from.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** If additional finance is required, that will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates, which will be considered early next year. As the Leader should know, that has been the tradition. It will require the approval of this Parliament before any such allocation is made.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Minister said that SURS did not have any lasting benefit so far as employment is concerned, and that the incentives to industry that his Government is proposing in this Budget document will be more effective.

How would the Minister apply this Government's proposal to Port Augusta, in particular, where SURS, and the RED scheme before it, have been a boon to the city in its attempts to provide facilities for the crunch that will occur when the Redcliff development commences? Port Augusta's employment is 75 per cent Government-based. If incentives are to be given to industry, they will apply to 26 per cent of the community. The Government-based areas face restrictions in State Government staff ceilings and, in relation to the Federal Government, a corporate plan for the railways. The expanded employment base in Port Augusta is grim indeed. How will the incentives to private industry affect the employment base at Port Augusta? I do not want the Minister simply to tell me that we have the real prospect of Redcliff in front of us. I am sure that it will happen but, if it is delayed for some reason, how will the incentive scheme affect the employment base in Port Augusta?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Government has offered a number of very encouraging financial incentives to existing employers, of whom there are some in Port Augusta, to develop. For the first time, we have offered a complete rebate on pay-roll tax to decentralised industry. Some years ago, a marginal scheme applied to new industries that expanded or existing industries that moved into new products. The rebate on pay-roll tax to decentralised industry applies across the board to existing industries?

**Mr. Keneally:** And to new industries?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes.

**Mr. Keneally:** Will it apply to Redcliff?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No, I would think it would not. Specific guidelines are laid down, and these are classed as manufacturing and process industries. Some areas involved in Redcliff, such as the flow-on or downstream industries, may be eligible. We have adopted the same, or similar, manufacturing classifications as have been adopted by the Victorian Government. Those classifications, in general, preclude mining operations or the direct processing of metals at the base grade. They do not, for instance, exclude any industry that uses raw material to produce some manufactured product.

I am unable to answer the honourable member specifically in the case of Redcliff, because an application would have to be made; certainly, I think that, in the case of downstream industries, such incentives would apply.

Meaningful incentives are available to industries in Port Augusta. One problem under SURS was that only 12 per cent of the people employed under that scheme ever received permanent employment. That is a small percentage, well below the percentage of 65 per cent in the Commonwealth Government's SYETP scheme. It is interesting to see that the percentage who received

permanent employment under SURS has actually dropped over the past couple of years; that highlights the fact that SURS has not been effective in producing permanent jobs.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Can the Minister give me information regarding the more than \$100 000 increase in this year's allocation for "Special assistance—Whyalla industries"? I also refer him to the incentive schemes and ask whether that increase is linked to incentive schemes available to other industries. Do these special assistance programmes to industry in the Whyalla area take the form of grants for improvements to plant, etc? This is an important matter regarding Whyalla because, recently, I made submissions to the Premier for assistance to a certain industry in Whyalla which, if granted, would absorb the entire \$100 000. It would, conceivably, improve the opportunity for that employer to employ additional workers. If the line entails assistance of the kind I have outlined, how would an industry in Whyalla go about obtaining such assistance?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I should like to be able to point out to the honourable member (which I unfortunately cannot do) that, because the allocation is three times that of last year, the present Government gives three times the importance to Whyalla than did the previous Government. However, it would not be honest for me to do that.

**Mr. Keneally:** Why don't you?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** We give it far greater importance than just three times the importance. The increased allocation has been necessary because certain commitments were given in 1978-79 that are being paid for this year. If we were to allocate that money on a commitment basis year by year, rather than on a payment basis, you would find that about \$96 000 was paid last year, and about \$100 000 this year.

Regarding local industries seeking assistance, I would urge them to contact the permanent head of the Department of Trade and Industry (Mr. Bakewell) and ask that department for a range of incentives that could be offered to their industries. First, special incentives are offered to industries in Whyalla. Secondly, companies in Whyalla would be eligible for allocations under the Establishment Payment Scheme. Thirdly, some companies in Whyalla would be eligible for rebates of pay-roll tax. Fourthly, rebates on pay-roll tax are available to decentralised industry, and certain companies in Whyalla would certainly be eligible. There are other ways of receiving Government assistance, such as guarantees and loans. The list is long and, rather than give all the details now, the honourable member should ask the industries to contact my department, or my office, and I will certainly ensure that they receive the assistance requested.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** As I understand the Minister's reply, the line is wrong, because all it does is falsely give a commitment to something which the present Government has no intention of carrying out. That is what the Minister has said. The line is increased by more than \$100 000 but, after receiving the information I sought, I am led to believe that there is no such increase at all.

I also point out that the incentive, as the Minister has said, of pay-roll tax and the shifting of industry existed under the policies of the previous Government. What I am trying to find out now is whether the Government, under the allocation of \$6 000 000, will consider special financial assistance to industry not only in Whyalla but also in Port Augusta and Port Pirie so that industry can be improved and more people employed.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The honourable member appears to be confused. This year, the Government is paying for some commitments made last year by the

previous Government. I am not saying that that same commitment has not been given this year; it has, and has been marginally increased.

**Mr. Max Brown:** It has not been changed.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** A commitment was made last year which was not met but which is being met this financial year. That accounts for some of it, but the original commitment for this year is included in the \$150 000. In answer to the other point raised by the honourable member regarding the new assistance offered, I point out that industries in Whyalla were not eligible for the sort of rebate of pay-roll tax now offered by the new Government. One or two industries were eligible, but a restrictive list of conditions applied. I think I am right in saying that no industry in Whyalla ever became eligible under the old pay-roll tax incentives for decentralised industry, introduced by the Dunstan Government. I think I am also right in saying that only three companies throughout the State ever became eligible under this scheme. One or two of those companies were situated at Mount Gambier. I think Fletcher Jones was the first example. New incentives are now being offered to industry in the honourable member's district and I believe that they will help to expand industry there.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Recently, the Federal Government launched a scheme at Port Augusta under which Aboriginal people were to be employed and trained. Under the NEAT scheme, any employer who employed a person of Aboriginal background was paid up to \$57 a week towards the salary of that employee. Will the incentives that the State Government intends to give to employers to encourage them to employ people (the wide range of incentives that the Government has said it is offering) be paid to employers as an additional incentive over and above the \$57 per employee already received under the Federal Government NEAT scheme? If that is the case, the total salary of an Aboriginal person may be met by the State Government and the Federal Government. This will provide an incentive to employers in the northern Spencer Gulf area to employ people of Aboriginal background.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The pay-roll tax incentives for employers to take on additional employees (as I recall the detail of the programme) still apply to various incentive schemes also offered by the Commonwealth Government. I can give an undertaking to the honourable member about that and, if I am wrong, I will contact him. As I recall the detail, certainly our pay-roll incentives for employment apply to any such scheme, the SYETP scheme being one. I know of other programmes where it also applies. If there are problems in that area, I ask the honourable member to contact me and I will see that a decision is made on the matter. He has raised an isolated case.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I said earlier that the majority (74 per cent) of employment in Port Augusta particularly relies on State Government and Federal Government assistance. Because this programme has been launched and because 50 per cent of Aboriginal people in the area are unemployed, will the State Government make decisions to employ Aboriginal people within State agencies in the area? This question is serious. Can the Minister give me some sort of undertaking as to the extent that State Governments will participate in the scheme, and receive, I might add, the \$57 allowance that the Federal Government makes available. If the Minister does not have the information available (and I expect he has not), will he give me a considered reply, because the matter is serious, particularly to the 50 per cent of Aboriginal people within my district who are able to work but who

cannot obtain work?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I appreciate the serious point that the honourable member has raised. I point out that the Government has given a commitment, through its various programmes, to help this type of person. Although I cannot quantify that in monetary terms, I think the honourable member would realise that the incentives offered by the Government will be of assistance to the people he has in mind. The honourable member also asked a specific question about whether the Government would give preference in employment to these people. I cannot answer that question, because this matter is the responsibility of individual departments, and I have no control whatsoever in that regard. I am not dodging the question at all. I suggest that the honourable member direct a letter or a query to each individual Minister so that his question can be answered on its merits. I point out that the Youth Bureau has employed one Aboriginal person and has been delighted with his performance and his development as a clerical assistant within the bureau. The bureau is examining ways to make that person a permanent employee. This matter should be taken up with individual Ministers.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Regarding the line "International Hotel Committee", actual payments last year totalled \$10 000; this year, no sum is proposed. I think I am right in saying that within the past two weeks there has been a significant statement in the press that the proposed hotel on the Victoria Square site would be proceeded with by a consortium. The previous Labor Administration had been negotiating with various consortiums over the past few years and was always within an inch of obtaining some sort of commitment. I think the commitment was as strong in the past as it is at the moment, although I know no more than what I have read in the press. Will the Minister say whether we can expect the building of an international hotel, where it will be sited, and when the commencement of that operation can be expected?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** First, regarding the fact that there is no proposed allocation for this year, I understand that the committee was involved in, I think, overseas activities last year. I expect that is where the expenditure was incurred. It is not anticipated that any expenditure will be required this year. In relation to the likelihood of the construction of an international hotel, I think that the honourable member should treat the announcement made some weeks ago by the *News* with the due regard one would give to such a newspaper report.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What does that mean?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** It indicates that the *News* latched on to some sort of headline and built up a story on that. I cannot indicate to the honourable member, because I do not know, what likelihood there is of that hotel going ahead. The *News* seemed to create some expectation. I suggest the honourable member should contact the *News*, because they seem to know more than I do about the likelihood of the project's proceeding.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I was very pleased to hear the Minister make that comment about the *News*, because I am not very friendly with them either, these days. I do not propose to ask them. I guarantee that, if I could get them before the bar of the House, I would ask some questions. Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs the Minister responsible for the development of the international hotel; if a development was close to finality, would he be the Minister responsible for the building of the hotel, and would he know if something was in the offing?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The answer to all three questions is "No".

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The sum of \$14 823 was paid out last



year in connection with pay-roll tax remissions on the first-year apprentice scheme. Can the Minister say where that amount was paid? Had it anything to do with the payroll tax remissions which I announced in February of this year retrospective to 1 January for an additional intake of first-year apprentices? Does that amount represent new employees taken on under the scheme?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The allocation represents the scheme announced by the Minister, which was a rebate of pay-roll tax. The scheme is taken up after 1 January under our new scheme, because at least 99 per cent of all first-year apprentices are under 20 years of age and therefore are exempt automatically under our scheme from pay-roll tax, provided the number of employees of the company has increased.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I understand that the scheme will be taken into the major scheme, but it has given the new Administration something to build on. As the Minister responsible, I would like to take some credit for its innovation. Can the Minister say how many apprentices were employed after the announcement of the scheme?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No. I compliment the Minister on implementing the scheme. I had been promoting such a policy for two or three years, and I was delighted when the previous Government took up the policy I had been proposing.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Why is there no funding for the Redcliff Petro-Chemical Project Working Committee? Has the Minister any further information on the \$60 000 proposed for the self-employment and group business venture, and on the additional amount of nearly \$70 000 for reimbursement to consultants in connection with the Small Business Advisory Unit?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There is no allocation on this line for the Redcliff Petro-Chemical Project Working Committee; the honourable member sat in this Chamber and approved funds for that committee under a different line. If he was unaware of that, I suggest he should stay awake and pay attention. It was approved under the vote for the Minister of Mines and Energy.

The self-employment and group business venture is an allocation, under the Youth Bureau, for unemployed individuals to try to start their own ventures, thus creating employment for themselves. I believe this programme should have the highest priority of the new Government. Unfortunately, unemployment is caused by insufficient employment opportunities being created by existing companies. I believe there is scope for people to create new demands for services or goods, thus creating new job opportunities. Often this comes back to the individual, who must take the initiative.

I have been impressed with what the Service to Youth Council has done in this area. The council has conducted a programme for some time encouraging unemployed people to acknowledge that there might be a demand for certain services in the community, so that they can purchase small amounts of equipment to supply the service, thus creating jobs. The \$60 000 is being allocated through the Youth Bureau for that purpose. I have spoken to the officer involved, and I think the programme needs to be expanded. I have asked the CITY programme, in addition, to look at how it can strengthen its side of the self-help programmes, encouraging people to employ themselves.

The additional allocation for the Small Business Advisory Unit is mainly in relation to the reimbursement to consultants. During the year 1978-79 the activities of the unit were considerably reduced, and there will be some sort of increase in allocations for consultants, rather than

using the number of staff employed two or three years ago in the department. The unit originally consisted of five or six people, but the number was reduced by the previous Government to three. It is now tending to use consultants rather than departmental officers for that function.

Vote passed.

Public Buildings, \$57 894 000.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** An allocation of \$52 835 is proposed for the office of the Minister, compared to actual payments last year of \$22 927. There is probably a logical explanation, but can the Minister say why this sum has increased by \$30 000?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The increase relates to the change in portfolios under the previous Administration in February last. The allocation of \$22 927 was for less than half a year, whereas the allocation of \$52 835 is for a full year. Does the honourable member understand the point? The staff were transferred from a previous department under the former Administration.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I would like to frame a question that I was not permitted to ask last night in relation to statements made by the Minister about the proposed secondment of Government day labour to contractors. One is very much aware of the philosophical outlook of the present Government, and it is obvious that it will be trying to direct as much work to private enterprise as it can at the expense of the day labour pool. It is a problem that is very worrying to me. Can the Minister outline the details of that scheme; how it will work; whether or not he has been able to reach agreement with the trade union movement, and what is their reaction to the proposals; and, more importantly, whether or not he has sought advice from the Solicitor-General in regard to the protection of rights of those employees who are seconded and who may not be able to work for the new contractor because of incompatibility? What is the legal situation with regard to workmen's compensation, long service leave payments, pro rata annual leave, and all of the credits that a Government employee would have built up over those years?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Upon taking office, the Government had a major problem that it had to come to grips with. It was a problem which the previous Administration had failed to come to grips with, in that there was a large number of surplus weekly paid employees. When this Government took office, without any change in policy it was assessed that there were at least 1 000 surplus weekly paid employees. This situation occurred under the previous Administration, and very little attempt was made by it to overcome the problem or to ensure that those people were usefully, gainfully and efficiently employed to the benefit of this State.

The new Government has tried to tackle the problem in a realistic manner. The first thing we have done is assess where there has been a change in demand for Government services and utilities due to a change in the population growth rate within this State. For example, there is a lessening of demand for sewerage services, for new schools, and for some roads simply because the growth rate of this State has diminished. That has had an impact on the demand for certain day labour services. Therefore, the Government decided that we should look at ensuring that those surplus employees were used in a beneficial way. So, we devised a policy, first to give them an assurance that there would be no retrenchments, and this we have upheld. I think the employees concerned have been very grateful to us as a Government that we have started negotiations on that sort of basis. There have been one or two areas where some clarification has been needed but the Government has given that guarantee. The P.S.A.

has written to me and made public statements about how much it appreciates the stand taken by the Government, despite the pressures placed upon it, to ensure job security.

The next area we dealt with was trying to ensure that people could be transferred from one section to another section of the same department. We have laid down certain guidelines on which that should occur, and we have also looked at ensuring that, if there is a surplus number of employees in a department, people would be transferred to another department or, if possible, to a different instrumentality. So, we have the transfers within departments, between departments, between departments and instrumentalities, or between instrumentality and instrumentality.

The exact basis on which that is to be done has been sent to the Trades and Labor Council. I asked the Acting Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, John Lesses, to come to my office. I handed him a detailed procedure which was to be adopted for those transfers. The former Minister has asked whether I have reached agreement with the trade union movement on that, and the answer is "no", because the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council was at that time overseas, and the council specifically asked whether we would defer negotiations until the Secretary returned. I understand that he will be back in South Australia after 2 November, and negotiations on those transfers will then be able to proceed.

The other area which the Government looked at, which I informed Mr. Lesses that we were looking at and on which no final details had been proposed, was secondment. Again, I stress to the House that the trade union movement was informed, as were the employers, that the Government was simply looking at this area. No firm proposals have been put to either party, and I stress that. That is why I was disappointed when the Trades and Labor Council said that it intended to reject any secondment, when in fact the Government had not had a chance to put any proposal to the Trades and Labor Council on the basis under consideration. I would have thought that was being somewhat unreasonable, in that the proposal was rejected before any proposal had actually been given to the council. I would ask that the Trades and Labor Council reconsider that decision taken on Friday night of last week and at least to have the patience to wait until we have put firm proposals to it. The council can then sit down and discuss with us some of the problems that it might see. I acknowledge that there are obvious problems at present, but we are working on either removing those problems completely or minimising them.

The Deputy Leader has quite rightly raised certain areas of concern. I, too, would be concerned to see that those areas were adequately covered. I would like to give an assurance to the House (because this is such an important area) that we do not intend to allow people to be retrenched by the process of secondment. By secondment we are in fact securing their employment. I must stress that. We are not saying, "we will off-load you on to private contractors who can then turn around and dismiss you." The private contractor will not have the power to do this. The basis on which the person has secure employment will be given both to the employers or contractors and to the United Trades and Labor Council when the details are finalised. We are currently looking at the problems raised by the honourable member. It would be unreasonable for us not to make sure that we have answers to all of these problems before putting forward any proposal.

That is the basis of the Government's policy in this area, and I believe we have taken a very responsible stand that

fully appreciates the human problems involved. Again, I stress that perhaps the public are not aware how bad the problem really is in relation to surplus weekly paid employees. There could be increasing public pressure applied on any Government (as should have been applied under the previous Government) unless that problem is tackled in a meaningful and sensible manner to ensure the best utilisation of those people.

I also stress we have even covered the area of salary or pay maintenance where a person moves from one position to another and there is a slight differential in salary. Depending on the length of service of the person involved, we have guaranteed that his salary will be maintained if he moves from one position to another where there is a slightly lower salary.

I also stress that we are not expecting skilled tradesmen to suddenly become unskilled workers. That would be unreasonable, and I assure members that we are not expecting a person to be downgraded to that extent. We are looking at people moving from one position to a similar position somewhere else and, in taking that into account, we will look at the problems of where the person lives and other transport and industrial problems that might be created. I again make the plea that we are looking forward to the co-operation of employees and the trade unions to assist in this matter. We seek that co-operation in the best possible spirit. It is a difficult problem that needs to be tackled in a responsible and sensible way by members on both sides.

I am somewhat disappointed in the Leader of the Opposition and the way in which he has been trying to make cheap political capital out of this issue, having no idea of what is proposed. He has not even had the courtesy to read the procedure sent to the Trades and Labor Council. If he had read that statement he would not have made the outrageous claims he has made in the press in the past few days. I ask members opposite to appreciate what the Government is trying to do in this area and to cooperate as far as possible.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I am delighted to hear the guarantees given so far by the Minister. To a large degree the policies enunciated by him on behalf of his Government are not far from the policies operated by the last Government.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There was no policy in operation.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** There was a policy of no retrenchment and a policy on transfers.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** There was no transfer policy.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** There was a transfer policy. I did not interrupt you when you were speaking. There was much negotiation with the trade unions about the problems the Government was facing. It all starts and finishes with the no-retrenchment policy. If both Parties have a no-retrenchment policy, we are giving guarantees to workers that they will retain their positions. I believe this Government is taking a humane stand in this regard, and I congratulate it for doing so. In relation to the secondment to contractors policy, if the Government itself is unable to find useful employment for its employees, how does it expect contractors to find useful employment for them, unless it gives up certain areas of Government work that are now being done by day labour, and I believe it would be more expensive to give that work to contractors. That might come; I do not know. More importantly, what happens to an employee who is directed for secondment by the Government and who refuses to take up that secondment?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I am not prepared to talk about the details of the secondment proposal because, as I have already clearly spelt out, these proposals are still

being formulated. I cannot give details which do not yet exist.

The details in relation to transfers from one Government department to another are certainly spelt out in the procedure and, if an employee refuses to co-operate in those transfers (and that is after individual personal consultation with both the union and the employee on the problems involved, not just by way of letter), then that person who has refused to accept any discussion or consideration for transfer within the Government services does face retrenchment. We have been open in that. We have submitted that in a public document that everyone can see.

The other matter which should be covered relates to the situation in which a person might be relocated from one area to another, in other words from the metropolitan area to a country town or vice versa. We have said that such relocation will occur only where the employee involved agrees to it. Where the employee agrees, the Government will pay for the expenses. The other undertaking given by the Government (and I think it is unique and again the sort of step one would hope from a progressive Government) is that the Government is prepared to cover the expense of retraining people where, in taking on a new task, retraining is necessary. We are prepared to ensure that our employees have every possible opportunity to take up some new useful role within either the Government services or a secondment basis with some guarantee of employment.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I thank the honourable Minister for that. I want to seek information in relation to statutory bodies. Has the Government considered the position of employees of statutory bodies, or does the Government intend to have any influence on the day-to-day affairs and the employment conditions of statutory bodies? In my latter days as Minister there were employment problems in the meat works area at Gepps Cross and there was Industrial Court action. The Public Service Association had come to me with a proposition which I was examining just before the election. I had no opportunity to reply to it. Has the Government taken an active interest in determining any policy regarding employment protection in statutory bodies?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Statutory authorities do not come under the Public Buildings Department. However, the same policy does apply to statutory authorities. The Ministers do not have direct control over many statutory authorities, so the best the Ministers can do is simply request statutory authorities to abide by Government policy, and then it is up to the board of that authority whether or not it adheres to that policy.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** My question is in regard to the line on wages and the answer given by the Minister to the Deputy Leader. I was happy to hear the undertaking given by the Minister in respect of secondment procedures because I believe the absence of that knowledge was one of the reasons why there was an adverse reaction from the trade union movement. One of the problems causing concern is a reference in the Minister's document which is standard in awards and which relates to dismissal for malingering, inefficiency, neglect of duty, misconduct or other sufficient causes. One of the fears mentioned to me has been allayed already — that the private contractor could dismiss.

The other fear relates to an old person who had worked for a Government department for many years and was then transferred to a private employer who might expect a higher rate of efficiency or output a day and, in the absence of such output, might then put in a bad work report to the department from which the person was

seconded that could then be used as an instrument of dismissal against the person involved. Could the Minister consider that aspect in the development of any secondment procedures?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Without going into the details of the programme, because I have said I would not, I can assure the honourable member that we are looking at that sort of problem or conflict developing, and we have taken it into account in our discussions and negotiations so far in trying to work out a workable scheme. I appreciate the point raised by the honourable member that there could be old people who, to an outside employer, could be classed as unsatisfactory workers, and the clause read by the honourable member should be considered only in connection with cases of extreme and obvious wilful behaviour by the employee involved. It should not be seen to be an outlet for getting rid of older employees who cannot keep up.

**Mr. O'Neill:** That relates to departmental transfers. I was not implying that that was in your secondment proposal; I wouldn't know.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I make the point that, even under the secondment proposal, we would not use a provision such as this in a harsh and unreasonable manner.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** We are asked to vote an amount of \$25 325 000 for wages. Is it possible for the Minister to say how many staff, and what category of staff, are covered by this line? How many transfers are likely to be necessary to obtain a minimum work force, in accordance with the election promise made by the Premier? The Premier's election promise was:

A minimum work force only in the Public Buildings Department to maintain public buildings and for minor repairs will be retained to ensure that the P.B.D. does not operate to the detriment of the private sector.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I have a list of trades involved. There are probably 70 or 80 classifications involved. The honourable member can be assured that there is a large number of staff including all weekly paid Government employees such as foremen, tradesmen, gardeners, labourers, cement hands, caretakers (because, as Minister of Public Works, I am responsible for the West Terrace cemetery), cleaners, and other services. I cannot give an indication of the number of employees likely to be transferred.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Minister said that when his Party came into Government there were 1 000 day-labourer personnel in the Public Service who were excess to requirements. I understood him to say further that the present Government is trying to do something about that situation. One of the means it is looking at is the seconding of people who work as Public Service day labour to outside industry. I understand that there has been a reduction of some 500 personnel by wastage in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, yet the administrative structure of that department, which was set up to service that labour force and includes personnel officers, people who pay wages, etc., has not changed. What does the Minister intend to do with those public servants who will become supernumeraries as a result of the secondment of day-labour to private enterprise?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I point out to the honourable member that we are really dealing with the Public Buildings Department and not the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Within the context of the Public Buildings Department, it would be quite wrong to assume that, because there might be a 5 to 10 per cent reduction in weekly paid employees, the need for public servants will be reduced by the same proportion. There is an

organisational review looking at the entire function of the Public Buildings Department and at what sorts of role should be carried out by that department. That review is specifically looking at how many public servants will be required and what types of classification will be surplus to need.

**Mr. Wright:** That was set up by me.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I appreciate that; it is continuing under this Government. Until that organisation review is completed, I cannot make any prediction about numbers involved, or types of people involved.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Before coming into office, and since gaining office, members opposite have, on many occasions, been critical of the activities of the Public Buildings Department. There have been clear indications that the activities of the Public Buildings Department will be run down, and that a lot of the work that the Public Buildings Department currently does will be farmed out to private contractors, yet we see that there has been an increase in the vote for the Public Buildings Department for this year of \$5 000 000, a 10 per cent increase. There seems to be some contradiction here. The vote has been increased, yet we are told that there will be a reduction in the work force and a reduction in the work that this department is going to do. Will the Minister explain that contradiction?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** What the honourable member has asked me to do is justify every increase in the vote right down the page, and that is difficult to do. I will highlight some of the areas in which there will be increases. The provision for salaries for existing staff will automatically increase, and that may not be far from accounting for most of the increase that the honourable member has mentioned. There will also be an increase in service and rental cost of Government office accommodation. I think that an increase of \$5 000 000 in an amount of \$57 000 000 is not a substantial increase. I hope that we will be able to make savings on that overall budget.

**Mr. Keneally:** An amount of \$5 000 000 is nearly 10 p.c.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I think that the member has asked such a general question that I cannot go any further. If he is prepared to be more specific, and to put his questions on paper, I will answer them.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I turn to the line dealing with the purchase of office machines and equipment. Members received a letter at their electorate offices some time ago advising that the Public Buildings Department will provide members with an Adler SE 1 000CD electric typewriter. This move will be appreciated by all electorate officers because they will be able to achieve increases in productivity. What worries me is what studies were made before selection of this machine. I understand that Adler is a good brand, and past studies may have proven that. I am concerned about this matter because of an advertisement that appeared in the *Financial Review* which offered incentives for purchase of that particular brand, including that model. It states:

Just lease any of these top quality Adler office machines at the recommended retail prices shown and you get a voucher courtesy of Adler exchangeable for a return flight ticket to Hong Kong on Cathay Pacific.

The advertisement continued, later:

Since the vouchers are transferable, they can be used as incentives to enhance your company's profits. Offered as a staff reward, they can lift sales, raise productivity, increase efficiency, reduce absenteeism. You'll find a dozen ways to use them or, if you're the boss, give yourself a bonus, and take your wife with you.

I am not suggesting that that has always been used as a motive for choosing the Adler, but I would appreciate any

comments the Minister has to make as to why the Adler was chosen and his assurance that that offer has not been taken up by the Public Buildings Department.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I can assure the Committee that I obtained no such incentive, or offer of such incentive, from the Adler company. I have not seen that advertisement. If the honourable member would carefully reread the advertisement, he will see that it mentions leasing rather than purchasing. The Government has purchased the machines. It considered two current types of typewriter on contract to it, namely, the I.B.M. golf ball and the Adler 1000, which was about \$200 cheaper for the Government to purchase. Regarding the overall economies, it may be no more expensive to supply members with an electric typewriter than it was to supply a manual typewriter, because the life we would expect from the new electric typewriter may be three times that of the previous manual ones which, in my experience, had a limited life—mine packed up after 18 months. Based on those estimates, I can assure members that we may save money supplying electric typewriters, I am sure that even the member for Mitcham (who is so critical and who had the hide, despite his claims of reducing Government costs and staffing, to send a letter to the Government requesting additional staff) may find some benefit, if he takes up the offer of an electric typewriter. There are real economies for the Government.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Minister explain in more detail how he proposes to reconstruct the area of public works so that it will be more efficient in the future, taking into account that almost every line in the Estimates has been increased? The only lines to suffer any reduction are "Overseas visits of officers", reduced from \$9 816 in 1978-79 to \$2 000, and "Preliminary investigations on projects not proceeded with", which is reduced considerably.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The main thrust of increasing the efficiency of the department is the organisational review which is currently sitting and which is a three-stage review. I expect the first stage to report to me some time in the new year. It is not for me to set the priorities, but for that organisational review to allocate the main role of the department. That is the key area with which we are concerned. There are incidental ways in which the Government expects to improve efficiency.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Will the Minister consider providing the Opposition with a copy of the report from the organisational review, as the previous Government was responsible for setting up that committee?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I shall consider that when I have the report, but, seeing that the report is still many months away, I certainly could not give such an undertaking now.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Minister explain the large increase proposed for the "Office of Minister"?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** To save embarrassing the honourable member, I point out that we have dealt with that matter in some detail. The previous year's allocation was for only half a year, because of a change in portfolio. The Ministerial office staff was under the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for only five months. As I have dealt with that matter fully, I would hate to become so repetitive, as I have had to become with regard to certain other lines.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Minister obviously has no idea, or will not say why, there has been a 10 per cent increase in funding on public works for this year. He thinks that it has something to do with the increased allocation for possible salary increases. A 10 per cent increase for a department as large as the Public Buildings Department ought to be well known to the responsible Minister. This seems to be a

case in which his departmental officers might have placed before him last year's Budget, plus 10 per cent. That is often the criticism of departments, but I do not believe it is true. Unless he can give a more complete answer, that is a suspicion the Committee could justifiably have.

The Minister and his Government made great play about efficiency in the Public Service, about the reduction of expenditure in the service, and about public works being probably the prime offender regarding lack of efficiency and waste of funds in the service. Yet, we see a 10 per cent increase in the department that the Government has used as an example to the electorate at large. The Minister should be able to tell the Committee why this department has had a 10 per cent overall increase in its funding. It is not good enough for him to say that it has something to do with the allocation of funds for likely increases in wages. He ought to be able to tell us whether that department's activities or employees will be reduced. If that is the case, how does it balance up with the 10 per cent increase in funding?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I am not trying to dodge the honourable member's question. He has included about 15 lines in his question, and asked me to justify the increase in each of them. I could stand here for the next hour and go through item by item stating the reason for the increase. I could start with the "Office of Minister" and explain to the Committee why there has been a \$30 000 increase. I have dealt with that line already. I could move on to "Purchase of office machines and equipment" and point out that one of the reasons for the increase there is that we expect to supply electorate offices with electric typewriters. First, there is an increase in salaries costs for existing positions because of wage increases. Secondly, there were previously unfilled vacancies of professionals within the department; those vacancies were already filled under the previous Government. They are being met under a wage commitment we now have for this entire financial year that was not met last year. That accounts for some of the fairly large increases in salary costs. The third area, namely, maintenance of schools, etc., has been increased substantially from \$10 600 000 to \$11 300 000. They are the main areas of concern. I think that that should answer the honourable member's query.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It does not. Only yesterday the Government put through a group of legislative matters that would reduce State taxation considerably in South Australia. The Government told the people that it would be able to fund the loss of taxation through more efficient services in the Public Service. It was not long ago that the Minister was highly critical of statements that the then Minister of Health made in relation to reduction in expenditure for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Minister said then that there would be a reduction in expenditure on food and on a number of other services, but that it would be taken up in other areas of the hospital.

That suggestion met with heavy criticism from members of the then Opposition. What we have here is exactly the same thing. We have been told that the Government is more efficient, that there will be a reduction in public expenditure, that we have tight and lean government and that the taxpayer's money will not be used unnecessarily. We have had thrown up to us consistently that the Public Buildings Department is a classic example of where these economies will be practised. Yet, at the first opportunity to discuss the funding of this department in the Parliament of South Australia, we find that there is a 10 per cent increase in the sum to be spent this year in that department. The Minister says he is not trying to avoid my question, and I accept that; he just cannot answer the question.

I am not one to promote a reduction in expenditure in that department; that goes against the philosophy that I follow. It is the Minister himself, his Government, and the Party that backs him who have been telling the people of South Australia that this is what they are on about. The facts of the case, as presented to us, indicate that the Minister has either misled the people of South Australia in that allegation or he just does not know what he is on about. He has tried two or three times to answer the question, but he has been particularly unsuccessful. It is a serious question.

There has been a 10 per cent increase in the funding for public works. If we are to have a reduction of State taxes, where is the reduction in public expenditure? Will we finish up bankrupt at the end of this year? This department was to show the people of South Australia how efficient the new Government was, but it has a 10 per cent increase in its allocation. I do not know what percentage of deductions will be involved in State taxes, and there is to be a 10 per cent increase in the expenditure of the State Public Service. I would like to know how the Government will balance its books.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** It is a pity that the honourable member had not spent more time in the Chamber listening to the answers I have already given instead of making phone calls, as he has admitted doing. Regarding the key areas where there has been a rise, I will explain simply (because the explanation has to be simple for the honourable member) that there will be a rise of about \$5 000 000 this year. The honourable member quoted that figure himself earlier. A sum of \$3 600 000 of that rise occurs in salaries. The reason is two-fold: it is partly because we anticipate that there will be some increase in individual wages this year, and partly because there were unfilled vacancies in the previous year that were filled by the previous Government in this financial year. I can go through each individual section and quote just that statement as supplied by the department.

What the honourable member was really advocating in his incredible speech was that I should turn around and retrench people, as he said the Government should not meet these commitments for finance. The commitments were made by the previous Government. I have said the Government has an obligation to honour the commitments, and that is the reason why we have implemented the transfer procedures I mentioned. Having already dealt with \$3 600 000 of the \$5 000 000 increase, I turn to the \$2 000 000 increase. In fact, there were reductions in some areas, particularly in general expenditure. There was an increase of about \$2 000 000 in land and buildings, a substantial part of which occurred in the maintenance of school buildings. If the honourable member is suggesting that I should stop the maintenance of school buildings in his district, I suggest he write a letter to me and I will certainly show that letter to any schools that make an application. Frankly, I do not think that he would be so foolish. I point out that we are talking about an increase of \$5 000 000. I have carefully justified \$5 500 000 of the increase. There was an actual reduction to account for \$500 000 to make sure the books balanced.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Regarding "General", I have a question about the policy of the Liberal Party to appoint a co-ordinator of public works. Does the Minister intend to create that position and to fill it before or after the committee of organisational review reports? I think it is important to understand how much notice the Government intends to take of the review organisation before it attempts to implement the policy enunciated prior to the election.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** That question was answered

by an answer to a Question on Notice given to the House yesterday. I refer the Deputy Leader to that answer.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Can the Minister give any information regarding the future of the construction area, and particularly Demac? Prior to the election, I was concerned that Demac, which served a useful purpose in the public buildings area of schools, might be in trouble. The Demac provision was really an invention of the Public Buildings Department and was used at full strength for some time. Because of the slowing down of the public buildings area, Demac slowly ran into trouble. At that stage, the previous Government was trying to induce departments that needed new buildings to examine the possibility of using Demac, I think with some success. That was about to take place. I have heard that Demac is in trouble now and may be cancelled out completely. Will the Minister give information as to the future of Demac?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** One thing that became obvious to me when I took over the role of Minister of Public Works, about five or six weeks ago, was that the previous Minister had taken none of the tough decisions that should have been taken in the preceding six months. A stack of problems confronted me immediately which, for various reasons, had been deferred by the previous Government. One of those areas to be looked at and reviewed was Demac. I am currently considering the question of Demac. I believe that the Education Department has indicated that, for its use, Demac has lost most, if not all, of the advantage it ever had. Demac is under review at present.

Vote passed.

Education, \$324 750 000.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I point out that it is a feature of this Budget, as it has been a feature of previous Budgets (I have checked this), that there is no separate line for the Minister's staff. This arises, I understand, from the fact that formally the Minister's staff has been employed under the Director-General of Education. I would have thought that for the most part Public Service people in most Ministerial offices would also be employed by the Director-General of the department concerned. For some reason, however, there is no separate line for the Minister's staff.

There has been some talk that the Minister is considering abolishing the concept of a Ministerial office and being serviced by the Director-General. Can the Minister give some assurance whether he intends to maintain the concept of a separate Ministerial office, or otherwise?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not know where the rumour began, but the Minister of Public Works and I will be sharing a press secretary. We have interviewed a number of suitable applicants and advertisements will be appearing in the national press a couple of times, probably on Saturday next, and we will be looking to receive interstate applications. The reason for not having appointed a suitable press secretary so far is that they have been made offers they could not refuse by their previous employers. We are still awaiting that appointment, but we will be sharing someone who will be based not in my office but in the office of the Minister of Public Works. The Government made a calculated decision not to appoint the same number of assistant staff as the previous Government had, and that is part of the basis for sharing.

The Minister of Education will be appointing one other additional staff member. I am still interviewing applicants for the appointment of a Ministerial assistant, and I made a telephone call today regarding that appointment. I will have one-and-a-half Ministerial appointments, and there will be the Minister's personal private secretary, at present

an officer of the Education Department, Clarrie Mills. That position, too, will be advertised with a view to its being filled by one of the applicants in due course. That would be a gazetted advertisement.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I was interested only in the Public Service staff within the Ministerial office. I assumed that any other appointees would be Ministerial appointments. The Minister may have misunderstood me, or perhaps he is considering that the two appointments he mentioned, leaving aside Mr. Mills, will be Public Service appointments.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** They would be Ministerial appointments on a contractual basis, and I believe the salary range will be somewhere in line with the 02, which is about \$19 990, plus the usual percentages for overtime.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The vote for Education is \$324 750 000, to go to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I have perused the document, and each page is headed, "Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs". I cannot find anywhere in the document one cent allocated to the Aboriginal Affairs Department. Is the title "Minister of Aboriginal Affairs" a palliative to the Aboriginal community, or is it a ruse and a sham that we have established a department and not allocated one cent to it? Can the Minister say whether any specific funds have been allocated for Aboriginal Affairs and, if not, why are we confronted with a document stating in heavy type that that is a part of the department's activities?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am sure the honourable member was speaking tongue in cheek; he still has a smile on his face. He must have realised that the Government inherited a Budget, and part of the job in creating a new Ministry is to pull out of all other Ministries the relevant sections and place them under the new Minister's tender care. I inherited the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Unit, which comprises a staff of three: the Co-ordinating Chairman, Mr. Nayda, and Mr. Headland, his secretarial staff, and a typist. They are covered under the "Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous" vote. It is group XX, and I think the allocation is \$67 000 for the maintenance of that unit, office staff salaries and maintenance of the office, which is still adjacent to the Department for Community Welfare. A number of Aboriginal fundings are in Community Welfare, and Aborigines are catered for under Housing, under Health, and other departments. For example, the Aboriginal Heritage would be under Environment. We do not intend to remove all of these units and place them under the Ministry—

**Mr. Keneally:** Which ones are you going to remove?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** We have not removed any. They are all still in the previous units. I have had an allocatory statement from the Minister of Community Welfare giving me control of the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Committee. That essentially is the only move taken so far.

We see the Ministry as essentially one of co-ordination, not only of State but also of Federal activities. We hope to be able to liaise closely at State and Federal levels, mainly to isolate problems in the Aboriginal communities. The Aboriginal community itself has applauded the move to have a separate Ministry, even though it means that the unit is small, because they feel they have someone in Government to respond to them directly. The next 12 months will be largely a time of working out what is best for the Aboriginal people in relation to my Ministry. We are talking quietly to the Aborigines across the State, and we are not rushing things.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I agree with the Minister that Mr. Nayda and his unit did not feel tremendously at ease when they were working in the Deputy for Community

Welfare—not that that reflected on the officers of the Department for Community Welfare, but they did not see themselves as providing necessarily a welfare function. I do not quibble that they are to be transferred to the responsibility of the Education Minister, but I am concerned about some of the issues raised by the Minister. Perhaps I have misunderstood him. Did the Minister say that there was a possibility that housing for Aborigines—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** Order! The line to which the honourable member should be speaking comes under “Miscellaneous, \$29 227 000”, and I ask him to raise these matters under that line.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I seek information on Aboriginal affairs, and it seems that this is a reasonable place to ask for it, because of the Minister’s title. We have had numerous instances of the Government’s having taken the initial document prepared by the former Government, and there are asterisks, crosses, and double asterisks showing how transfers have taken place. Apparently, however, this rearrangement has been given bottom priority and has been given no attention up to the present time, although there has been some understanding, with a magnificent title being made out of it, without any work being done to find out what the co-ordinating role should be.

I think it deserves a better go. We have been told that there is an allocation of \$67 000 under Department for Community Welfare. If the rest of the Budget papers could have been rearranged, as they have been, with various departments going one way or the other, surely it would not have been too much to expect that appropriate commitments for Aboriginal Affairs could have been brought in here.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member for Salisbury’s remarks would be more applicable to the “Miscellaneous” section than to the line now before us.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** I was really commenting on their absence from the executive administration lines. The Minister here is being referred to as the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. It is not a “Miscellaneous” matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the matter the honourable member is discussing does not appear under the vote under discussion, he cannot refer to it. Does the honourable member wish to continue?

**Mr. ARNOLD:** I would want to speak again therefore on the “Miscellaneous” line, because that is another piece of bad tokenism that may be referred to in that line.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Regarding the line that I was speaking about earlier, I think I should give the Minister some assistance in this matter. I spoke about the rumour relating to the possible dismantling of his Ministerial office, and he said he had no idea of the source of this rumour. I can recall an occasion on which six Ministers of Education were present—that was me and my five “linear” predecessors. The occasion was that all of us had been serviced by one man, Mr. Bernie Combe, who was a career public servant who had been in that Ministerial office for many years until his retirement. He was succeeded by a gentleman who was also a career public servant and who was appointed to that position in the normal way and who had to go to appeal in relation to the job. There is nothing sinister in that, in fact, it is merely a further assurance that all the proper Public Service procedures had been undertaken. I am referring to Mr. Bateman, who no doubt would have thought would see in his Public Service career (he is still a young man) the same sort of succession of Ministers. Mr. Bateman has been transferred to a position with the Director of Administration and Finance. I do not want unnecessarily to embarrass the Minister about this matter, because I think decisions may have been taken in other places, but I point out that

people are a little surprised that it has happened. Mr. Bateman is the only public servant who has been transferred, and people have made the assumption that something must be afoot in the Minister’s office that is not afoot in the office of the Minister of Labour and Industry or the office of the Minister of Environment.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not propose to canvass the reasons for the transfer, and certainly not the ruination of the career of the former secretary of the former Minister of Education. Suffice to say that the grounds are incompatibility to some extent and, if the matter is subject to appeal, as I understand the former Minister indicated, then I believe that—

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I was talking about the appeal against his original appointment to me in 1975.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I have no knowledge of that, but I have heard a rumour about an appeal against his present transfer, and I assume that matter would be before the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association. Therefore, I do not propose to canvass the matter in the House. Mr. Bateman has been transferred, but he has been found a position within the Education Department commensurate with his salary and his abilities, and I have no doubt that he will acquit himself well in his new position and that he is quite capable of extending his career quite considerably.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I do not want unnecessarily to prolong this aspect of the debate. I think if I can get some satisfaction from this next question I will be quite happy to move to another part of the line. The Minister’s reference to “incompatibility” disturbs me a little. In fairness to the public servant now under discussion, I invite the Minister to give some assurance to the Committee that in the short time he was served by Mr. Bateman he found him completely trustworthy and satisfactory in the best traditions of the Public Service.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I made it quite clear to the former Secretary that at no time had I questioned his ability. In fact, I concluded after some weeks that he was bending over backwards to assist. Certain comments which he made to me quite early within the first or second day of my taking over the Ministerial portfolio would be known to the former Secretary, so I do not propose to air those comments (as he aired them to me in confidence) in the House.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to “Regional Offices”. I note that the increased allocation on what was spent last year is some \$12 000 or \$13 000. That, given the strains of inflation, is a very modest increase, and it certainly would not take into account inflation. What advice has been given to the Directors of the regional offices to maintain their operations within the Budget provision allocated here? Have they been advised to curtail, for example, staff or administrative expenses? How are they being expected, with an increase of only \$13 000 over actual expenditure for the year 1978-79, to fit their activities into that provision?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The actual increase is more than the honourable member has acknowledged. It is significant that when people compare statistics, they always take actual payments for the previous year and the proposed payments for the current year. We are looking at a voted amount of \$877 000 for the previous year which has been increased to \$1 014 300, and as that contains an automatic increment for salary increases, and as we are already committed not to dismiss or retrench staff, one can assume that the services will be maintained at the present level and that the voted figure should in fact be considerably higher than the few thousand dollars that the honourable member has quoted.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** I accept that advice, but it seems to me that we need some information about why the actual payments last year were much higher than the voted amount. What are these extraneous and unusual circumstances which resulted in that extra money but which will not occur again this year? Otherwise, it would appear that the figure that we are voting this year may well grow to \$1 200 000, in which case the figure that appears here will bear no relevance to any financial details. Can the Minister say why the actual payment last year was that much higher than we voted and that the circumstances that gave rise to that increase will not be happening again this year?

**Mr. BLACKER:** I refer to the line "Research and Planning Directorate" for which \$63 600 has been proposed. I refer to the Rural Education Research Unit, which I believe has been operating at Roseworthy College for the last three or four years. I understand that that has been funded externally and that it has been put to the respective States that such funding should be carried on in a State-by-State basis. Has this State undertaken to fund the Education Research Development Committee or the Rural Education Research Unit, or something similar to that which is presently operating at Roseworthy? If not, can he say whether anything will be done in that area?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** In answer to the member for Salisbury, there is no obvious reason why the figures from last year should have varied considerably, or any reason why they should be considerably higher next year in view of the fact that we are intending to peg the staffs of regional educational offices rather than extend them, so I cannot see that there will be a massive expansion during the current year. There certainly is no obvious reason.

In answer to the member for Flinders, I think the Roseworthy question might better be addressed to the Roseworthy line later on, where we have an allocation of \$114 000. I assume that there may be other questions arising from that line.

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

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I remind the Minister of a statement he made which was reported in the *Teachers' Journal* and which was quoted on page 1 of its most recent issue. The headline is "Minister promises 700 more employed". I seek an indication from the Minister that that is not a net increase in the teaching force, but is roughly the number of teachers he intends to recruit. I think, in the report of his statement further on, he says 600 to 700. I would like it on record that that is the number of teachers the Minister thinks will be recruited.

Will the Minister also give us some idea of his assumption, built into this figure, of the wastage rate from the current staffing establishment.

**Mr. Becker:** You should know.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I will say certain things later which may throw quite a few of the Minister's calculations out of gear. Taking the Minister's own assumptions, I am interested to know what he believes is likely to happen, what is built into this final figure in relation to the resignation rate and other means whereby people leave the teaching force either temporarily or permanently. That information could be given in terms of numbers, in terms of percentage of the total teaching establishment which will waste and have to be replaced, and in terms of that figure compared to last year's figure, whether it is above or below that figure.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The figure of between 600 and 700 new teachers refers to the number of potential staff currently being interviewed. As I said yesterday in

response to a question in this House, there have been about 2 700 applications. I am acting less on my own surmise than on the expert advice given to me by the departmental officers appointed by the former Minister who told me that there should be 600 to 700 new appointments in the 1980 teaching year. We are not in a position to assess accurately the situation. That is the approximate figure that we are working on. To what extent the number of vacancies will be attributable to attrition, resignations, long service leave or retirements, I do not have a precise breakdown. I doubt whether officers of the department will be able to provide that information until late November or early December.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I would like an assurance from the Minister that he will try to get for me whatever information is available. There is no doubt that by far the biggest component in the recruitment figure is what is produced by wastage. That was the case, even in the days that the department was expanding in a way that it is not at present. Since that number is the largest component in the figure, surely the Minister's officers must have some sort of guiding figure to help with this matter.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I will obtain more precise figures for the former Minister. I assure him that the figure of 700 is the more optimistic figure. I think that was seized on by Mr. Gregory as the better figure to relay to the readers of the *Teachers' Journal*.

**Mr. TRAINER:** According to information I have, some high schools are competing with each other for enrolments. As enrolments have decreased, and with teachers wanting to hang on to their jobs, some schools have been advertising for students by putting out glossy brochures. My informant told me that some schools have a head start because they have good printing facilities that enable them to turn out better quality brochures than the other schools. It was suggested that in some cases the schools might employ outside firms to help them promote their image. This is a divergence of school funds that could be put to better use. Does the Minister think that touting for enrolments is a valid area of school expenditure? I ask him to consider the suggestion that it might be better for each regional office to produce one brochure explaining the relevant information applicable to each high school so that schools are not all spending money on this type of advertising.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I would be more worried about the honourable member's allegations were I not aware that zoning restrictions have only recently been removed in this State, and therefore it would be a recent endeavour on the part of schools in South Australia to start canvassing in this way. I think that it has been standard procedure in most secondary schools I have been aware of over the past 16 to 20 years that, almost invariably, towards the end of the year the schools issue some form of prospectus on an informative basis to children moving from one year to the next or from primary school to secondary school. Also, parents would be involved in counselling towards the end of the year. My own children have received a prospectus, not soliciting their transfer from one school to another but of an informative nature, explaining what courses are available and what student counselling will be available on such and such a night for certain classes, and so on.

If these prospectuses were being bandied about on a semi-commercial basis saying "Come to our school instead of your school," I would be worried. One of the purposes of removing zoning was to give people across a district a wider choice of schools to attend instead of having education rubber stamped. This gives the schools the chance to specialise. One school might specialise in Latin



and French, if it had small numbers and needed to boost enrolments. Another school might specialise in some other subjects. This sort of rationalisation is going on, and has been encouraged, but certainly not to the extent that schools should be trying to wean children away from other schools holus bolus, without some specialist reason, namely, having a course that another school does not have. If the honourable member has a specific instance where that sort of canvassing is going on, it is a matter for a regional education office to take up and talk out with the school principals and staff.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** In the article from which I previously quoted it was said that the school purposes grant has been partially restricted. I assume that that means partially restored, and that it was a printing error. I would be interested to see any figures that the Minister can get for the committee relating to the exact effect of this partial restoration on a typical school—whatever school the Minister would like—and to produce figures. In another article the Institute of Teachers was rather critical of the Minister and reminded readers that the Labor Party at the election not only promised to fully restore the school purposes grant but had promised to index it, whereas in the Minister's budget, quite apart from indexation from the new base, the base that I undertook to provide has not been reached, because there has been only partial restoration. I am interested to see whatever figures the Minister can obtain for us about this matter—perhaps at a later date.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There were obviously one or two important decisions to be taken in reframing the Budget. I remind the former Minister that the basis on which he was working ranged from \$322 000 000 at the most pessimistic to \$324 500 000 at the most optimistic.

The new base is \$324 750 000, which is a slight increase. One of the possibilities was that the school equipment grant money could be increased to the pre-1977-78 level. The former Minister had halved the equipment grant last year. The sum total of the grant we are making for school purposes, formerly called the equipment grant, is an addition of \$425 000, which will give an increase of about 70 per cent.

**Dr. Hopgood:** On the reduced figure from last year?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes. It was half last year's, and we will increase it by about 70 per cent.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding private schools, to what does the \$931 000 apply? I note that a further provision is made under "Miscellaneous". I would appreciate information on this matter.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The money allocated to independent schools is based on a formula, with the basic cost per State student as the basic figure. This is variable, and each year it has been increasing. It is an automatic increment.

**Dr. Hopgood:** The member for Salisbury is referring to the line on page 46, not to "Miscellaneous". That is obviously not the Medlin Committee.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the \$931 000 provided for private schools. A further sum is provided under "Miscellaneous". Why are there two separate entries, and what is the explanation for the \$931 000?

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** There are two central components in the "Contingencies" line—what some people in the department call the "escapables" and the "inescapables". The "escapables" are the grants, that you can reduce or not pay. The "inescapables" are the utility costs for power, water, and so on, and that is the area where schools are still resisting a movement to school-based funding. Another report in the *Teachers' Journal* has the President (Mr. Gregory) saying:

Schools will be urged to effect savings in water, fuel and power bills wherever possible.

Can the Minister say whether any particular targets have been set for schools in relation to these savings? If that is so, what specific assistance, if any, will the department give schools in helping them to meet these targets?

I refer to information as to the sort of landscaping appropriate to the school, how often you should water the oval, and that sort of thing. Has any specific assistance been given to the schools, and, in particular, have any specific targets been set for schools?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The target set is a general one, and more specific information will be forwarded to schools in the course of the next few weeks. The overall figure we are hoping to achieve by way of water saving is \$1 000 less than was committed last year. In school telephones, we are hoping to save \$50 000, and in fuel and power \$250 000. In relation to the number of residential conferences, we are hoping to conserve some \$40 000, and by a reduction in the use of motor vehicles throughout the department we hope to save \$50 000.

Reference to landscaping is very relevant in this State, where we are desperately short of water. Most people throughout the State have been advised that a dry garden, with bark, and water-conserving plants, is probably more desirable than lawn. I was told in Perth last week that 40 per cent of that State's water consumption goes on nothing other than domestic lawns; that is a phenomenal amount of water. If people are prepared to pay for it, and it is available, all very well, but in this case we are hoping that there will be that degree of conservation.

We cannot guarantee it, and specific directions will be sent to schools about how they might conserve. We might, for example, put labels over electric light switches saying, "Switch it off," but there is a tendency for people to ignore such notices. This point is relevant to Demac units, where Demac and Samcon were particularly energy consuming, because they had high concrete walls and small windows, and the lights had to be put on in batteries throughout the classrooms. This is all part of the long-term plan; we should all be conscious of saving in all these areas.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** The Minister has indicated that there are specific costings to which he is working. Although it is obvious that no compulsion is involved, there are certain targets which the department has set, and that is desirable. Can the Minister assure me that, if these targets are not set, it will not affect the grants going to schools? I can well see the possibility that Treasury officials may well want to say to the Minister, "Look, if you cannot effect those savings, we want the savings to occur elsewhere," and they will have to occur to the grants. I seek the Minister's assurance that, irrespective of the utility costs and these other savings, nonetheless the grants announced to schools are fixed and will not be reduced in this financial year.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member's assumption is correct. We are hoping that this conservation will be by coercion rather than by compulsion, and that people will have the common sense to realise what we are trying to do. We regard teaching staff as the most important component and, if teachers can conserve funds so that more staff can be provided, it is more strength to their arm.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Under "Management and School Services Directorate", I refer to the provision for the transport of students. In rural areas, school buses are necessary, be they primary, secondary, or area schools, to get students to and from the school each day. When the buses are not required for the purpose of transporting students to and from school, will the Minister consider requests from citizens in those isolated country towns and communities

who may wish to use school buses to provide transport for the aged and for disabled pensioners on certain occasions during that part of the day, that would not conflict with the use of the buses to transport students? There would need to be some qualification about how such a concession to the community would be paid for. One would need to bear in mind whether other public or private transport facilities were available.

The question relates not to those communities that have either public or private transport available now, but rather to those communities (towns like Lameroo, Pinnaroo, Kingston, Keith, Tintinara, Meningie and Tailem Bend) in which there are presently no public or private transport facilities available. Nonetheless, there is a need, since those communities have been established for almost 100 years or longer in some cases. Will the Minister consider any applications along these lines?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** While I would not like to see the Education Department, with its marvellous fleet of buses, competing with the State Transport Authority or even with private enterprise, there may be some cases in isolated communities where under-privileged groups may expect to take advantage of taxpayers' money, and use departmental transport. Rather than make an instant decision, if the honourable member would like to refer any specific case to the Education Department transport section, it will be considered on its merits.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Regarding the transport of students, will the Minister investigate the problem that has been brought to my attention in the West Lakes area where there is inadequate public transport for students at West Lakes Primary School and Semaphore Park Primary School? Will the Minister investigate this matter with a view to providing better transport for those students?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes, I will certainly investigate the complaints. The matter has not been brought to my notice, but it is a condition in rural areas, for example, whether there is, or is not, a transport system, that people living within a certain distance of a school or bus route are expected to transport youngsters at their own expense. If some considerable variation of existing regulations is involved, obviously the decision would have to be State-wide. I will consider the matter along those lines.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding "Publications Working Account—Transfer to Deposit Account", there is no provision proposed for this year. Was it from this line that the publication *Vantage* was financed and, if not, what line financed *Vantage*? Is it proposed that the department will continue publication of that magazine? I would also appreciate any information that the Minister can give about my previous question relating to the provision of \$931 000 to private schools.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The sum of \$931 000 was the salaries component; I confused that with the per capita grants. Regarding the transfer to working account, I am not sure whether this is specifically related to *Vantage*, but the honourable member's surmise that *Vantage* is being discontinued is, I believe, correct. If my information is not correct, I will ensure that correct details are available later. I think that is the case.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** The Minister's statement quoted publicly about funds for long service leave seemed to be almost an open-ended commitment. To conclude the Budget, it has obviously been necessary for the Minister's officers in the Treasury to work on some assumptions. After all, only so many people are eligible for long service leave.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What line?

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** The line "Teaching Staff" does not go into detail.

**Mr. Mathwin:** And you set it up.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Surely the Government of the day is responsible for the general form of Budget papers. I am fully aware of the fact that there is no significantly greater or lesser detail in this Budget than in the Budget introduced by the previous Government.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member should not answer interjections.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I agree that it was not a worthwhile interjection, but I wanted to be fair to the member and give some information. Will the Minister give some idea of what sort of notional figure he is working on? Only so many people would be eligible for long service leave and only a proportion of those would want to take it.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I speak from memory; the last time I looked at this matter was several weeks ago. However, I believe that the former Minister worked on the same basic figure of about \$1 300 000 for the anticipated amount that would be payable in one year. If everyone eligible for long service leave applied, I think that the figure could be doubled, and the Treasurer is still quite prepared to meet that figure, which may be \$2 400 000 or \$2 500 000. The Treasurer is prepared to meet any applications from people who are eligible and who wish to take long service leave during the current financial year.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Regarding the line "Transport of Students", I notice in two lines an increase of just over \$500 000. In many country areas, students are obliged, because of the distance from the school, to actually board a bus before the sun is over the horizon. Because of the increased allocation of \$500 000, is there likely to be any concerted effort to reduce those bus routes, either by making them more direct or by creating express buses so that students in outlying areas will not be obliged to board a bus so early? I raise the issue particularly with regard to the districts in which smaller schools have been closed. In those cases, undertakings were given that adequate bus services would be provided. In many cases, students who are in grade 1 (the students I am most concerned about in this instance) have to board a bus before the sun is above the horizon. The situation is cruel for those children, and that is putting it mildly.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I share the concern of the member for Flinders in this regard. So far, with the availability of funds and buses, the current solutions would seem to be the most practicable. I am well aware of the problems relating to the honourable member's district. I believe that in my own district a certain bus runs for about 50 minutes, with young children staying on that bus for that time both morning and evening. That is a long day away from home for these children. The alternatives at present are that parents take children to and from school; this means two trips each day for parents. The honourable member can be assured that the transport officers are currently investigating a number of routes that are considered particular problem areas. Whether the solutions will be favoured by the honourable member remains to be seen. I know he has had a letter of rejection quite recently from my office; similarly, I have had to sign letters of rejection to myself, so I can say the honourable member is being treated no differently from me.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I refer now to the most serious aspects of the questions I put to the Minister, because this gets to the heart of the Budget and the assumptions that lie within it. I say at the outset that, if my line of reasoning is correct, two rather undesirable things result, which are either that the Minister seems to have been misleading the people recently in relation to what this Budget will do (and I shrink from making that conclusion, knowing the Minister

as I do), or that the Minister and I, within a matter of only a month or two months, have been given conflicting advice about what money will buy in terms of teachers. I shrink from that suggestion, because of the respect that I have not only for the officers of the Education Department but also for officers of the Treasury.

I say very seriously that there must be some decline in the staffing establishment as a result of the money built into this Budget. The Minister has suggested that the Labor Budget would have stood at between \$324 000 000 and \$324 400 000. Obviously, he got that from a docket dated 24 August 1979, when, at that stage of negotiation with Treasury officers, the Budget stood at \$324 442 000. That is obviously the source of information, and that was the correct state of affairs.

If nothing had happened after that time, the Labor Budget would have stood at \$324 442 000. The Minister says that that would mean a reduction of more than 100 in the total staffing establishment. On his own figures, the Minister has received an extra \$350 000. He knows what a teacher costs. It is a matter of long division to work out that that buys an extra, say, 30 teachers. I was going to be more generous on the contingencies, but there is not a great deal of money involved, and I do not see how an extra \$350 000, even if the Minister's assumptions about my hypothetical Budget are correct, could get him into the black on his staffing. Where do the extra teachers come from when he has only an extra \$350 000?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The first figure I quoted was based on his allocation of \$324 000 000, which was low, but better than the \$322 000 000, which scared me when I saw it. The figure of \$324 000 000 would have meant the loss of 160 staff—95 school-based teachers would have been taken out, 25 non-school based-teachers, 40 release-time scholars, and so on. The figure of \$324 515 000 is less than the allocated figure, and was the actual commitment which the Education Department wanted to operate effectively in all schools in South Australia. That is a commitment which the honourable member's own officers were seeking. At that stage, they had been promised \$324 400 000.

The figure of \$324 515 000 would have meant a reduction of 20 school-based teachers across the whole teaching spectrum, and a reduction of 20 release-time scholars who would have been taken out instead of being allowed to take their release-time. The figure of \$324 750 000 means a reduction of 20 school-based teachers. On the first line, the school-based teachers will be brought down by 20. At the same time, we have made allowance for temporary relieving staff, for additional ancillary staff, and we also point out that the amount of money included in non-government schools will contribute towards an increase, not in the Education Department staff, but in the teaching staff outside the State school-based system. In effect, we will have an increase of only 30 teachers in the primary school area.

**Dr. Hopgood:** Are you including non-government schools?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No, this is in the State school system. My officers have assured me that we would see an extra 30 teachers within the primary school system. If there is an error of mathematics, they are in a better position to estimate accurately the cost per teacher than I have been in the last five busy weeks, but I will have the figure re-estimated to find whether there is a gross error of calculation.

**Dr. Hopgood:** I understand that it is difficult to go too closely into the figures, but the increase of 30 in the primary area must be at the expense of the secondary schools. There must be internal shuffling. I am concerned

with the global figures. Let us look at the salaries line. Surely, all those matters the Minister has raised are within the total of \$289 816 000, listed on page 45 as total salaries. I am sure we are dealing with comparable headings, and I was told, as Minister of Education, that to maintain a steady State position within the staffing establishment I had to find \$291 299 000, and the Minister has got \$289 816 000. This is why I say that either there is a reduction in the overall staffing establishment, contrary to what has been said publicly, or the Minister and I have received conflicting sets of advice as to what subventions were necessary to keep the ship on an even keel. That situation should be chased up.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am willing to take out comparative statistics. The only accurate figure I have is the figure for primary, secondary and special school students and staffing from the August 1979 teacher census, and that was 14 555 teachers to 224 525 students. I shall be pleased to take out more recent and accurate statistics.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** It is necessary that I take issue with the public statements of the Minister and the statements he has made this evening about the amount of money accepted by the Labor Cabinet as its subvention to the Education Department. The Minister referred to an earlier figure, which was obviously historical even when he came in, of \$322 543 000. I had a series of discussions with Treasury officials, and with the member for Hartley and the former member for Brighton in their then respective positions as Treasurer and Deputy Premier, because I was alarmed at the effect of the figures.

As a result of those discussions, I was able to get initially \$1 700 000 for long service leave, which would have been built into the Budget as a total figure, and an extra \$500 000, which the Treasury was originally saying we could take up later in the year. It was for 34 teachers who had been employed before 30 June and who were not on the pay-roll up to that point. Also, I got an extra \$600 000 which the department claimed was a clerical error in calculating the moneys which would come from the Commonwealth, the Schools Commission.

Initially, the Treasury officials did not want to give me the benefit of that figure, but it was the figure we got. It gave an additional \$2 800 000. I was still not satisfied, and I went again to the Treasurer and put a case for additional moneys for the Education Department and the Department of Further Education, and as a result of that further meeting, with the then Deputy Premier having been present, and with a senior Treasury official at the other end of the telephone, it was agreed that I should get an extra \$1 900 000, representing \$1 300 000 for the Education Department and \$600 000 for the Department of Further Education. I recall some light-hearted banter about whether it should be a round \$2 000 000, and that banter was at the expense of the Treasury official at the other end of the telephone.

The point is that, if that \$1 300 000 is added into the other figures, you get a final figure which has been agreed at the political level of \$326 634 000. The reason for the extra \$1 300 000 in that total figure was to minimise the reduction which would have to occur in the total staffing establishment. Nobody was pretending that that figure in excess of what the Minister has got would have been sufficient even to maintain the current staffing establishment at its present level. Maybe the Minister is a magician or something like that, but I cannot see how the staffing figure that he is talking about can possibly square with the money that he has been given, given the matters I have previously referred to and, given the fact that I have now revealed what I would have been prepared or allowed to spend, even that would not have reached the staffing levels

that the Minister is talking about.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The former Minister's escalated figures sound most impressive. All I can say is that I am working on three sets of figures which have been provided by his own departmental staff which he of course appointed with all good faith and trust, and the last document says:

Assuming an allocation of \$324 400 000, that is, the figure under negotiation at the time of the election, the following table shows a possible basis of budgeting . . .

It goes on to refer to reducing by 80 teachers, by 10 teachers and by 23 teachers. Obviously, the Minister is another one of those who believes in not letting his left wing know what his right wing is doing, and I suppose the final figure should have been produced at election time to produce a more favourable result for his Party.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I am not interested in the point scoring that took place during the election. I was particularly concerned during the election not to make all sorts of irresponsible promises that I might not have been able to keep. My Party may have suffered as a result of that attitude, but we tried to be responsible. The last thing I would like to say on this subject is that that information was conveyed to departmental officers—the additional \$1 300 000 in the Education Department and the additional \$600 000 in the Department of Further Education.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** During the election campaign the Government promised to have specialist teachers in arts, music, drama, languages, and physical education, and remedial and multi-lingual teachers, appointed within the primary and pre-school field. How many new teachers in these fields will be appointed in the coming year?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** If the honourable member had been listening to the preceding debate, he would have realised that there would be very few additional staff overall appointed to any schools in South Australia. Primary schools are gaining 30. The point which I have to make (and this is for general public comment, of course) is that when this Government took over it was voted into office on the basis of quite a number of promises. These policies were not worked on simply for an election which we felt was going to be called in September this year; we were working on them earlier in the year. They were prepared and in hand, and there were certain promises which seemed to this Government to be much more important than others. For example, if there is a loss rate to South Australia of 1 700 people, that means that families are leaving at quite an alarming rate. That was the net migration rate published in March or April this year.

We decided as a Party that there were certain things that we must do, and among the initial most important incentives were to keep people in South Australia. The promises that we made to stop people going to Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia, where the remissions in stamp duties, gift duties and death duties are given. These were quite soul-searching but very important decisions in that they stabilised the population. One has only to look at the number of people who took their houses off the market and decided to stay in South Australia.

**Dr. Hopgood:** Come on!

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It happened in my electorate. Your head is in the sand if you do not realise that. Business people decided to stay. This Government decided that the first initiative was to pass that legislation, and it has been passed in this House. Other initiatives were taken to get people into industry and commerce and get things moving again; for example, the pay-roll tax incentives have been through the House. Obviously, we

cannot increase income as soon as we get into Government in five weeks. We have to make conscious decisions on what we are to do first—any responsible Government does that. As long as people have confidence in the State and are staying here working, teachers will be assured of work. That is one very important decision, so the fact that we are not increasing the teaching staff by vast numbers immediately should not be held against this Government.

We are conscious of the proposals that we made right across the board in so many directions. We did emphasise that the primary school area is one that we are extremely keen to see develop along different lines probably than were adopted in the past, and this is reflected right across Australia. The "primary means first campaign" was devised in March, April or May this year when it was not known that it was to be aimed at this Government. However, it was very close to our own education policy; we do have common aims, and I am sure the former Government had similar aims. We intend to honour our promises, but we did not say that we would be able to honour every promise as soon as we came into power, so I ask everyone to be a little forbearing.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** I refer to "Contingencies", either secondary or general—my query could come under either one. I refer to the fact that no allowance was made under the former Administration for such things as replacement of equipment, and being involved in the technical education side of the Education Department I know that a number of schools have been suffering from the fact that no allowance was made for replacement of equipment, to the detriment of schools, which had to plead with the former Administration to try to get some funds to upgrade the equipment. Of course, the pleas were to no avail.

A large sum has been expended on new buildings, to the point where this equipment cannot be supplied for these buildings. Can the Minister inform me whether any allowance has been made for the replacement of equipment and, if it has not, whether such allowance will be made in the future?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The equipment grant provided for within this Budget is still a fairly restrictive one in that we are not allowing for the purchase of very much new equipment. We are making allowance for the replacement of equipment in schools, and we would prefer that not too much new equipment be purchased in existing schools during the current year.

**Dr. Hopgood:** This is a school-based decision. If they want to spend it on new equipment, they can do so.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** That is so. If they want to spend it on a telephone call to Adelaide or elsewhere—

**Dr. Hopgood:** No, that's one of the "inescapables"; that is what you still pay for. It is not paid under a grant.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Am I just being too cynical? Apart from that, we have the school supplies grant with provision for increased payments to schools of an extra \$300 000 and foundation grants for the purchase of equipment and curriculum materials in new schools, which we increased by \$239 000 in the present Budget. We are looking after the new schools. We would prefer that the older established schools conserve resources.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I refer to the line "Management and School Services Directorate". A high quality, high capacity photocopying machine, the Xerox 3600, is available to schools, and throughout the department, only on a rental basis. I have reason to suspect that the terms on which this machine is rented are not favourable to the taxpayer. There seems to be a hidden cost in the firm's rental methods. The problem associated with these costs has not apparently come to the notice of the authorities who recommend that this machine be used on a rental

basis, although I understand that competing firms have previously attempted to point out this irregularity. The Xerox 3600 is an excellent machine, but the accounting method involved seems to be loaded against the consumer, particularly if the consumer is a high school. It is available only on a rental basis on copy cost; in other words, there is no rent paid for the machine, *per se*, the user merely pays for the number of copies made, and it is on a sliding scale.

There is a minimum charge of \$175 a month, which in a 10-month year amounts to \$1 750 per annum. Obviously, in order to justify renting one of these machines, a school would have to have a fairly large throughput.

From one copy to six copies, all copies are at the rate of 3·8c each. Between the seventh and fortieth copy the cost is 28c for the whole batch whether there are seven, 30 or 40 copies made, and there is another sliding scale once more than 40 copies are made. If one looks at these figures one sees that between one and six copies a copy costs 3·8c. The seventh copy actually costs 4c, because it is 28c for seven copies. The cost then drops to 2·8c a copy for 10 copies, 1·4c a copy for 20 copies, ·9c per copy for 30 copies, and ·7c per copy for 40 copies. The majority of duplications on a machine of this type in a school would be in batches of less than 40 and in the range of 30 to 35 copies for a class set, and in addition a large number of copies coming from one of these machines would be in two's or three's for use by the staff. Yet the firm concerned approaches schools on the basis that the average cost is ·7c. That is only an ideal amount achieved with the actual run of 40 copies. Schools really do not have the facilities to look at this data supplied by the firm concerned in order to make an accurate assessment of whether it is worth their while getting that particular machine. As I said before, the minimum cost of the machine is about \$1 750 per annum, and the average cost per copy does not work out to ·7c: it is closer to 1c or 1·2c. That is a difference of only perhaps about half a cent per copy, but if there is a minimum charge of \$1 750 that means 175 000 copies a year must be made on the machine. Half a cent per copy on that number is a substantial sum that people do not realise is hidden in the cost factor. Could Education department officers make a more careful study of these sorts of rental/purchase schemes before contracts are entered into?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am quite surprised that a more accurate costing was not done. I had an identical experience in my electorate office when I inquired of the company whether I could purchase a machine and was informed that I could only lease a machine and that there was no provision for purchase. I took out the sort of costing that the honourable member quoted and decided that it was just not profitable. So far as I was concerned. I informed the representative of my decision, and he asked why I did not encourage other Government departments to pool in with me. I was not in that sort of game, and it was my conscious decision, reached after very little calculation, that I could not make the machine pay. I am surprised there is not sufficient financial expertise among school staffs and people who purchase that they have not arrived at the same decision, but I will investigate the matter. I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my notice.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Has the Minister had representations made to him by the member for Fisher about teaching staff at the Adelaide Children's Hospital Special School? I am seeking this information because of an article which appeared in the *News* on 29 January 1979, at page 3, where the member for Fisher was reported as being very critical of the then Government for reducing the number of teaching staff at this school. I think at the time that the teaching staff had been reduced by one. The member for

Fisher, according to Stephen Price, under whose by-line the article was printed, was very critical of the Government and said that he had written to both the Premier and the shadow Minister of Education about this issue. He is reported as follows:

It amazes me that the Government can find moneys for all sorts of inquiries and disadvantaged groups and cannot fund a successful venture like this.

The member for Fisher expressed great concern about the situation that existed at the Adelaide Children's Hospital Special School at that time. Subsequent to the election on 15 September a question was asked in this House of the Minister by the member for Baudin, as follows:

Does the Government intend to increase the teaching staff at the Adelaide Children's Hospital Special School in this financial year? If so, by how many? If not, why not?

The answer received was as follows:

The school staff will be reduced by one from 1980.

I can imagine the sort of reaction that that brought from the member for Fisher, who I am sure has been on the Minister's doorstep. If he has not, it raises the possibility that the member for Fisher might have been trying to make some political capital at the expense of the children who attend this school. If it was a matter of criticism eight or nine months ago when the staff was reduced by one, when the previous Government was in power, it is certainly more than a matter for criticism when that already reduced number (in the honourable member's view) is reduced by an additional teacher. What is the position relating to this special school? Has the Minister received representations from the member for Fisher following those very trenchant statements he made about the previous Government concerning this matter?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes, the member for Fisher did tackle me earlier this year on that subject, as did teaching staff and others associated with the school.

**Dr. Hopgood:** How could they attack you earlier in the year?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** This was at the beginning of the year when the issue was before the Government on a previous occasion. This is not a new issue; it has been going for some time. There were threats of closing the school 18 months or more ago. It is a long-term issue and the staff have been trying to protect themselves.

**Dr. Hopgood:** You used the wrong word; you said they attacked you. Obviously they didn't do that; you weren't the Minister.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I said they "tackled" me. The press release stated that the shadow Minister, the Minister, and others had been approached and had tackled me on the issue. I recall signing a couple of documents recently, one a letter to some outside inquirer about the position. We advised that the reduction of staff would be by one only. The other was the answer to the question asked by the honourable member. Either one or both contained additional information, which the honourable member declined to quote. I discovered that the actual number of youngsters going through the hospital had, fortunately, declined and they tended to stay there for a shorter period, so that the number of teaching hours required had reduced. If that is not so, I will find out. I agreed to the revised situation next year on that basis.

**Mr. TRAINER:** It appears that some companies wishing to install photo-copiers in schools are not accurately quoting the service cost to the school, particularly rural schools. The example I have been given is that of Renmark High School, where the company quoted a service cost, a factor which must be considered by the school. It is not only the cost of the hardware, but also the software and the maintenance that must be considered,

and the school was let down in relation to maintenance. The only information given was that there would be a \$17·80 an hour charge for all mileage incurred, over 50 miles each way. The company would not give an exact quotation, even though it could have given a good estimate, knowing the distance of the school from where the service would be provided.

Also, the company would not say accurately how many services per year would be required. It said "probably about four a year", whereas my informant tells me that the machine would be more likely to involve 10 or 12 services a year, resulting in a substantial difference in operating costs. This information should have been available to the school so that it could have made a good rational decision. Will the Minister take steps to ensure that better access to information on photo-copiers is provided to schools before they decide on one, and tie themselves to what could well be a white elephant?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It is several years now since I was last engaged in teaching in a school but, at that time, the department had an admirable system, in that it had a publication available to all staffs, listing all reputable makes of photo-copiers and other machinery, and undertaking to pay the annual insurance fee against repair and maintenance, provided that the school purchased a certain type of equipment. I took advantage of such a contract (with probably Nashua at that time), and the inbuilt costs of servicing were covered by the insurance policy. If the autonomy that has now devolved on schools permits them to make fairly *ad hoc* decisions on what to purchase, obviously some schools are acting ill-advisedly. I believe that the department's advisory service is such that, for many years, it has been able to tell schools what type of equipment is more reliable, and it is the old maxim of buyer beware, or, if you are not sure of what you are buying, seek expert advice.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I would shrink from the suggestion that the member for Fisher has lost interest in the Adelaide Children's Hospital Special School, since he has been unable to grab any headlines at its expense. The Minister said that the staff at the school would be reduced because fewer children are there. In January, the member for Fisher said:

Patients from both Modbury and Royal Adelaide Hospitals will have access to the school this year.

The reply to the question related only to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and the statement on 29 January 1979 was as follows:

The Adelaide Children's Hospital has opened a psychiatric in-patient adolescent unit for children who stay one month or longer and they, too, will attend the school.

There seems to be some conflict in the information given to Stephen Price, by the member for Fisher, at the time the honourable member was anxious to grab a headline, and the reply given by the Minister to a question asked by the member for Baudin. I would have thought that, now that the matter has been raised, the member for Fisher would want to enter the debate. That is only fitting, as he made statements prior to the election.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must get back to the line.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am right on the line, Sir. He made statements as to the teaching staff and the numbers employed at the Children's Hospital but, subsequent to the election, he seems to have lost interest. He may be able to put me straight, and I hope that he can do so.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I shall have great pleasure in soliciting advice from the member for Fisher; I can see that the new Minister has a lot to learn.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** It seems to me that the moral of the

story is that, with responsibility, comes wisdom. Can the Minister indicate whether there will be any change in the number of release-time scholarships offered this year? Will his Government save money by reducing the number of release-time scholars and, if so, how much will be saved as a result? Finally, will the release-time scholars be on full salary? There has always been a little debate whether a release-time scholar ought to come out of the teaching set-up and to his year of study on 75 per cent or 85 per cent of full salary on the grounds that, after all, he gains some advantage as a result of this year of study that will enable him to get a higher salary because of his higher academic qualification. I am not subscribing to that argument, but it is around the place, and that is why we should check with the Minister from time to time whether he has yielded to these sorts of argument and whether there will be some reduction in payments to release-time scholars, and how much will be saved?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There will be a reduction in the number of release-time scholars. I think I mentioned that we had reduced the number by 20. I noticed that the former comments, on the Budget, for the Labor Party made specific mention about retaining the full salary. So, obviously, it was a question troubling the previous Government, too. I have not made any negotiations about salary reductions at this stage. If there is any rumour about that, I had better get on to my departmental officers and scotch it.

**Mr. EVANS:** It is a long time since I have been sought by the Labor Party to comment, and I am privileged that it has chosen an opportunity such as tonight to do that. When I made the statement to the press on 29 January, it was the result of representations made to me by concerned people in relation to the lack of staff at that time in that institution in this area of special education. Since the present Minister and this Government have been in office, I have had no complaint or representation. So, they must be 100 per cent satisfied that there is sufficient teaching staff at present.

If there is not, I am sure the same person will make representations to me and if that happens, I will make the same representations that I made in the past to the Minister, to the shadow Minister (if the Opposition has a shadow Minister) and to the press. If representations are made to me in the same terms and on the same grounds, I shall be happy to take them up again. I am sure the Minister will look at things in the proper light and the difficulty will not occur.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Regarding the line "Personnel Directorate—Primary", the Minister in response to my question dealing with specialist teachers in art, music, drama, etc., almost gave a second reading explanation on the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill. I got the impression that the appointment of specialist teachers in this area depends on whether there is any response from those people who are living in Queensland, New South Wales or Western Australia and who will be flocking back to South Australia after the abolition of succession duties. That is what the Minister said. The Minister also said that, as a responsible Government (and I recognise that the Government might not be responsible, but that the Minister is responsible), it could not deliver all election promises in one basket straight away. However, the Liberal Party said that specialist teachers are to be appointed. The Minister did not answer my question; he gave a second reading explanation dealing with succession duties. I thought you, Mr. Acting Chairman, in your fair way, would have brought the Minister to order, but you obviously thought he was dealing with the line.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I remind the honourable

member that he is a long way off the line in talking about succession duties.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** No, I am dealing with "Primary" on page 45, regarding a proposed vote of \$109 354 000, an increase of about \$2 500 000. My original question to the Minister was whether this increased sum included the election promise of specialist teachers in art, music, drama, physical education, languages, and remedial and multi-lingual services, and I received no answer. Really, Mr. Chairman, I am on the line.

My question to the Minister is: when will those specialist teachers be appointed? The Minister's first answer to me was that appointment was subject to an inflow of capital into this State as a result of the abolition of succession duties. We deserve a more positive answer about when these specialist teachers will be appointed, because what the Minister is really saying is that, if the abolition of succession duties does not produce an inflow of capital, the election promise of specialist teachers is a broken promise.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member's line of logic is far too obtuse for me; I am in the slow-learners' class. We have 600 or 700 staff to be appointed, most of them fresh from teachers college. If the honourable member had been present in the Education Department and seen the selection panel at work and the list from which applicants were selected, he would have seen the variety of specialist roles. The roles included are physical education, library, art, language, and linguistic teachers. From the beginning of next year, these teachers will be sent to primary schools and often individual schools will request the appointment of a specific teacher. A school may have a library assistant and may want a physical education expert. Oddly enough, few schools have been asking for physical education staff.

There will be, among the new teachers, a wide range of specialist roles. These teachers will fill teaching and specialist positions and will team teach. Not all classes will be reduced to 25, 24 or 21 students (I think the ratio in primary schools will be down to about 21 students this year). Not all classes will be of that size. While one teacher is taking physical education classes, the other teacher will be team teaching another subject. The system depends on the Principal and how he wants to deploy his staff. Specialists will certainly be included in the new staff for this year. I do not think that I said we would have a tremendous influx of money coming back into the State, but I said we will put the brakes on people looking to leave South Australia. South Australians are staying in this State, where we want them.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I return to the issue of photo-copiers. One aspect, which would probably be of interest to the Minister as a former librarian, concerns the recent developments in relation to the new Copyright Act that the Federal Attorney-General introduced to the Senate in June this year. A whole series of amendments attempted to tidy up an untidy Act. Full credit goes to the Federal Government for its attempt. Some complications have resulted from this Act with respect to the actual photo-copying machines. Schools and educational institutions in the past have been among the worst offenders in breaching the Copyright Act, as I think most teachers and educationists would admit if they were honest with themselves.

The new Copyright Act grants certain exemptions from the requirements of the old Copyright Act, but under certain conditions.

One of these conditions that will apply in some cases will obligate the school to institute a register of all multiple copying undertaken in the school. There will have to be a

table or index card system and there will probably have to be a type of cross-index system. Any author wanting to see what has been copied in a particular school can then go to that school, and at the flip of a card, can see how much money is owing to him. There will have to be a list of the date of copying, who in the school authorised it, who carried it out, the number of copies taken of the particular article, extract or book and the details of the work itself—title, author, etc. That is one complication in respect of photo-copying copyright material.

The other complication is that the actual photo-copy itself has to be labelled in some way. Every copy that will come out of the copying machine will have to have information on it to identify clearly who authorised it and carried it out, and when and where it was done. It will have to have something on it to indicate the name of the institution (possibly just the school number), who authorised it within the school and the date on which that copy was made. Unless there is to be an awful lot of note-keeping and scribbling on the copies, this requirement will almost certainly necessitate some sort of modification of the photo-copying machine itself, perhaps a light emitting diode arrangement that would flash at the time the copy was taken, so that a record could be kept on the copy, or possibly some form of label that could be placed each day on the glass platen of the photo-copier. Some brands might be difficult to adapt to this requirement of the Act.

Will the Minister say who will fund these alterations to photo-copying machines in schools in order to meet the requirements of the Copyright Act? Will this be the responsibility of the individual schools, will the responsibility be accepted by the Education Department as a whole, or do we pass the buck back to the Federal Government, since the Copyright Act was introduced by that Government and it is under that Act that this expenditure is necessary?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As a member of the Australian Society of Authors, whose President was initially responsible for lobbying Gough Whitlam into putting the Copyright Bill through the Federal Parliament, and as an associate member of the Library Association, I get much information on this issue. I am not happy about the proposed method of taxing copies in schools and educational institutions. It is extremely clumsy, and will be only as efficient as is the method of policing, which could be expensive. The returns sent in are dependent on the accurate reading of the rev counter at the back of the equipment. I have put to the Federal Government that a much simpler way is that unused empty blank audio cassettes might have a tax of 5c or 10c, and that copying paper might have a tax on the roll or on the machine when it is initially purchased. I think for ongoing costs, probably a simple tax on a roll of paper would suffice. Every copy taken off is thus part of the initial cost of the paper. This would be levied by the company supplying the paper, and part of it would be sent to the Copyright Institute. It would be like collecting an additional value added tax.

I think there are methods far easier than checking every piece of equipment. It would be like the change to the metric system, where having to change every piece of equipment involved a tremendous initial capital cost which could not be recouped to the owner of the machine. I shall be taking up this issue with the Federal Government, and I entered into initial discussions with Senator Carrick last week.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The member for Napier raised a point about what appeared to be broken promises in relation to the employment of teachers. I wonder whether the Minister's cavalier attitude towards election promises

and his willingness to break them has anything to do with the fact that his electorate borders that of the honourable member for Wannan, who, in the area of broken promises, has no peer.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** To what line is the honourable member speaking?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Director of Teaching Staff. The Minister has been asked whether or not the Government will honour its promises in relation to the employment of teaching staff. These promises were important to members of the teaching profession and to the parents of schoolchildren. One of the answers given by the Minister to the original query was that, as a result of the taxation reform Bills that went through the House this week, people who otherwise might have left South Australia will remain, thus helping to consolidate the demand for teachers. The Minister should realise that the people who are allegedly leaving South Australia to retire are not those who are producing the children who will be attending our schools.

A clear commitment has been made, and I do not think it is acceptable for the Minister or his colleagues to say that, when they went to the people with a whole range of promises, these promises were dependent one upon the other and priorities had to be determined, not prior to the election, but afterwards. If the Government is unable to honour the promise, it will dishonour it, without concern for the attitude adopted by the electorate at the time of the election. It is not good enough.

The Minister has not given a reasonable explanation of why he is not prepared to honour these promises or, if he is prepared to honour them, the time table involved. Are these promises to be honoured between now and the next election?

**Mr. Millhouse:** You never know.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** We welcome the member for Mitcham to the Chamber tonight. He has made his interjection, he is in *Hansard*, and now he is on his way. Having supported him in his attempt to be recorded in *Hansard*, I come back to the serious point at issue. Either the Government can honour this promise or it cannot. If it cannot, we should be told why; if it can, we should be told when.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member must know why any Government is unable to honour every promise made at election time. In the event of financial constraint inherited from a previous Government, which was guilty of financial maladministration—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The argument I presented to the member for Napier was double sided. The second side was that pay-roll tax incentives were designed to keep people in South Australia because of employment, and many who left the State were going to the mineral rich States which were prepared to develop their mineral resources. People are not now leaving South Australia in such numbers. Any real estate agent can say how many houses have been taken off the market since the Liberal Government came to power.

**Mr. Keneally:** No-one will buy.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** They would not buy—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable Minister must stop replying to interjections.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** We are placing emphasis on primary education, with a view to reducing teacher-student ratios. Because we have not honoured the promise in its entirety in the first four or five weeks of Government—

**Mr. Keneally:** That's not the point. You told this

Committee that you wouldn't be honouring this promise—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question, and the Minister should not reply to interjections.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** We have made commitments, and we have honoured more than the commitments mentioned tonight. We are looking to 1981 to change the amount of money made available to primary schoolchildren as part of the book allowance. I notice that the member for Baudin intended to bring up a matter in private member's time relating to that issue. We are attempting to redress it. How much of the money should be allocated to physical resources and how much to staffing? Conscious decisions have been made, and we will work towards honouring our promises over the next three years, while we are in Government.

**Mr. PAYNE:** This is the first time I have had occasion to speak of a mind-boggling increase in an amount on which we are being asked to vote. I refer to the Education Facilities Directorate, for which \$67 500 was voted in 1978-79.

The amount actually spent was \$29 521, and the amount proposed is \$375 100. I have not had a lot of experience in this area, but I am concerned about the future of schools located in my area. If in future years there are changes in staffing caused by a change in enrolments at junior primary level during the term of this present Government, I believe that is related to this line. I suspect that the Minister would be relieved to have information before him that will enable him to detail actual expenditure for a change instead of being forced into a position of putting the proposition that, if you are a Liberal Government and you make a number of promises at an election, you do not have to honour them all. When pushed into a corner, this Government puts forward the proposition, "We are fulfilling some promises, so what is wrong with that?" I leave the morals and the ethics of that position to the judgment of the electors. I ask the Minister for any information he may have on this line that will explain the very large—

**Mr. Trainer:** A 1 170 per cent increase.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I thank my colleague—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** Order! The honourable member does not need any assistance from the member for Ascot Park to give a second reading speech on the lines.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I thank you for your approval of the effort I have put forward so far. I am also tempted to say that, in your other capacity in this House, I have not always received your accolades over the years. It seems in this instance that I am actually on the right track. There was a modicum of praise in your direction to the Committee that the member who presently occupies the crease (to coin a phrase) is reasonably capable of taking care of his own efforts. In my declining years I am sure you will forgive me if I seek consolation—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will return to the line.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Actually, there is nothing in the line about declining years, but the increase proposed in that line is of such gargantuan proportions that it might cover almost any topic. Perhaps that increase is to cover the declining years of teachers, or it may be to cover the declining years of the students.

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

**Mr. PAYNE:** I am back on the line "Education Facilities Directorate", which shows a tremendous increase from \$29 521 to a proposed expenditure this year of \$375 100.



Mr. Acting Chairman, I am sure you share with me my concern that the Committee should be asked to approve an increase of that size without much more detailed information on how the taxpayers' money is going to be spent. I ask the Minister to provide that information.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** This question is just rubbish. In other words, the increase is related to waste disposal.

**Mr. Payne:** If you haven't got the answer—

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am giving you the answer. I said it is just rubbish; in fact, it is waste disposal.

**Mr. Payne:** That is offensive.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am not being offensive at all; I am giving the answer. The honourable member is too sensitive. When I saw the increase in the line, I admit that it made my mind boggle. In fact, it was so much of a boggler that when I inquired I found that the majority of the money had simply been transferred from "Curriculum Directorate", which used to handle rental and hire charges. The \$100 000 provision for rental and hire charges applicable to land and facilities was previously under "Curriculum Directorate", and waste disposal (hence the rubbish) relates to costs associated with the removal of waste from schools previously provided under "Curriculum Directorate", the amount being \$202 000. Therefore, \$302 000 in that line has been transferred from another line.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I refer to "Personal Directorate—Primary", with a proposed allocation of \$109 354 000. I am becoming rather confused, as I am sure are members on this side, at the answers we are receiving from the Minister. Earlier I asked a question under this line dealing with specialist teachers, and the Minister stated that teachers would not be appointed straight away because those appointments would be subject to tax reform Bills passed by the House yesterday. However, the Minister felt that these new teachers would be appointed within one year. The member for Stuart pursued this line very effectively, and the Minister then broadened his answer to include the abolition of succession duties, and he even incorporated the mineral energy policy of the Government.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I remind the honourable member that there is nothing about succession duties or minerals in this line, and I ask the honourable member to return to the line.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, with due respect, if you read *Hansard* tomorrow you will see that the Minister, in reply to my earlier question, introduced a second reading speech on succession duties to justify the fact that the Government could appoint specialist teachers.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. I point out to the member for Napier that I have no control over the answers given by Ministers in this House. I ask the honourable member to confine his question to the line to which he is referring and that does not include succession duties or minerals.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Is it the ruling of the Chair that, no matter what material a Minister introduces into the debate, members on this side are unable to comment on it? Do you mean that, if information is sought by members on this side, the Minister can canvass any material he wishes and you are going to prevent members on this side from responding to that material?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I have no control over a Minister's answers. Members may refer to those answers, but they are not to use that as a constant debate in this House.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I will try to

closely follow your ruling on that point of order. In response to my first question on when specialist teachers in art, music, drama, physical education, languages, remedial and multi-lingual areas should be appointed, the Minister said that, as a result of the abolition of the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill and other tax reforms, there would be new appointments within the next financial year. The member for Stuart then pursued that argument.

He talked about broken promises, and the reply the Minister gave was that, as a result of the Government's mineral policies and pay-roll tax, there would be appointments in this field within the life of this Parliament. So, we have had two conflicting answers; the answer to my question was "within the next financial year" and the answer to the member for Stuart's question was "within the life of this Parliament". I ask the Minister whether these specialist teachers will be appointed within the next financial year or within the life of this Parliament.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I can assure the honourable member that there will be several hundred teachers who will be specialists from among the new appointees early next year. I would assume that almost every single one would be a specialist in some way and that these will go into our schools at the beginning of the next calendar year.

*Mr. Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There will certainly be those specialist groups included among the staff. Not every school is going to need a specialist in a specific area, and we said clearly in our policy that we would tackle this on the basis of areas of need first. That is unquestionable, and we were very conscious that there were areas of need, and they are not all situated in Liberal electorates.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the Education Facilities Directorate. It was mentioned to us that some years ago there was a booklet put out about the various photo copiers that were available suggesting the best ones for schools to use. I am concerned about the growing trend of schools in this State to use microfiche equipment and mini computer equipment in their printing process and information storage activities. I am concerned because of the vast variety of equipment that is available in both those areas and the problems that may arise from failure to standardise the equipment used by schools and also the failure to obtain the most cost efficient use of capital resources available to each school. What is being done by the Education Department, first, to inform schools of the most appropriate spending of whatever money they have in the areas of microfiche and mini computers? Secondly, what efforts are being made by the department to train staff in the most efficient use of those facilities? It would be a shame, for example, if large amounts of money were spent on converting school information facilities to microfiche, and the staff were not sufficiently trained to handle the equipment, thereby wasting the capital outlay.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I think the honourable member is unduly concerned if he is worried about staff not being able to handle modern technological equipment. In my experience, all the staff have to do is let the children teach the staff; I have seen children use microfiche with ease. The School Libraries Branch uses it extensively to provide microfiche details of the classifications of tens of thousands of books each year. There is no problem with using the equipment, which is pretty standard. The microfiche equipment that the South Australian Education Department is using is a standard type of equipment. I do not know that there is much cause for concern about the use of the micro computers, either. They tend to get such a hammering, but electronic items are almost

consumables. They are updated quickly. The Wang micro computer is extremely popular within the Education Department; it is a very efficient piece of equipment. Certainly, the question of standardisation (and cost associated with one department not being compatible with another) is of critical importance.

I can say from personal knowledge that we had a number of Shibaden tape recorders which were virtually unserviceable from the outset; half the department got Shibadens and half got Sonys, and only half was satisfied. I will not comment further. Then, the Department of Further Education standardised on Philips colour video equipment. The general Education Department had Sony equipment. There was no compatibility there. One had a horizontal tape—Sony U-matic and the Nivico and the National. On the other hand, the Philips had a one-up-and-one-down type of cassette. Rationalisation can save tens of thousands of dollars and working hours. That is the sort of rationalisation that I will be looking into. I have every faith in Mr. Colin Dunnett, for example, to make the correct decisions on rationalisation.

**Mr. PETERSON:** I ask the Minister for clarification of the provision for the Education Facilities Directorate of \$375 100. Did you say that was for rubbish removal?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I said this was partly for rubbish. Waste disposal accounts for \$202 000, which is the cost of collecting and disposing of waste from schools, formerly under "Curriculum Directorate". It is a transfer from one line to another.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Turning to the matter of new schools being opened, I refer to "Personnel Directorate—primary and secondary". Despite the glowing tribute that was made about an hour ago by the member for Mawson to my powers of recall, I do not have total recall. First, I ask what is the number of new schools that will be opened in 1980. Following that, I ask the Minister to address himself to the general proposition of how many staffing positions will be required in order to staff that number of schools. I realise that it may not be possible for the Minister to give us this specific information immediately.

Also, how many positions in established schools will be freed by declining enrolments in those established schools? Generally, would it not be a fact that the second figure that I have asked for (that is, the number of staffing positions in the new schools) will be greater than the number of staff which will be freed from the older schools from the declining enrolments, given that if you lose four enrolments from a school, you cannot take a teacher from it? There could be 100 schools where that is happening. The second factor would be greater than the third, so would not that further eat into the number of teachers? The Minister says he has got at least 30 additional teachers for primary schools, but I believe he obtained them simply by transfer from the secondary sector. Would that not mean that there will not be any real improvements in the staffing situation? If you want to have the most efficient use of staff, you build schools which have enrolments similar to those at which the member for Mawson recently taught.

They are huge schools with big enrolments, where staff can be deployed all over the place. That is not an effective, although it may be an efficient, way of using staff. Staff is used inefficiently at a two-teacher school which has only 23 children attending it. That gives a marvellous pupil-teacher ratio, although it involves a fairly lavish expenditure on staffing resources. The Minister claims some improvement in staffing generally, but I dispute that. However, if I grant the Minister's argument, would not all of that be taken up with staffing new schools without any real improvement being effected in the old ones?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Essential staff expansions in new schools will be met generally by the redeployment of staff from schools in which numbers have declined. This was an issue to which I referred in Question Time yesterday. Generally, the honourable member's assumption is correct, although my officers tell me that the general primary school teacher-student ratio (not the maximum size of any class) will be down to 20 or 21 next year, which represents some improvement.

The Institute of Teachers, in submissions made to me immediately on my accession to the Ministry, indicated that it was looking in 1980-81 to a maximum primary school class size of 25 students. I assume that we are getting near to their immediate requirement with present staffing in primary schools.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I refer again to the problem that evolved in the Education Department and the Department of Further Education with incompatible video systems: there was a clash between the half-inch Philips system and the three-quarter-inch U-matic system. I hope that the Minister is aware that there is a latent problem in relation to all the new home video recording systems that have come on to the market in the past 18 months. There are several of them, including the V.H.S. system, the half-inch beta system, the various half-inch Philips-type systems, and so on. They constitute a problem because they are incompatible not only with all the institutional machines already in schools but also with each other. What further steps does the Minister intend to take to ensure that taxpayers' money in schools is not consumed on incompatible machinery foisted on to schools by private enterprise?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There are no guarantees that schools that have the power to purchase at their own discretion will always make the right decision. However, I should like to think that recommendations would be made by responsible Government officers to the extent that schools that do not buy machinery that is compatible may not expect to get subsequent help with repair and maintenance, because the sheer cost of looking after a vast assortment of technological equipment and carrying the necessary spares is something with which the department could not cope. This is the sort of problem that exists when one buys something on a one-off basis and then finds that no repair and maintenance service is available within the township, and this really gets schools into trouble. It always has done so, and I suppose that it is this type of *ad hoc* decision made by a staff member who sees an attractive piece of equipment that creates the problem initially. This all stems from a lack of communication with consideration of information that is presented by the department.

**Mr. Payne:** I thought it was called free enterprise, which your Party supported. However, I am open to edification on that.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There is no harm in advising people regarding the most suitable equipment to purchase. One does not have to be mandatory about it. The repair and maintenance aspects must enter into the matter. I suppose that is why most people settle for cars produced by major manufacturers.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I caution the Minister against making an easy assumption that pupil-teacher ratios can be related to class sizes because, although it should follow that when there is an improvement in the pupil-teacher ratio it should be reflected in class sizes, this does not always happen, as other things can be done with the additional teaching resources apart from simply reducing class sizes. Teachers might spend more time out of the classrooms on

preparation and marking, for instance, which are legitimate pursuits for teachers to follow.

In any event, when the Minister reads the *Hansard* proof tomorrow, he will see that I asked for specific information and, if he can supply me with that information, I should indeed be grateful.

I now refer to hourly-paid instructors, to whom the Minister referred earlier. Has there been any reduction in the sum of money that is available for hourly-paid instructors and, if there has, will the Minister say what saving will be effected and how many hourly-paid instructors he is foregoing as a result of the reduction?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** A reduction of about \$40 000 was proposed in relation to some hourly-paid instruction. It would be difficult to say how many instructors were involved, as they would obviously be teaching different numbers of hours. I suppose it could be worked out on an hourly basis. Although I do not know precisely how many people would be involved, it is a \$40 000 reduction, and that could be related to the full-time teaching equivalent.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I refer to the allocation for primary schools under the heading "Personnel Directorate". Before the election, the Liberal Party said that children must be taught "acceptable moral and social values". Obviously, the Minister considers that, under the previous Government, acceptable moral and social values were not being taught in primary schools. Will the proposed vote of \$109 354 000 take into account that existing primary school teachers will have to undertake retraining so that they can teach our children acceptable moral and social values? Also, will the Minister define for the Committee his ideas of "acceptable moral and social values"?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The position of a teacher is unique, in that he is *in loco parentis*. I should like to think that most teachers in South Australian schools are already setting a fine example.

**Mr. Payne:** Of course they are.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thank the honourable member for that interjection. There is no inference in what we said.

**Mr. Payne:** Yes, there is.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No, it was simply a statement of fact. This is a Liberal Party policy, which says that we must teach acceptable moral and social values. It refers not to what anyone else does but to what we think staff must do. Some parents and others criticise the odd person; that is a simple statement of fact.

I would expect teachers acting *in loco parentis* to assume that they are acting for a parent who is of good, average, moral fibre.

**Mr. Payne:** The previous Minister was in the same category, as you are in many areas, beyond reproach. What if he didn't take any account of that?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not object to interjections, but I point out that in the past few weeks I have opened quite a few schools and what I have been particular about doing very early in my addresses has been to acknowledge the work of the previous Minister and his predecessor.

**Mr. Payne:** This has been noted, by the way, in comparison to what some of your colleagues are doing.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I say that in case it is thought that there is any inference that the Liberal Party education policy reflects on the previous Minister. It has also been part of my general statement to schools that I appreciate the example set over the past few years, and that we have not inherited a decrepit system. This does not mean that I do not find faults in some directions. Perhaps these faults will emerge later. I ask all teachers in schools to regard themselves as exemplary. They have a tremendous influence on youngsters. Members only have to recognise

that when their youngsters come home they say "The teacher did this . . ." or "The teacher did that . . ." to realise the lasting impression good teachers have on youngsters. I remember the good teachers that I had, but the bad teachers I do not give the time of day.

**Mr. TRAINER:** Does the Minister's list of new schools include a new Tailem Bend High School? During a grievance debate earlier in the session the member for Mallee made an impassioned plea for a new high school to be built at Tailem Bend. He is asleep now; I assume he is tired from all the driving he has had to do because he does not live in his electorate. I ask this question to enable the honourable member to produce something for his electorate to show that his heart is there, even though he does not live there.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I referred earlier to the amount for "Education Facilities Directorate" increasing from \$29 521 last year to an amount we are asked to approve for the current year of \$375 100. I was pleased to receive some fairly detailed information from the Minister. My submission that it was a mind-boggling increase was confirmed by the Minister, who used the same term when pointing out that, on first perusal, he too found the increase mind-boggling. I have some knowledge of school waste disposal problems that have occurred within and outside of my electorate. Is one contract let for the handling of waste disposal from schools throughout the metropolitan area, or is there a series of local contracts?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am unable to give a precise breakdown of how contracts are let. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Under the line "Curriculum Directorate", I seek the expenditure that is being sought for books to free scholars, data processing charges, equipment, fuel (electricity), fuel (oil), equipment grant (now called the School Purposes Grant, I believe), ground maintenance grant, supplies grant, foundation grant, library books and materials, maintenance of equipment, maintenance of facilities, materials, motor vehicle expenses, postal charges, purchase of motor vehicles, purchase and rental of office machines, water usage, rates, swimming, transport of handicapped children, and travelling expenses. I would appreciate the Minister's getting that detailed information for me at his leisure.

**Mr. McRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Do the lines before us provide for any increase in ancillary staff over all, or will the ancillary staff in new schools, of which we spoke a little while ago, be provided by a reallocation of ancillary staff from existing schools?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There is provision of an additional \$50 000 for ancillary staff. Admittedly, this will only make a small progress towards the Schools Commission target, but at least it will mean we will not be transferring staff from other schools to meet the needs of new schools.

**Mr. TRAINER:** What is meant by the line "Transfer to Deposit Account—Salaries Suspense"?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** This refers to money held in a separate account following the transition of the Education Department salaries payments to the new computerised system. In the event of any staff members needing a cash payment in a matter of emergency, the \$250 000 is held in reserve so that the matter can be handled expeditiously. I move:

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

Motion carried.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** The Minister may have answered my last question in part when he referred to the Schools Commission target. My question was going to be, "Does this Government have a target as to the desirable ratio of ancillary staff to teaching staff in schools and, if so, what is it?" The information I now seek from the Minister is whether the Government accepts the Schools Commission figure as its policy. If so, what is that figure, and how soon does it expect to be able to implement that?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I have not accepted the Schools Commission target as the Liberal Party target. This is one of those problems where one wonders whether to attach more importance to qualified trained teaching staff than to ancillary staff. It is a question to which I will be addressing my personal attention over the next few weeks, and I am not prepared to give a firm policy statement at this stage.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I refer to the line "Curriculum Directorate—General". Is the Minister aware of the project referred to as M.I.R.A.P.H. (Migrographics as a Reading Aid for the Physically Handicapped) that is being partially funded from Curriculum Directorate? How much has been allocated for this worthwhile project, which seeks to provide assistance for many of those in the community who are unable to share the written world either because they have defective vision or because they lack controls which would enable them to hold a book, for example, cerebral palsy?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am totally unaware of what amount, if any, has been allocated towards that specific project. I have seen it in operation and it is not something that I have addressed my mind to at all, although I will.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Members would be aware that manpower planning is something which the previous Government, through the Public Service Board, pursued for some years. I would imagine that something like that policy continues. That being so, the Minister would have a ceiling for his Public Service staff, and I would imagine that that is reduced from last year and that that will have to be taken up by wastage. Is the Minister able to indicate to the Committee by how many his Public Service establishment will have to waste this year? Also, how much money is saved as a result of that wastage?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The general target within the Government for saving by attrition in the Public Service was 3 per cent. The Education Department, the Police Department and I believe one other department were to be treated slightly differently. To the best of my knowledge, very few Public Service staff will be lost. There is a reduction of only five or six envisaged in a report which I received from my Director-General.

Vote passed.

Further Education, \$43 252 000.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I direct the Minister's attention to the total vote for the Department of Further Education. The Minister has previously referred to what his understanding was of the configurations of a Labor Budget for the Education Department. I assume therefore that he has certain information as to the Department of Further Education as well. If we go back to the date that I mentioned earlier, which is obviously the document which has formed the basis of the Minister's information to the Education Department, would he agree that that document illustrates that the Labor vote was also to be \$43 252 000? If the Minister accepts my earlier contention that there was a later decision taken at a political level and communicated to the department that an additional \$600 000 would be set aside for the Department of Further Education, is he prepared to concede that the Labor Budget would have provided \$43 852 000 for the Department of Further Education?

It has been remarked around the place that the Department of Further Education feels let down by the Minister. That is unfair. The people who have let down the Department of Further Education are the Minister's colleagues. I find it extraordinary that nobody in the department said to the Minister at some stage, "Hey, Hoppy was going to give us an extra \$600 000," and that he did not go to Cabinet and say that that amount was proposed by the A.L.P. and that therefore the Liberal Party should do the same. It is obvious that, if that scenario is true, at that stage he was rolled by his colleagues in Cabinet. There is no doubt that that information was given to the officers of the Department of Further Education. I do not recall at the time, because he had some ill health, whether it was communicated to Mr. Kloeden or to his Deputy Director-General, Mr. Sando. It was immediately communicated as soon as I got back into the building after my meeting with the then Treasurer.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not have the documents to which the honourable member refers. My information was by manuscript and I simply have the education Budget. I am well aware that the actual sum allocated by the present Government was \$500 000 less than was required by the Department of Further Education.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The sum of \$846 000 is allocated to the Adult Migrant Education Programme under salaries and wages and contingencies, with an asterisk stating, "Previously provided under other Department of Further Education lines". That money has come from somewhere else in the Department of Further Education. Can the Minister say what lines it came from so that I can put the other lines in better perspective?

**Mr. PAYNE:** The Minister has been putting forward a proper personage tonight. When he has not had the information, he has clearly said so. There has been no criticism from the Opposition of the Minister on that basis. We expect *bona fides* as distinct from baloney. He has lost nothing by being genuine in this matter. "Services rendered by Education Department" conjures up a wide range of activity. The sum involved is \$552 000. I have an adult friend who has become blind and who has great difficulty in reading. Just before the election, he drew to my attention the fact that the transcription of books on to tapes so that they are available on play-back facility for the blind, as described to me, occurs only in Tasmania in relation to what might be described as contemporary literature. I suspect that the line I have chosen may not be the correct one but, because of the paucity of information in the lines, I think that the Minister would agree that the line I have chosen is a somewhat general one.

Will he examine the matter I have raised as to whether, through the Department of Further Education, he is able to instigate some inquiry into this matter? The number of books being read on to tape at present is limited, this activity being carried out only in Tasmania, thus causing difficulties in delivery to the mainland. Is this not a worthwhile activity for the Department of Further Education to pursue under the line I have chosen?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The answer to the previous question regarding the Commonwealth funded programme for adult migrant education, \$756 000, is that it was previously included in "Lecturing, administrative and ancillary staff, item 2", and a corresponding decrease has occurred in that line to compensate for the increase in the new line.

Regarding the provision of taped material for the blind, I am conscious of the need for this, but I do not envisage that the Education Department or the Department of Further Education would be responsible. I put on to audio tape the entire Criminal Law Consolidation Amendment

Act for a student of mine who became blind, and who subsequently passed law. It was a time-consuming labour of love. People who benefit from this sort of thing are extremely grateful. I will investigate the question more deeply and give the honourable member a reply.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** For the Wardang Island project, last year's Budget voted \$164 000, and \$160 000 was spent. The total allocation now is \$150 000. Last year, the split was almost equal between the salaries component and the contingencies component, whereas this year the split is \$113 000 for salaries and wages and only \$37 000 for contingencies. Obviously, there has been a reallocation of priorities in those two lines. Why has that taken place?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The project is one which the former Minister would have had under review and which I certainly have had under review. One of the major questions I am addressing myself to as both Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister of Education is the question whether the scheme has achieved what it originally set out to do, namely, give the natives at Point Pearce sufficient self-determination and administrative ability to make them want to take over the scheme and run it for themselves. There seems to be some community resistance to that idea. I do not think that there is the skill at the moment. One thing I will be doing soon is to have a look at the project and discuss with the people there precisely what they would like to do. Then we will be deciding the long-term future of the project. It will not be an easy decision to arrive at, and the differentia in the allocations in the lines are probably partly the result of some foreshadowed decisions by the previous Government.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Is that extra salaries component either for an increased number in the staff employed at the project or an upgrading of the staff there to cater for the difficulties they may be facing?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** According to my information, the actual payments made during 1978-79 were below the vote, because of delays in appointing staff.

**Mr. BECKER:** At page 83 of the Auditor-General's Report, we are informed that, in March 1979, Cabinet approved of the establishment of a working party to review the Wardang Island project and to report to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Community Welfare. Will the Minister obtain information for me on whether that report has been prepared and whether it has been presented to the previous Minister of Education and Minister of Community Welfare? If it has not, could he advise what stage the working party has reached?

**Mr. PAYNE:** Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I will undertake to obtain the information and pass it on to the member for Hanson.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I seek information regarding "Transfer to Deposit Account", for which the provision is \$50 000.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Regarding the line "Adult Migrant Education Programme" under the "Contingencies" heading, \$90 000 is proposed for this year. From the look of the subscript on the page, I take it that this line was previously distributed over several lines. I also refer to the line "Salaries and wages and related payments—Adult Migrant Education Programme", under which a sum of \$756 000 is proposed for this year. There is no basis of comparison with the last financial year, because there was obviously not a consolidated entry. Has the Minister available immediately a consolidation as to what was spent under these two lines last year and, if not, will he obtain it? Secondly, is the Minister in a position to say whether these

sums and the corresponding sums last year in fact make up the total sum to be expended on the programme? Do those sums include the Commonwealth Government subvention to the State through the TAFE council or are they purely the State component of the amount that will be spent?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not have comparative statistics or the itemised information that the member for Baudin seeks, but I undertake to obtain that information for him. In response to the question by the member for Salisbury, the provision of \$50 000 in the working deposits account is to provide for manual (that is urgent) salaries, in the event of the computerised pay system not being able to provide those as requested.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding the line "Lecturing, Administrative and Ancillary Staff", can the Minister provide any information about the hourly rate of pay for part-time lecturers and the increases that are anticipated in the coming 12 months?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No, I do not have that precise information. The only hourly paid matters that have recently been before me have related to specific issues like language instruction. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am not sure how the Department of Further Education works regarding the employment of part-time lecturers. Does the department pay lecturers for preparation time? In other words, does it pay higher amounts for courses that require greater preparation time and less in regard to courses that require less preparation time?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am not sure about the precise manner in which hourly paid lecturers rates are broken down, I know, from personal experience (because I have talked to hourly paid staff) that those staff members believe that they are more productive than their full-time equivalents, because they say they are paid for what they do rather than for what they do at home. I will obtain the break-down for the honourable member.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Regarding the line "Services Rendered by Education Department", \$552 000 is proposed for this year. In relation to the use of Education Department facilities for Department of Further Education classes, what pressure exists on the Minister at present to have people involved in these classes pay an additional sum for the use of the facilities? It was difficult for me to know whether I should raise this matter under the previous vote or under this vote, but I hope I will not be ruled out of order.

Schools concerned about rising costs in recent times have looked at the fact that they play host to D.F.E. classes and also W.E.A. classes. These schools are aware of the resultant increased costs for power and even cleaning from time to time. There has been some pressure that schools themselves should be able to charge for the hire of facilities. If that was the case, there would be some pressure on the D.F.E. and on the fees that have to be charged for courses. I would appreciate some indication from the Minister as to the current state of play.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** So far, this issue has not been raised with me, although it has been raised by schools as to when the Minister will gazette a new scale of charges for the hire of school premises, grounds and classrooms. This information is probably relevant to the question, although it has not been directly related to the Department of Further Education. The honourable member pointed out that the W.E.A. would probably be among the casualties. In fact, that institution has approached me and has said that some schools have asked it to contribute a higher rental charge for school classrooms.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding the line "Services

rendered by the Education Department", can the Minister say whether the sum proposed will be paid entirely to the school councils concerned or whether it is paid into Education Department revenue? Can the Minister also say whether the rates differ between schools, depending on the type of facility offered, to the extent that an open space school would command higher rates than would an older traditional style school?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I do not know the break-down from school to school. As I understand the situation some schools charge and others do not. The only assurance I have been given by my officers is that this is an annual charge rendered on the Department of Further Education by the Education Department for the use of facilities and administration functions carried out. The sum is negotiable and will not alter for 1979-80.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** So that sum goes to Education Department revenue, and not the school's revenue. Regarding the line "Colleges and branches—Equipment, materials, services, general education expenses and cost of operation", \$6 041 000 was voted for 1978-79; \$5 332 000 is proposed for this year. How is that sum allocated between the various branches of the Department of Further Education? Is the sum determined by the enrolment figures for last year, partly on a needs basis, on the areas that the different colleges service, or, on the number and variety of courses? What formula has been devised to divide the sum between various branches of the Department of Further Education?

**Mr. McRAE:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The reduction in the line relating to colleges and branches, equipment, material, and so on, is somewhat misleading. It is due partly to a change in debiting procedures, because the rental of premises, as seen in the line relating to administration expenses, increased considerably the 1978-79 allocation, and therefore a decrease is reflected in the sums for colleges and branches. Some of that rental procedure has been transferred to the first line. Also, the Adult Migrant Education programme formerly appeared in the line, so the difference is nowhere near as great as it seems.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** Can the Minister say what is happening in relation to fees for the stream six courses? The Government of which I was part increased these fees on a couple of occasions, and the time must be getting near for a further increase. Can the Minister give any information on prospective fee increases? Is it likely that there will be increases in the next 12 months?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** A decision has been arrived at, and the Department of Further Education has been notified that its submission regarding increases was approved by Cabinet some two weeks ago. The new charges, from memory, will be of the order of 92 cents an hour, an increase of 17½ per cent.

Vote passed.

Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$29 227 000.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** A sum of \$10 270 000 is proposed for *per capita* grants to independent schools. I have always been puzzled as to why this is still referred to as a *per capita* grant, since only a minuscule portion is disbursed through the schools as a *per capita* grant, and by far the greater amount is disbursed by the Medlin Committee, the successor to the Cook Committee, on a needs basis, worked out by them and recommended to the Minister. I have never been sure why Treasury officers continue to insist on calling this a *per capita* grant, since it has not been that *in toto* since about 1970. If I put that on the record,

perhaps someone will do something about it. It is an anachronism.

I will concede that at one point in the whole of these three votes the Minister has outbid me, and that is in relation to this line. The Labor Government made it quite clear before the election that its subvention to non-government schools in its Budget would be \$9 997 000, and the Minister has found an additional \$300 000 to go to non-government schools. In all of the non-implementation of promises that has gone on, and in all the confusion about how many teachers he will be able to employ in terms of the money available, he can make one point, and that is that he promised to give more money to independent schools, and that he has done.

What is the basis upon which this additional money is being made available? Will it be made available to non-government schools on the old pre-Dunstan and pre-Hudson *per capita* basis? Will it be given to the Medlin Committee to disburse as part of its total bucket of funds? Will it be devoted to some specific purpose of need in the schools which lies outside of the normal matters which the Medlin Committee examines?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The additional allocation was a relatively small step along the road we promised to travel when we said that the allocation by the Liberal Party towards non-government schools would be increased to 25 per cent on the cost *per capita* of State Government school education, and it represents less than a 1 per cent increase. It was a token, a small incremental step. We have not decided how many increments we will take before we arrive at the 25 per cent. As the cost of educating the State school student increases with the decrease in the teacher-student ratios, so the amount of money allocated towards non-government schools automatically rises, and this is quite a dramatic increase, so the overall picture will be examined in the course of the next 12 months.

I heard the member for Baudin comment that the method of allocation of funds on a needs basis by the now Medlin Committee was one which he favoured and he spoke strongly at Cabra a couple of years ago, in an extensive debate, against any alternative system. With that in mind, I do not feel too badly that we should permit that body, at least for the present year, to allocate funds on what it assures me would be a needs basis, with an initial grant having already been paid to the schools in the pre-Christmas period, and subsequent topping-up grants being allocated on a needs basis. I shall be watching the situation, because I appreciate that the honourable member himself was interested in making sure that non-government schools were catered for more if they were in need than if they were affluent.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** The Minister said he is not sure of the number of steps that will be taken to reach 25 per cent, but I assume it will be no more than three steps. The commitment at the election was to 25 per cent and the Government, at the very worst, would have to get to that figure in the Budget two years hence. Perhaps we should have some assurance on that matter and also that what the Minister has told us about the effect of the slow decline of enrolments in Government schools and some build-up of enrolments in secondary schools will not be used as a qualification to water down the commitment that the Government has made.

I should like, too, an absolute assurance that the present system under which the Medlin Committee works will not be altered or, if it is altered, that it would be in the direction of a more steeply graduated needs basis rather than a less steeply graduated needs basis, given that the Minister's colleagues in Canberra, through the Schools Commission, fund on a far more steeply graduated needs

basis than does this Government or than did the one of which the honourable member was a part.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am certainly conscious of the need to look after the needy; that has been part of the Liberal Party's education platform and we certainly would not want a dilution of the present system. As to the question of incremental steps, I point out that the Medlin Committee was anxious that the whole of the 25 per cent be granted in the first year. For that reason I expressed considerable reservation about our ability to do that.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I refer to the matter that I raised prior to the dinner adjournment concerning the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Last year \$178 000 was paid on behalf of Roseworthy, and this year \$140 000 is proposed. I believe that the Education Research Development Committee has been operating at Roseworthy since 1976. That committee was initially funded through a Federal grant and then through ongoing grants, but now the effectiveness of that committee has apparently run out. There is an urgent need to continue that type of committee to deal with education in, and to research the needs of, rural areas. What State funding has been provided for this type of research, and is any expenditure allowed in other lines to cater for it? Last year \$498 298 was paid under the line "South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research", but this year only \$40 000 is proposed and that reduction in expenditure is of some concern. Obviously, that programme is also being phased out. Can the Minister give me any information on these two lines?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thought I had almost every statistic available from Roseworthy, but that one appears to have eluded me. I will obtain a report for the honourable member. The operation of various projects at Roseworthy is currently under extensive review by the College Council following a Treasury report, and I will have something to say about this matter in the next week or two. I am not making any further statement at this juncture, because a report was prepared at the request of the previous Government, and as yet Roseworthy College has not had an opportunity to give a comprehensive response to that report, as it is entitled to do before any decisions are arrived at. Roseworthy College is having a College Council meeting next week, and I anticipate that some action will be taken following that meeting.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I was not reflecting on the amount proposed for Roseworthy College itself. The Education Research Development Committee is operating as an adjunct to Roseworthy at this time: it is not necessarily a part of the institution but just happens to be there. I am concerned that such a scheme, be it at Roseworthy or elsewhere, should continue in South Australia.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Earlier in this debate I wanted to canvass some issues relating to the Minister's area of responsibility dealing with Aboriginal affairs. It was quite rightly pointed out by the Chairman that I would be able to discuss these matters under the "Miscellaneous" line, and I now take advantage of that ruling, appreciating the opportunity members have to canvass these issues at greater length under this line. The first line involved is "Aboriginal Education Foundation" with a proposed expenditure of \$8 400, which is a minor increase on the \$8 000 proposed last year.

I recall being present in this Chamber when the Minister of Agriculture described Aboriginal people in South Australia as a "lazy and dirty lot". Is that attitude reflected in this line? Can the Minister of Education assure members that the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture toward a very important section of our community whom he describes as a "dirty and lazy lot" is not the Government's attitude to these people?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It is that sort of remark that highlights the great difference between members on this side and members opposite. The honourable member is the only person over the last two years whom I can recall having raised this subject. I am particularly delighted to note that wherever I travel among the Aboriginal community not a single one has made any reference at any stage to that particular incident. They are a very gentle and polite group of people, and to raise an issue such as this does not do the honourable member much credit.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I suggest that I am much closer to the Aboriginal community than is the Minister. Having lived much closer to Aborigines, I know them very well, and I can assure the Minister that members of the Aboriginal community in South Australia were greatly offended by this remark, from which the Minister has not dissociated himself and the Government. If the remark had been made privately or personally outside this House in another context, I would not raise the matter, but it was made deliberately in this Chamber. Because the honourable member who made the remark has risen to that very important level of Minister in the South Australian Government, it is the Government's responsibility either to say that the attitudes of the Minister are expressed in its policies on Aboriginal people or to dissociate itself from the comment.

The Minister of Agriculture, who is now present, may well wish to retract the statement he made here not very many years ago. I have raised this matter because I find those comments very offensive, and they have never been retracted, as they should have been, particularly now that the member for Alexandra is a member of the Cabinet. Unless those comments are retracted, I will continue to raise the matter, because they indicate a state of mind that is racist. I would hope that the Minister's attitudes towards Aboriginal people would generally be the same as my own. I believe that Aborigines are people, and—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member should speak to the line. The line has nothing to do with attitudes.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance on this matter. All lines in the Budget estimates must reflect an attitude of support or non-support. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I will not query the Minister's attitudes towards Aboriginal people, but I want a clear indication about the Government's views on these people, having regard to the attitude of one of the senior members of that Government.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** This whole tirade from the honourable member is one of the most demeaning outbursts that I have heard in this Chamber.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will listen to the Minister.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Over the past four years there is only one action that I have taken in the Chamber that I believe I should not have taken. On the very evening in question, I defended Aborigines with a lengthy outburst. At the same time, I was silly enough to point out that the member for Alexandra had one attitude towards Aborigines from this side of the Chamber and that he had a counter attitude outside in the corridors.

I think it is worth repeating because he is bringing up a rather objectionable topic, something that does not do him any credit at all. It is one thing that has stuck in my mind for about four years. If that is the sort of tactic he is going to bring up with regard to Aboriginal affairs, then I suggest that he would be better not to come into this House with that manner of speech. I make it quite clear that as recently as yesterday I went to the Aboriginal

college and spoke to the students there. Then I went to open an exhibition of Aboriginal missionary works and art works in Way Hall. I made it quite clear then that I did not blame the honourable member on this side of the House for the problems that the Aborigines were facing; in fact, I attributed it to a message from a great man of over 200 years ago, none other than Charles Darwin, who said that the Aborigines were little better than the Tierra del Fuegians, at the tip of South America, where the natives there were of the lowest order. He compared them to our Aborigines, with their complex syntax, with their complex musical system, with their multi-lingual abilities (they are able to speak across both sides of the boundaries of each of their localities—they generally speak several languages) and the fact that they were so bright, yet Charles Darwin said that they were the lowest of the low, ignoring the fact that we are all *homo sapiens* with the same intellect and physical capacities. If the honourable member is looking for an opinion, I would say that we have over 200 years of history that we have to redress. I made it quite clear to the Aboriginal people that the Liberal Government (as the Labor Government did) will respect them for what they are; not as political entities, but simply as people. The sooner we all start to get on with one another simply as people, I think the better off we will be. That is the simple message that I gave to the Aborigines.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I accept a great deal of what the Minister has just said but, as my integrity has been impugned, I would like to put the record straight. The comment to which the Minister refers was a comment that I made to him one day early in his Parliamentary career, that tolerance was a matter of geography. One can be very tolerant of a difficult housing situation at Port Augusta if one lives in Adelaide. I have said that to Aborigines. I am able to say those things to Aborigines because I have no guilt complex at all. I am able to speak to Aborigines in my district in the same way as I would speak to anyone else. That is the attitude that I adopted then and I adopt now. I feel sorry for people who have to put up with difficult social circumstances because they are living alongside a particularly bad family, whether it be Aboriginal or not. Tolerance is a matter of geography. The Minister was not prepared to say that to the House, but I have said it, so that people here who might have thought that I said something terrible about Aborigines can be assured about what it was I said. I do not reflect upon the Minister. His attitudes are clear, and I respect them. He wishes to ignore what his colleague has said, and I will do so in future.

Earlier, we were wondering why we now have a new Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs. The Minister pointed out that the funding for Aboriginal programmes was included under a variety of different departments, and it was not the new department's intention to congregate this funding under one department, although his new department would act in a co-ordinating role and would try to ensure that funding for the Aboriginal community was spent in the best possible way. I wonder about the ethics, on the State level at least, of differentiating between members of our society. The member for Mallee made this point the other night. He tended to say that it was apartheid, although I am not as extreme as that. I believe there is a very good argument on the Federal level for a Department for Aboriginal Affairs, because at that level they have responsibility for providing funds for the various programmes that are required for Aborigines in Australia. I raised my original query because I felt that this new Ministry was window-dressing. Indeed, my original thoughts have been supported by the fact that there is no funding for Aboriginal affairs at all, except for \$8 400 for the Aboriginal Education Foundation, allocated in the

Minister's department. Can he expound further on this matter?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member may realise that for the last three or four years I have enjoyed the shadow portfolio of Aboriginal Affairs as well as the portfolio of Education. We have entered into a very pleasant relationship with Aborigines across the State on the basis that they could communicate with the Premier or we me on any issue that was troubling them. The former Minister in the Labor Government who was responsible for Aboriginal affairs also gave consideration to any requests that we put forward. I think we had a mutual and reasonable understanding of the situation. It was a very carefully considered decision on the part of this Government to establish a portfolio for Aboriginal Affairs, partly on the basis that when we came to Government the idea was welcomed by the broad cross-section of the Aboriginal community who had enjoyed the quiet confidence and who therefore welcomed the chance of having a Ministry of their own. Without speaking in any deprecatory way about the work of the Community Welfare Department, the Aboriginal people felt that being tacked on to the Community Welfare Department was something of a handout syndrome. Therefore, they felt that to be removed from the department physically and to have a person to whom they could relate in Government was a forward step. From the comments I have heard from the communities, if we achieve nothing more than that, I think we have done reasonably well. Obviously that was the least of our aims; it was a bonus. What we really intended to do was to divorce the Aboriginal consultative body from the Community Welfare Department physically. If they wish to move into the Education Department building, they are welcome to do so. We will use the co-ordinating committee to pinpoint areas of need.

The honourable member said he felt that to discriminate racially between sections of the community was not on. We agreed, and one of the decisions which we made was that health, community welfare, housing, and other aspects of Aboriginal life should continue to be dealt with as they are normally within normal Governmental procedure. However, in view of the fact that the Aboriginal community, like other ethnic and minority groups in South Australia, is under-privileged, and the fact that we have a Minister of Ethnic Affairs, we felt that there should be someone to pinpoint specific areas of need in the Aboriginal society. There are 2 000 people in the Pitjantjatjara area, which has had a lot of attention, but there are 10 000 others scattered across the rest of the State who desperately need attention.

If we can pinpoint those areas of need, our Ministry can point out to other Ministries in a co-ordinating way what it would like done. Also, we have entered into dialogue with the former Federal Minister, Mr. Viner, and the present Minister, Senator Chaney. We have met with them as recently as last week to see to what extent we can help to diagnose problem areas and to co-ordinate better the spending of Federal funds in South Australia.

As with the Education Department, we acknowledge that we have a sound system. Because of the former Government's attitude towards Aborigines, the Federal Government's response to South Australia has been good, as South Australian Governments have over the past decade or so been paying particular attention to Aboriginal needs.

However, there is still a long way to go. One of the results of this has been that we have received Federal funding from Senator Chaney to help with the continuation of the Aboriginal Consultative Council, which is something that the other States do not have. So,



we receive a little extra, and our per capita grants for Aborigines in South Australia are generally better than those that the other States enjoy. We will try to expand on the work done by the former Government. That is the basis for the establishment of the new Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** I refer to the line relating to community centre projects, for which \$375 000 was voted in 1978-79 and which is now provided for under the "Minister of Local Government and Minister of Housing, Miscellaneous" vote. Will the Minister say whether community development boards will have any say in the allocation of this money?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As a member of a community development board in the South-East, I point out that such boards have far less actual say than they have recommendatory powers. Previously these boards recommended direct to the Minister, but now the idea is that they recommend to local government. So, if community development boards were interested in a certain project, they would no doubt have their say, although the ultimate responsibility for allocating funds would devolve upon the Minister.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** I refer to minor grants that were previously provided for under various miscellaneous lines. Will the Minister say what criteria are used and what mechanisms are to be used to determine who receives these grants?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am disadvantaged in relation to this line, in that I asked for a detailed statement. It may be in my office downstairs and I have not picked it up. Unfortunately, I have left the precise breakdown of these figures in my office in the Education Centre. If any honourable member is looking for a precise breakdown in the minor grants area (so many grants have been transferred to this line), I will undertake to obtain it for him. I have not yet discussed with my officers the precise criteria used to establish who should get what. That is another point that I will have to examine. I know that each year much lobbying is done, and sometimes the person with the loudest voice comes out the best dressed. However, I am not saying that that is the main criterion.

**Mr. LEWIS:** As this is the Year of the Child, will the Minister say why the Government is continuing to fund the childhood services programme? Obviously, there is a very good reason for this. I realise that the allocation for the programme has been increased. What service does it provide?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Funding for the Year of the Child comes from the Federal Government and State Government. The Federal Government's responsibility for the current year has increased slightly not because of an increased commitment to pre-school childhood services but more because of an increase in the child care area. The South Australian Government has picked up the tab for the balance of the recurrent funding. It continues to fund the childhood services line because the Liberal Government is strongly committed to providing childhood services.

The Liberal Party said in its election policy statement that it would get as many 3½-year-olds into the system as it could, once again determined on a needs basis. This year, an increase has occurred, and there will be an expansion of services. In fact, about \$250 000 has not yet been specifically allocated. However, we hope that that money will be used to provide education for 3½-year-olds and upwards on a needs basis.

Members of the former Government will acknowledge that there are already 2 000 3½-year-olds comfortably accommodated within the Kindergarten Union service.

The present Government hopes to be able to provide accommodation for additional 3½-year-olds without taking the credit for them.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the allocation for the Aboriginal Education Foundation. Members were told earlier that they could not discuss this matter under the Education Department vote because it contained no provision in this respect. I said that I considered this was a slight on the contribution that Aborigines make to the community. However, I have been heartened to hear the Minister's comments regarding his philosophy on the matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on the ruling of the Chair.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly not, Sir. I commend the Minister for the attitude that he has evinced tonight. It concerns me that the people who have drafted this material which has been presented by the Government have made a few inherent suppositions about the contribution Aborigines make to the community. I am concerned, for example, that the allocation appears under the "Miscellaneous" item, almost as though it is a bit of an afterthought. As this subject has been given Ministerial status by the Government, it deserves something better than being just a miscellaneous afterthought. Also, the total allocation in this area is \$8 400, an increase of only \$400 on last year's allocation.

The only other item at all applicable to this matter, we are told, is the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Committee. The drafters of this document were not able to transfer that from the Department for Community Welfare to this department, while they were able to transfer all of the other items I mentioned before. With the constant reference in this document to the transfers that have taken place, that is one that was obviously last to catch their attention and was not able to be done in time. I compare that with grants to ethnic groups. A vote of \$62 000 last year has been increased to \$120 000 this year. That increase is to be commended as the amount is nearly double.

It seems that there is perhaps a subtle message there that it is reasonable to double ethnic grants but that the Government does not feel that there is any reason to increase the grants to the Aboriginal community in a similar way. For example, the amount for the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Committee has been increased only by \$4 000 to \$67 000. Perhaps the task ahead of the Government in trying to co-ordinate all the needs of the Aboriginal community in South Australia should necessitate an increase in the staff available to do that job. I appreciate that there are specific allocations in the Budget. Just the co-ordination of that role, if it is to be done successfully and for the benefit of the community, must require a bigger allocation or a bigger increase than has actually been the case.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Aboriginal Education Foundation grant has not been transferred from anywhere. It belongs under education simply because it is a contribution by the State Government towards taxi fares to get Aboriginal children to and from school, so it has not been moved from one place to another. Nothing has been moved. We did not transfer any lines from any department, pending an overall review of how we are going to operate the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio. Therefore, any reference to the contribution to ethnic communities is not relevant.

The main point that the honourable member has missed is that the South Australian Government is responsible for every Aboriginal in South Australia, just as it is responsible for every member of the community. That is

part of our normal funding, but there is specific funding that the Federal Government makes available in addition to what the State would normally provide. Therefore, there are two completely different sources of funding allocation. Our State money is left where it belongs with the relevant Ministry because the Aborigines are part of our State community. The Federal Government's allocation is a different matter; it is a specialist grant. The tendency is to fund individual groups rather than to fund just one Aboriginal grant. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs is responsible in Adelaide on behalf of Canberra and we co-ordinate with it.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I notice that the allocation to ethnic groups has been substantially increased over the amount allowed for the previous year. A number of my friends in different ethnic communities, especially those from southern and south-eastern Europe, would be interested to know how it is proposed to spend the increased allocation.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The doubling of the allocation is partly because the ethnic affairs policy undertook to double the allocation to school groups, which were extra-curricula groups where native languages, and ethnic languages other than English, were being taught at weekends, evenings and other than during normal school hours by members of ethnic communities, teaching the home language outside of primary and secondary school classes. That grant was increased from \$14.50 to \$29.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I seek your ruling, Mr. Chairman, about something of which I should have knowledge. When we ask for specific information from a Minister on a line and that information is brought back, is that information incorporated in *Hansard*?

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the honourable Minister has it tabled in a way similar to replies to questions, my understanding is that it would be incorporated in *Hansard*. Otherwise, if the honourable Minister contacts the member involved by letter, as often happens, it would not be incorporated in *Hansard*.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** There is no automatic condition for that, Sir.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I understand that the information is usually tabled and then incorporated in the record.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** I support the idea that minor grants need to be in the actual Budget papers, but I believe that they should be in the public record somewhere. If the nodding of the Minister's head means that he will table that information at the appropriate time, I will move on to other matters I want to raise. In relation to teacher education inquires an amount of \$75 000 has been allocated. This is the so-called Auchmuty committee. No doubt this vote is for the State working party, which is preparing a submission under the chairmanship of Mr. Kevin Gilding. The official Auchmuty committee is being paid for by the Commonwealth, which invited the States to set up their own working parties. Is this the vote for the working party?

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Yes.

**Dr. HOPGOOD:** How close to conclusion is the State working party and, once that submission has been prepared, will that be a public document? The amount allowed for the childhood services programme is exactly the same as would have been allowed in a Labor Budget. Has the Minister any information about room for expansion in the Budget? I am aware that the Minister's problem is that the Commonwealth has not increased its subvention, and has not decreased it, either (which has to be an improvement on the past couple of years), so some of this increase has gone into making up what we would have got from the Commonwealth if it had indexed what we got from it last year. That reduces the capacity for

much expansion of enrolments over the system.

I am interested to know what information the Minister can give on that matter, and whether the Government accepts the target that the previous Government had, which was announced by the former Premier (the Hon. D. A. Dunstan) in 1975, that there should be a total cover of four-year-olds by the end of the decade. "Total cover" has to mean, since there is no compulsion, all those children whose parents want them to attend pre-schools, which is not 100 per cent (various figures between 85 and 95 per cent have been quoted to me). We have not got to this stage, setting aside the 3½-year-olds altogether. What expansion is provided for under these lines, and does the Government generally accept the Dunstan commitment of 1975?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I have not examined the implications of the Dunstan commitment. It is probably the first time I have heard it acknowledged that it was a Dunstan commitment and not a Federal Government commitment, because the Federal Government has been blamed for not keeping up to its promises in past years. It is an interesting admission.

The second point is that there is some \$250 000 as yet unallocated towards expansion of childhood services apart from their anticipated expansion. There is not, at the moment, much room for increase, and this will be allocated on a needs basis. Other aspects regarding the provision of childhood services perturb me. This is an area where I am not completely satisfied with the former Administration, because there seems to be some duplication of expense. We are paying the Childhood Services Council some \$200 000 in administration. The Kindergarten Union which occupies about 80 per cent of the budget also has its own administration. Perhaps in the next month or two we will be having a look at whether any rationalisation is possible.

**Dr. Hopgood:** Is that what you meant by no formal inquiry in your reply to my Question on Notice?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes, I am not having external bodies looking into the matter. We have all the expertise that we need within the Childhood Services Council, and they would be the very people that people from interstate would call on if they were going to inquire. That is the attitude that I had towards it. I thought I would mention that in case the honourable member was under any misapprehension. The former Minister asked what we were going to do with the inquiry. We believed that we had expertise within the Childhood Services Group in South Australia to investigate.

I am not sure how advanced the teacher education inquiry is. I know the Auchmuty committee is supposed to be reporting early next year, so our own inquiry should be well advanced. I will make inquiries to ascertain when that report is expected. The amount of \$75 000 was assessed by the Treasury as being adequate for the purpose.

**Mr. TRAINER:** Is the Minister aware of the problem that has been encountered with the interpretation of regulation 44, part III of the T.E.A.S. arrangements? This regulation has been in existence since 1976 and until this year has been interpreted in South Australia to mean that, to be eligible for financial assistance under T.E.A.S., a student must have been enrolled for at least 75 per cent of a full-time course for a year or for at least 75 per cent of full-time study for part of a year, if the student was enrolled for only part of a year. However, in 1979 this regulation has been applied on a term-by-term or semester-by-semester basis. This has created special difficulties for students in tertiary institutions such as Flinders University, Adelaide College of Advanced Education, and so on, which have academic programmes

based on topics of short duration.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Will the honourable member link up his remarks to the line?

**Mr. TRAINER:** I link it to the line, "Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia" on page 49. Will the Minister make representation to his colleagues in the Commonwealth Government to try to rectify this matter which results from a new interpretation being placed on this regulation that has caused hardship for quite a few people in tertiary institutions?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As a former councillor in these matters, I am aware of a number of anomalies that have emerged year by year, and this is one issue that I have been prepared to take up with the Federal Government direct. I recognise that the Tertiary Education Authority probably would be the best body to negotiate on our behalf. I will take up the matter.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding the minor grants, the Minister has agreed to get further information. Will that information extend to covering the reason why minor grants have been increased substantially from last year's total vote? I note from the various notes to the Budget that last year the vote for minor grants was \$21 950 and actual expenditure was \$15 907. The vote this year will be \$72 677.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** One of the reasons for the increase is simply that so many items which were formerly listed separately have now been transferred with a triple asterisk into the minor grants.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I refer to page 48, the line "Imperial Relations Trust Fellowship". First, will the Minister say who are these imperial people with whom we have some sort of relations? Secondly, why, since \$1 200 was voted in 1978-79 and not spent, was it then necessary to increase the amount to \$2 000?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** My information says that this contribution is according to a long-standing policy of contribution by all States and the Commonwealth towards the cost of the three Institutes of Education Fellowships at the University of London.

Vote passed.

Police, \$67 208 000.

**Mr. BANNON:** I refer to the line "Office of the Minister". There is a reference to clerical staff and to the Chief Secretary himself under a special Act. Maybe we could wait until the Chief Secretary is here.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is my understanding that the Minister of Agriculture is deputising in the absence of the honourable Chief Secretary, who is interstate on business.

**Mr. BANNON:** This makes the situation somewhat difficult. I will still proceed to ask the question. I appreciate that the Minister of Agriculture has hastily come to fill the breach, but it is most unfortunate that, when we are discussing the lines and when this is the first opportunity for the new Minister to explain his policy and financial measures, we cannot question him on his own lines directly. I realise that not all Ministers are in this place but here is a case of a Minister who is in this Chamber but who is not present.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I draw the honourable Leader of the Opposition's attention to the fact that he is not relating his comments to the actual vote before the Committee. I ask him—

*Mr. Duncan interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth may not interject while I am addressing the Committee.

**Mr. DUNCAN:** I rise on a point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition must

confine his remarks to the vote before the committee.

**Mr. DUNCAN:** Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to Standing Order 159, which states:

No member shall interrupt another member whilst speaking, unless (1) to request that his words be taken down; I was seeking to interrupt you to request that, pursuant to rule 166, your words be taken down by the Clerk, as I believe they ought to be taken down. However, you would not allow me to exercise my rights under Standing Order 159.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What is the honourable member's point of order?

**Mr. DUNCAN:** The point of order was that you would not allow me to exercise my right to take a point of order whilst you were speaking, pursuant to Standing Order 159. I sought to interrupt you, Mr. Chairman, to have your words taken down, but you would not permit me to do that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order, because it is highly disorderly for any honourable member to interrupt the Chair while the Chair is addressing the Committee.

**Mr. BANNON:** I will relate my remarks to the heading "Office of Minister" and line "Administrative and Clerical Staff". Clearly, as the Chief Secretary is not present in the House, something has gone wrong in terms of his time table or, alternatively, if he knew that he was not going to be present in the House, arrangements could have been made by his administrative and clerical staff to ensure that adequate notice was given to us and that the order of business was changed in such a way as to enable us to question these lines with the appropriate Minister before us. It seems wrong that we are put in the position where the Minister is not present in the House. It is the first occasion on which he could appear before the House as Minister, but he has absented himself.

I am not questioning that he is on legitimate business but, indeed, if that were so, it must have been planned business, particularly for him to be interstate. His clerical and administrative staff must have made travel arrangements for him, which could have been signalled to the House so that the Chief Secretary's lines could have been put earlier.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable Leader has made his point. I draw his attention to the actual line. No money is allocated for the Chief Secretary. However, funds are allocated to his clerical and administrative staff; therefore, the honourable Leader must relate his remarks to the actual vote under discussion.

**Mr. BANNON:** I am relating my remarks to his administrative and clerical staff, because something has gone awry with the Minister's arrangements. Either he failed to convey information to his staff, whom we pay under this line, or, alternatively, his staff are not sensitive to the needs of the Committee. Whatever the case is, I think we must protest about the Chief Secretary's absence for the examination of these lines. Certainly, we thank the Minister of Agriculture for making himself available. He has already had to do it on behalf of the Minister in another place. He has displayed considerable versatility, but it is not good enough that we are going to examine lines on an important part of the Budget without having the appropriate Minister before us.

**Mr. EVANS:** I would like to put the record straight. As Whip, I negotiated with the Opposition Whip yesterday that the Chief Secretary would be absent today and tomorrow. For yesterday, I said that he would be absent from 10 p.m. At no time did the Opposition Whip say to me that they would like to have these lines brought forward. It was known to the Opposition. Arrangements

were made for a pair, because the Minister had to be in Queensland yesterday afternoon to attend a Ministerial function today and tomorrow.

**Mr. McRAE:** It was not until the peremptory action by the Deputy Premier this afternoon that any member was in a position to know the programme. The Opposition was prepared, and it had made reasonable suggestions to the Government as to its programme, and replies have not been received. Every reasonable endeavour was made to get some facility with that honourable gentleman. I am afraid that he who in Opposition complained most of arrogance on the part of the Government and demanded openness and accountability of Government is now—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope that the honourable member will link his remarks to the line.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am obliged to, because the Opposition Whip has been impugned badly, and I do not think that the member for Fisher realises the seriousness of it. The Whip is not here to defend himself. I want to be heard on his behalf and to point out that it was not until this afternoon that the Deputy Premier took the peremptory action he did—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must not refer to a previous decision of the House this afternoon.

**Mr. McRAE:** I understand that that is a Standing Order of the House. The Opposition was at all times ready to negotiate a reasonable position with the Government—the same Government which, in Opposition, was demanding openness, accountability, and less arrogance. We were brushed aside, and not heard. The arrogant gentlemen opposite have precipitated this situation. They are at fault, not my colleague the member for Baudin.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member has had a reasonable opportunity, and I have allowed him considerable latitude. I ask that his discussion relate to the matter before the Committee.

**Mr. McRAE:** I hope that the Government's arrogance will cease at this point, because we have had enough of it.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I do not propose to display arrogance in attempting to answer the Opposition's questions. In view of the allegations that have been made about the Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine, I explain that arrangements have been made for me to take his place in this instance whilst he is away on Ministerial business.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable Minister ought to come back to the matter under discussion.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** That is all right with me. The whole discussion so far has centred around that point. I indicate to the Opposition, through the Chair, that I will make every endeavour to answer their questions in relation to the lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! In calling on the honourable member for Mitchell, I ask him to relate his remarks to the line under debate.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I will be most scrupulous in referring to the line so that your jurisdiction will not be called on, Sir. I refer to the line "Sergeants, Constables, and Probationary Constables", and point out that, in the 1978-79 financial year, \$38 951 600 was voted, and expenditure amounted to \$40 486 691. The sum proposed this year is \$42 537 500 and, without resorting to a calculator, my summation of the position is that about \$2 100 000 is the increase put before the Committee for consideration. Elsewhere in the Budget documents, I understand, the sum allowed with respect to salaries for the financial year under consideration has increased by about 9 per cent. The sum of \$2 100 000 would appear to be, if one does the

extrapolation involved, considering that about one-quarter of the financial year has already transpired, about 6 per cent.

My calculation is that \$2 100 000 in respect of the sum of \$40 486 691 represents an increase of approximately 6 per cent. I believe that it is therefore fair to say that the increased sum for 1979-80 apparently represents (and I say "apparently", because members will agree that there is a paucity of information in the bare statement of fact in the given line) the financial provision for the guts of the Police Force in the coming financial year—that is, sergeants, constables and probationary constables—and is an incremental sum, sufficient only to allow for the probable and forecast sum to meet wage increases likely to occur during the financial year. I am sure that members of the Police Force will not object to my referring to them in this manner; I have a high regard for the Police Force, which upheld the laws of this State in a way the previous Government always found commendable.

We have been asked to approve a sum that does not appear to provide for any increase in the numerical strength of that force, but appears to provide merely for likely increases in salaries and wages that may occur during the financial year. Where is the provision by the Government for an increase in the numerical strength of the force, that vaunted increase that was necessary to change what they said was the unsatisfactory state of law and order prior to the election? The Government made promises, and it also made allegations that a great effort was needed (if one believed the allegations) to restore law and order to this State. Obviously, a monetary provision is needed for the body that is required to maintain law and order—the South Australian Police Force. During the election campaign, members opposite made promises and won the prize. Also, there was scurrilous advertising to the effect that citizens of this State were subjected to a state of lawlessness, which was curable only by an increase in the guardians of the law. Despite this, the sum we are considering appears to provide for only the likely salary increases for the present numerical strength of the force.

It is a poor situation when a Government, as an important part of the policy on which it is elected, puts forward a premise that there is an increased need for strengthening of the body that takes care of law and order because a state of lawlessness apparently existed and could be cured only by the election of a Government of another political persuasion, and it then makes this provision. I believe members are entitled to look at what the promises contained. The proposition was clear and simple—things were crook in suburbia! Members opposite dangled before the electors the fact that, if a Liberal Government was elected, it would restore law and order. It was said that people would be safe in the streets. It was also alleged, wrongly I would argue, that it was not safe for people to be abroad on the streets then. The then Opposition stated that, if it was elected, it would be safe for people to be abroad. A natural corollary to that claim was that there would be a provision in the finances of this State to strengthen the law enforcement agency, which we all understand to be the Police Force.

However, now that the acid test has come and money has to be provided, and the "put up or shut up phase" begins, we are provided with a sum that, on my calculations, appears to provide only for a sum that any prudent department would put forward and that Treasury would provide advice for. This sum appears to cater for only the likely salary increases during the full financial year. I seek from the Minister an explanation for this turnabout in behaviour. The Government, having won the position it sought and having suggested to the public of

South Australia the various defects of life in this State that it would fix on entering the Treasury benches, including the alleged state of lawlessness, puts forward to support and strengthen the Police Force a provision such as this. One cannot discern any concrete evidence of good faith on the part of the Government.

No provision has been made where it counts, for an increase in the numerical strength of the force which members opposite suggested was vital and which they suggested would be provided not by the previous Government but only because of the election of a Liberal Government. The Liberal Government was elected and that fact has been accepted. We now ask where is the honouring of the promise made by the Government prior to election in terms of cold hard cash? I look forward to the answer to be provided by the Minister who has been stuck with the job of putting forward the information we are entitled to seek. I almost feel sympathy for him, and I know he will do his best. I firmly believe the Minister will be hard put to provide information that will dissuade me, and I suspect many honourable members on this side, that the allegations made by members opposite prior to the election—

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I won't get a chance to answer before midnight if you don't stop soon.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I hope the information that the Minister will provide to meet our requirements will equal the zeal he has for his substitute role. As the Minister would be aware, we will be the judges of the respective merits of this matter. I do not criticise the absence of the other Minister, because I do not know why he is not here.

The Minister is stuck with the job of extricating himself from the dilemma in which members opposite find themselves. They have made allegations and claims, and they are now called upon by me, as a member of the Opposition, to justify them.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Being asked for information, abused, threatened and criticised, before one has had an opportunity to speak, is rather rugged. In relation to the line referred to at times by the member for Mitchell, there is a clear explanation for the \$2 100 000 increase proposed. It includes, as well as the anticipated indexation increases, a provision of \$517 000 to enable the appointment of 11 new sergeants and the recruitment of 56 additional constables required in relation to traffic policing, firearms control systems, and other new initiatives.

Last year, wage indexation determinations, the payment of two days Christmas bonus, and the increment payments caused increased costs but, by delaying the filling of vacant positions, the overall additional expenditure was contained to \$1 535 091 over the amount appropriated. The provision to be made this time is based on actual expenditure recorded in 1978-79, plus allowances for the carry-over effects from last year of wage indexation decisions, upgrading of constable positions to sergeant, and the expansion of probationary constable ranks through the reduction of the cadet training period to two years. In addition, \$517 000 has been provided for the payment of the officers mentioned. The overall Budget figure for the Police Department is up by about \$5 000 000 on the figure for last year.

The member for Mitchell referred at length to the amount of money involved in this vote, and said that it did not appear sufficient to cover the services required to maintain law and order. That was the theme of his 15-minute address to the Committee. Even though that amount is up by only about 5 per cent on the previous year's allocation, the overall funding proposed for the Police Department is an increase of about 8 per cent on

last year's allocation. I suggest that, to get some sort of sequence in the information available, the honourable member should go down through the lines. If he goes to the line relating to the Police Commissioner's office staff, he will see a line that has increased by \$2 500 000.

**Mr. Payne:** That is for accounting and clerical staff.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** There is an explanation. Many of the services to which the honourable member referred are covered under that line. If the honourable member was, (first) fair, and (secondly) intent on trying to get the information in some sort of order, he would have had the information that he sought. The answer would have substantially allayed his fears and would have explained what the Government has in mind in providing additional services, hence the additional moneys to be made available.

**Mr. PETERSON:** The sum proposed to be voted for cadets is \$1 241 100, while actual payments last year totalled \$1 830 954, representing a reduction in this year's allocation of 30 per cent. I support the comments made about the promised increase in the Police Force, and I also support our highly regarded Police Academy, but why should there be a reduction? Is the policy to take in additional adult recruits at the expense of junior recruits as cadets, or is there to be a reduction in the Police Force?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** During 1978-79, under the previous Government, the recruit intake programme had to be curtailed as a result of the introduction by that Government of the freeze on staff members. Recruits were engaged during that period only to fill vacancies on strength, and consequently the savings from that source far exceeded the additional cost of wage indexation determinations and automatic age increment payments for that year, recording savings of \$252 746 over the amount appropriated.

Provision is made for 26 pay days based on 30 June cadet strength and salary rates in operation as at that date, which allows for the carry-over effect of wage indexation determinations from the previous year. It is appreciated that the honourable member should raise such a question, and I hope that the explanation covers the difference in the amount and does not suggest a straight-out reduction in the cadet force for the ensuing period.

**Mr. McRAE:** If it were not for the archaic state of the rules of this Parliament, I am sure my Leader would be moving for an increase in this line. As has been explained tonight, Standing Order 315, while allowing one to move for a reduction of a line, does not allow one to move for an increase. We want to move that the line be increased, but we are not going to jeopardise public confidence in the Police Force or in us by moving for a decrease and going ahead with some flimsy explanation that it was only because of Standing Orders that we had to use such a device.

I am very sad that that is the case. Making one or two preliminary comments leading up to my main attack on this line, which is a disgrace to the current Government, I am happy that that pre-eminent criminologist, the member for Glenelg, is present, even though the Chief Secretary is not. I am very glad that, even though the Chief Secretary has not seen fit to grace us with his presence, the Minister of Agriculture, who seems to fulfil so many roles here, is with us tonight and is at his charming and affable best.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the member for Playford to come back to the line.

**Mr. McRAE:** The Minister needs to be at his charming and affable best in view of the disgraceful line he has to deal with. One of his constituents, that ubiquitous and obnoxious man Buick, led the attack on the Labor Government, which was defeated by that disgraceful

advertisement paid for by Adrien Brien Ford, as I discovered later, which showed an armed hoodlum. Members opposite can guffaw and laugh, but that is the plain fact of the matter. Nobody has denied that fact, because that has been widely publicised, and I know it to be the truth. Supporters of the Government frightened the people of South Australia with what they chose to call a law and order campaign that sank right down to the depths of the gutter. Members opposite can be quite sure that their villainous supporters in the business world are being checked out at this minute to make sure that we identify each and every person who paid for their iniquitous and ubiquitous front man from Kingscote. It is perhaps ironic—

**Mr. Bannon:** He does exist.

**Mr. McRAE:** I believe that Buick does exist, and there were rumours that he would receive a Government appointment. That is quite conceivable in view of the pay-offs that are going on.

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

• **Mr. McRAE:** I am sorry, I will do that. It is just that Mr. Buick and his vicious advertising campaign against the Government—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Playford is carrying on in the same vein.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am referring to the line that deals with payment for the front rank of the Police Force in this State.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Buick has nothing to do with the line.

**Mr. McRAE:** Indeed he has; it is an attitude of mind. This Government went to the people of South Australia, and with great respect, Sir, your supporters, the people who helped put you in here, put dreadful advertisements in the newspapers saying that I and my colleagues, as members of the Labor Party, agreed with such horrible criminals. There are no bones about that. While I still have a breath left in me I do not intend to let that issue go. The people who did that are villainous, and they must be brought to account. There are no depths to which they will not sink. Any moral and honest member opposite (and there are many of them) are terribly embarrassed by the whole situation. We must consider two things: one is the preposterous situation indulged in by this Government, which copied a similar campaign run by its New South Wales counterparts a couple of years ago in terrorising the population with threats about violence in the streets, raping, child molesters, bank robbers, and the insinuation that the Government, by its tactics and its failure to deal adequately with the Police Force, the Parole Board, the Supreme Court and every other law agency was somehow involved with these people. That tactic was entirely iniquitous and wrong.

I have often stood up in this Chamber and campaigned for proper gun laws. Members will recall that it was I who made the original adjournment speech calling upon my own Government, criticising it and calling upon my Premier, to demand tighter gun laws. I disagreed with my own Premier and Government and demanded better law and order on the streets. So there are two levels to consider. One is the absolutely iniquitous attitude of people like Mr. Buick and his supporters. The second is the reality of the situation, which is that there are criminals abroad. This government and the previous Government have not been able to do anything about these people, but the concern in the community is real. People are entitled to expect to be able to walk the streets unmolested but can they? They cannot in Hindley Street late at night and they cannot do so in many parts of the city or the suburbs.

People are entitled to think that their teenage daughters should be able to walk home from the bus unmolested, but they cannot take that chance if they are reasonable people. We do not really know why that is, but it is a fact that throughout the Western world over the last 15 years every country and State, transcending all political borders, has seen an enormous increase in crimes of violence.

**Mr. Payne:** I thought it was only in South Australia.

**Mr. McRAE:** It is alleged that it was only in South Australia through the iniquitous attempts of fools and rogues like Buick and Adrien Brien Ford. People are entitled to safety on the streets and, as I have pointed out in the past, one way of achieving this, before you get into any debate on how to deal with criminals or how to punish them, is to catch them first. The capture rate is very small, because we do not have sufficient manpower in the Police Force. There is not sufficient back-up, communications, and all the other things that go with it, in the Police Force to maintain the security and safety needed in the community.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What do you do with the criminals when you catch them?

**Mr. McRAE:** The member for Glenelg has for years carried on as though he was the Minister for McNally. He has paraded and postured around the place with ridiculous and preposterous suggestions, but I am being honest about this very real problem. It is a fact that women and children in our community should feel frightened and that also applies to men. These criminals are laughing at our police and the whole community. There are criminals around who have bashed, beaten, tortured and molested men, women and children but who have never been caught, simply because there is not sufficient manpower on the beat. That is the key point. In the past, I have put my cards on the table, and I have not kow-towed to my Ministers or my Party. If this Government wants to be fair dinkum with the people they represent, they have to pay for more police and for proper back-up facilities. The Government has simply not done that in this line.

If my Leader was able to, he most certainly would have moved to increase this line, and it is only because of a technicality that we are unable to do that. Most certainly we would not reduce the line, because even I as a person who from time to time appears in the criminal courts against the police have many friends in the Police Force, and I am proud of that. I know from my discussions with them that their morale is low and that they are not happy with the state of affairs, with not enough money for proper policing of the services.

*Mr. Mathwin interjecting:*

**Mr. McRAE:** There is no point in the Minister for McNally and his colleagues shouting about it. I am talking about a non-political issue. I am talking about safety and security in the streets.

With respect to you, Sir, I do not give a damn whether it was the fault of the Liberal Government, the Labor Government, the Dunstan Administration, the Corcoran Administration, or any other. What I am concerned with is the realities of getting on with the job. In particular, that becomes the case when there is a lack of morale in the Police Force combined with a feeling of fear in the community and also with a preposterous Government which made all these promises to the people and which was aided and abetted by fools and rogues like Mr. Buick, incidentally from the Minister's own district. Now, when the Government has the opportunity, it reneges on its promises. It is no good saying this is the last Labor Government's line. The opportunity was there to increase that line and bring up proper manpower. I demand that the Minister do something about the matter. I realise he

has been caught in a nasty spot and that he has been left in the lurch by his colleagues. In this situation I demand that he do something about the matter with his own Government.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I point out to the member for Playford that for the current period the Government has provided \$6 303 000 more for the Police Department and associated services of the Police Force in South Australia than the previous Government voted for the previous year 1978-79. That additional \$6 303 000 that we have provided for those services represents a 10 per cent increase on what the previous Government voted last year, so that in total in respect to this line we have recognised the need. It would be remiss of me not to convey what I know to be the Chief Secretary's feelings in respect to the Police Force over which he has control. The Government respects the services that we have. We recognise that they are important for the safety and protection of the community and all those other things that were shouted about by the member for Playford.

In recognition of those needs, I suggest that the Government has been responsible and has provided, as I said, 10 per cent more funding in this line than did the previous Government last year. In fact, we have provided for about 8 per cent more money than the previous Government actually spent last year, so that it caters quite adequately for the anticipated inflation and wage indexation that we are to be faced with. It provides for additional duties that we agree are desirable. They do not happen to be in the same specific order as the previous Government used, and we have increased some and reduced others. Members of the House may be assured that my colleague, the Chief Secretary, would not have done these shifts of funding in the respective lines by his own personal initiative but with the support and assistance of the department which is serving him and which obviously served the previous Government only six weeks ago.

Really, I do not see that there is anything to become surprised about following the remarks of the member for Playford in relation to the funding. However, as I said earlier, if there are any other questions about any of the other lines, I would be happy to attempt to answer them. I would urge the members of the Opposition to proceed with the lines in their respective order, so that it is not only simpler for me to provide whatever information I have available but so that the Opposition will then receive the information in the sequence in which it will be provided. It will then be unnecessary for Opposition members to recap and ask question as foolish as some of those that have been put forward, because the answers relating to the previous lines will have covered the facts. With great respect, I suggest that if Opposition members adopt at least some of the ideas that I have put forward it will not only be easier for me, but it will be more informative at the same time.

**Mr. DUNCAN:** Notwithstanding the gratuitous advice from the Minister, I refer to the line "Contingencies—Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". I presume that that is the only line under which one can seek information in relation to the grandiose extravagance of the Police Department, the Echunga police horse stud. I seek information from the Minister as to the Government's future intention in relation to the Echunga police horse stud and the troop of horses at that establishment, because it seems to me that it is one of the greatest and grossest wastes of public expenditure. The Police Department spends a large amount of money on this quite extraordinary extravagance which seems to provide little more than a polo ground for international jet-setting royalty when they come to South Australia. I think it is

long overdue for the Government to make it fairly clear to the Police Department that we no longer wish to subsidise this plaything of the international establishment, because, basically that is all it has proven to be in the past few years, apart from the use of the horses in the 1970 moratorium exercise.

**Mr. Evans:** That's what upset you.

**Mr. DUNCAN:** That is not the case. I was not in South Australia at the time of the 1970 moratorium, so the honourable member's comment is quite incorrect. There is no doubt that this is a very great waste of money, which could be used more effectively and efficiently within the Police Department by providing more police officers on the job.

It is about time that some rationalisation occurred to get rid of this plaything and to spend the money in a much more effective manner in terms of reducing the amount of crime which exists in this State and about which members opposite expressed so much concern before the last election.

I seek information regarding the number of police officers involved with the mounted squad. Will the Minister ascertain how many ancillary officers are involved in duties associated with the squad, how many horses are owned by the Police Department as part of that squad, and what is the cost of operating the Echunga stud? Also, does the Government believe that this involves a reasonable use of funds in the police area? I know that certain people consider this to be a considerable waste, which should not be continued indefinitely.

What is the Government's attitude? Government members, when in Opposition, have expressed grave concern about law and order in South Australia, and one would expect that the Government, which has such a commitment to this concept, would be showing much greater concern about spending every dollar within the Police Department as effectively and efficiently as possible in an attempt to reduce or stop crime. I do not believe that the sort of crime to which Government members have alluded in the past is affected one iota by the existence or non-existence of the mounted squad, which could be abolished to the benefit not only of the revenue but also of the people of South Australia.

[Midnight]

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am not able to commit my colleague with respect to policy on whether or not the mounted force is to be abolished. However, I will seek from him answers to the several questions asked by the honourable member. There is nothing in the line specifically to identify the number of police personnel engaged in the mounted force or, indeed, the number of horses owned by the Police Department; nor is there any indication in the records of any attempt by the previous Government to pull down any part of the Police Force, including that part referred to by the honourable member, and to replace horses with extra personnel. I do not recall when in Opposition any suggestion by the former Government that this should happen. No suggestion of that type was made up until 22 August, when the Parliament was prorogued because of the election. All sorts of plans may have been made between that date and 15 September, although I am not aware of them.

It absolutely amazes me that the former Attorney-General can criticise the new Government for not having taken initiatives along these lines when, during nine years that the Labor Government was in office, and indeed for years before that, the Police Force had a mounted squad.

Every effort will be made to obtain the replies to the honourable member's questions.

**Mr. DUNCAN:** As the Chief Secretary is not in the Chamber this evening, will the Minister who is handling the debate say who has been sworn in as Chief Secretary while that gentleman is outside the jurisdiction of this State, and who is undertaking his work and exercising his powers, or has the new Government at this early date left the Police Force without Ministerial direction?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member and report to him in a few minutes on this subject. I will try to get details of arrangements for an official replacement during my colleague's absence.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I seek information on the line "Police Force—sergeants", etc. I am not really quite sure whether the Minister of Agriculture can answer this question. I think he is more at home with pigs.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is nothing in the line about pigs. The honourable member will confine his remarks to the line before the Committee.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I was just referring to the fact that the Minister is more at home with pigs than he is in answering a question when representing the Chief Secretary.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Napier should know full well what the rules of debate are. He should endeavour not to reflect in any way on the Minister.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I was not reflecting on the Minister of Agriculture. I was just saying he would be more at home with pigs because today he made a very important Ministerial statement dealing with swine. I was saying he was more at home with pigs. I was saying he was more familiar with dealing with the problems associated with swine than he was in dealing with problems of the Chief Secretary. That was not reflecting on the Minister.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I hope the honourable member will delete those remarks.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Yes, sorry. In an earlier reply to a question from the member for Mitchell the Minister of Agriculture said that 11 new sergeants and 56 constables would be appointed. If those appointments are in line with the election promise made by the Liberal Party that the Police Force would be expanded and provided with increased back-up support and mobility, I think that members of the Government are deluding themselves. It is fairly common knowledge to most members of Parliament that back-up support is required for every police car put on the road in South Australia.

I am sure that the Minister is aware that for every police car that goes on the road in South Australia there must be at least five uniformed police officers to back it up, plus clerical staff, radio facilities and so on. If the Minister is saying that that election promise about the Police Force being expanded is being met by the appointment of 56 constables and 11 sergeants (and that is what he said), the Government is fooling the people of South Australia. As the member for Playford and the member for Mitchell said, the election was run on the basis that this State was a lawless one because of the Labor Government. The Liberal Party was going to increase the Police Force so that it was safe for people to walk the streets. Yet the Minister freely admitted (and he nodded his head to me a while ago) that 56 constables and 11 sergeants will make this State safe.

**Mr. Lewis:** You've forgotten about the courts.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** It is pleasing that the member for Mallee has at last woken up.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the honourable member for Napier that he should not answer interjections.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that you have pulled me up. I would like to think that members, when interjecting on me, will be pulled up in the same way as I was pulled up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will not interject.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister reiterate his earlier statement that the sum total of 56 constables and 11 sergeants will make the State of South Australia safe for the people?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** In relation to the line "Sergeants, Constables and Probationary Constables", for which \$42 537 500 has been provided, I reaffirm that incorporated in the additional amount provided by this Government, provision is made for sufficient funds to enable the appointment of 11 new sergeants and 56 additional constables. In the opinion of my colleague the Chief Secretary, they are requirements needed in relation to traffic policing, firearms control system and other new initiatives. As I mentioned earlier, there have been adjustments in funding (some up, some back) throughout the lines under this Chief Secretary vote and, indeed, collectively. Overall, the figure voted this time is \$6 303 000 up on that which was voted by the previous Government, and a lesser figure, but certainly at or about 8 per cent more than was actually expended last year. As a Government, we are satisfied that we can uphold our election promises. We have made adequate provision for extra funding to do so and look forward to the continuing co-operation of the Police Force in order to achieve it.

**Mr. PAYNE:** The Minister is doing his valiant best to fill in for the Chief Secretary. One could assume from his remarks that he grudgingly admitted that the point made by the honourable member for Napier (that, apparently, 56 constables and 11 sergeants are going to change the State from lawlessness to law and order) was correct. I sympathise with the Minister as I have sat in the same position as he is now in. Filling in for another portfolio can be a difficult situation. I am trying to put forward what we have been told about these 67 men. The Minister feels uneasy about it, because he then refers to the other money that he says is being provided. What is that supposed to conjure up to us? Are they going to be given roller-skates so that they can be in two places at once? We are talking about a very small number of extra men who will suddenly cause the State of lawlessness portrayed by the members opposite to become a State of law and order.

That does not really wash. I sympathise with the Minister. It was my understanding, when answering my original remarks, that he referred to a 10 per cent increase. I noticed, in going through it again, that he referred to an 8 per cent increase. I point out to the Minister that a 10 per cent increase would amount to \$42 846 000, whereas we are looking at \$42 537 000.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The \$6 300 000 is the difference between the amount voted in 1978-79—

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

**Mr. PAYNE:** If I tried to do that, and referred willy-nilly to a whole total, you, Mr. Chairman, would be the first one to pull me up. I am talking about the line under discussion, namely, the one relating to the 56 constables and 11 sergeants. If the Minister, who was stuck with the job of defending this portfolio, was referring to that line, his arithmetic is wrong. A 10 per cent increase on the sum last year would change the line providing \$42 537 500; it



would come to about \$42 800 000. Perhaps I misheard the Minister.

We are charged with the grave responsibility of voting on large sums of money that is not ours, but that of the State's taxpayers. I am determined to do what was contained in the Liberal Party's election policy, because I see a Budget as needing the exhaustive examination that was promised by the Government opposite. When one wants to do that, all kinds of epithets are used and misguided motives are attributed to us. How do we know that 56 constables and 11 sergeants are contained in that line, unless we ask? Where does it say that? Anyone who suggests that we are not doing our job properly, and finding out what is involved, is wrong. There would be no point in having an Opposition if the Government just trotted in a document and said, "That's our best effort. Just put your stamp on it."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is far too much conversation coming from the Government side.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I hope that I am not too tempted to say that it could be argued that I am functioning like a tape recorder on playback, having listened to the member for Glenelg for nine years, rather than a gramophone. I trust that I do not sound the same. I am doing my level best to present reasoned arguments on these matters. I may have misheard the Minister when he referred to 10 per cent and 8 per cent increases. I understood him to say that it was a 10 per cent increase and, if he were referring to the specific line, his arithmetic was incorrect. He may wish to correct it.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I referred to a 10 per cent increase in the total vote on several occasions while answering questions from the Opposition. The overall proposed figure for 1979-80 is \$6 303 000 up on last year's vote, and approximately 8 per cent up on what was actually spent last year. The difference between the vote last year and this year is spot on 10 per cent. As I have also said on several occasions, some lines are up substantially and some only slightly; some are down substantially and some only a little. Overall, an increase of 10 per cent is involved. I do not know how many times I have to spell that out. If the honourable member insists on asking questions about the line "Sergeants, Constables", etc., I refer him to the figure cited in the first answer I gave. The sum proposed by the present Government is, in round figures, \$2 100 000 up on what was spent last year.

**Mr. Payne:** It is not actually; it is \$2 050 000.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I said \$2 100 000 in round figures.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Regarding the line "Development of Firearms Control System", will the Minister say whether there is any evidence that the previous Government consulted the State A.D.P. Centre, which that Government set up as an expert centre to advise it on A.D.P. equipment, regarding the purchase of the computer, the expense of which appears in this line? If so, when was the A.D.P. Centre consulted, and what was its advice to the Government on the acquisition of the computer? Was it shown, beyond all doubt, that that computer was the most efficient unit to procure, or do we have another Flinders Medical Centre mess?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Considerable material has been provided by the department for my colleague in relation to this line. The under-expenditure of \$173 302 in 1978-79 resulted because work did not proceed as was originally intended, with the firearms control system being an integral part of a total study that was going on at that time. The provision of \$982 000 is associated with the development, implementation and operation of the firearms control system. Information is given involving the

identified computer costs of \$395 000, consultants' fees \$357 000, technical and other equipment \$46 000, and costs involved in office machines, motor vehicles, and operating expenses, etc. in setting up that unit. There is some added material available that I am sure can be passed on to the honourable member if he is interested in the background that led to the previous Government's decision to proceed to set up that unit. In recognition of the recommended requirements for the further development and function of the firearms control system, members will note that \$982 000 has been provided this year in lieu of \$76 698 spent in the previous year.

**Mr. McRAE:** Because the Government is suppressing conversation and discussions and legitimate questioning—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the matter before the Chair.

**Mr. McRAE:** Here we have a Government which came in on a plank of law and order, supported by Mr. Buick, who, if he could have got away with it, would have blamed the Truro graveyard on the Labor Government. We have an expenditure of \$42 000 000. The Deputy Premier this afternoon gagged the debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member cannot refer to a previous decision of the Chamber.

**Mr. McRAE:** We are looking at a vote of \$42 000 000 from a Government that got in on this blood money, paid out by Buick and people like that, who were prepared to sink to any depths in the gutter. As I understand the honourable gentleman, from the notes he has before him, there was no conscious endeavour by the Chief Secretary to increase the police expenditure to deal with these hoodlums. I was honest enough to admit that the problem of these hoodlums is real.

As I understand the position, no conscious endeavour was made by the Chief Secretary to increase the lines relating to the front line of the Police Force in dealing with violence in the streets, nor did he raise the matter in Cabinet. In a moment of embarrassment, the honourable gentleman let slip that this matter was not raised in Cabinet discussions, at least in Cabinet discussions in which he was involved. I am putting two things. If the Minister for McNally would stop interrupting—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is no such person.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am already being censored and suppressed. Honourable members opposite can laugh; it is mostly the new members who are laughing, and they can afford the luxury. When their colleagues were in Opposition, they complained bitterly, and this is one of the many broken promises to the people of South Australia. Open government—what a farce, and what a fascist Government. That is what we have here.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! That is an unparliamentary expression.

**Mr. McRAE:** I do not think it is unparliamentary, but I will withdraw it in relation to the honourable gentleman I am speaking of. Did Cabinet make a conscious decision to increase the police vote to deal with the problems raised by Buick and those who paid for the advertisement, including Adrian Brien Ford, and the Ford Motor Company, and some of the other traders in South Australia? If they did not, did the Chief Secretary make a conscious decision to do that? If they did not make that conscious decision, not only did they use gutter tactics in the first place, but they used gutter tactics and then betrayed those they had conned.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope the honourable member can link up his remarks.

**Mr. McRAE:** I have dealt with that line. Having been censored as I am, there is no more I can say.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I can assure the member for Playford that he is not being censored by the Chair, and I hope he is not reflecting on the Chair.

**Mr. McRAE:** In no way, Sir. I am reflecting on the Deputy Premier and on the whole of the Government side for the facist line they are adopting.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! That is an unparliamentary expression.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am sorry; I withdraw it, and say the totalitarian and censorial line that they are adopting, which is totally undemocratic.

I turn now to the line dealing with the development of the firearms control system, and I congratulate the Government on continuing the policy of the previous Government, because it was much needed, to get this system organised. The \$982 000 in this line is the cost of the computer system that will make the regulations on firearms effective. As I understand it, the Chief Secretary is pussyfooting around, trying to placate the rural lobby, like Mr. Buick and those who paid for the advertisements, and various other supporters of the Liberal Party, including the gun runners down Rundle Street, the Hambly-Clarks and others who paid for advertisements.

I want to know whether the Minister will honour his promise and put this measure into effect, or whether he will pussyfoot around in an attempt to placate and pay off all the people who put his Government into office. I want those serious questions answered, and the people of South Australia deserve some answers. Not only is the \$982 000 under that line well spent but much more on top of that could be well spent to cut out unnecessary firearms. Every day of the week we see dreadful fatalities and domestic tragedies caused through the use of firearms.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will identify every dollar in the proposed expenditure for this line. This firearms control system includes a proposed expenditure of \$395 000 in direct computer costs; \$357 000 in consultant fees for the setting up of this system; \$46 000 for technical and other equipment; \$21 000 for office machines; \$10 000 in contribution towards vehicles required by that service; and \$153 000 for operating expenses. That expenditure covers the operation of the system for 1979-80. The expenditure I have outlined totals \$982 000, which is the amount proposed under this line.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I seek information from the Minister in relation to the line "purchase of aircraft—net cost of replacement" which has a proposed expenditure of \$180 000. How many aircraft are available, and how many aircraft does the department already own? Will this aircraft work in conjunction with the St. John Ambulance and the Hospitals Department to supply medical assistance at the scenes of accidents? An aircraft could also be used in relation to traffic problems and other problems throughout the State. Police forces in other countries throughout the world have air services that are used to the advantage of the people of those particular countries.

Other advantages could accrue through the monitoring of traffic coming back from race meetings and road racing events, or on holiday weekends when the traffic on the roads is particularly heavy. An aircraft could also be used on those occasions when there is vast overcrowding on some of our arterial road systems, especially in relation to the metropolitan area where there has been a lack of action by the previous Government in providing proper freeways for the people of this city.

We regularly have traffic jams and problems getting to and from the city after people have finished their daily toil. Can the Minister say how many aircraft are available, what type of aircraft they are, and whether the aircraft are to be used with other organisations and or departments throughout the State?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The Police Department at present owns a Piper Seneca II—Charlie Oliver Easy. VHCOE is the registration of the Piper aircraft. Provision of \$180 000 is made to cover the replacement of that aircraft, because it is considered by the department that a more suitable and reliable unit is required. In normal circumstances the unit, which was acquired in December 1977, would not have been due for replacement until 1980-81. However, in view of the incidence of serious engine problems that have been experienced with each of the three similar aircraft used by the department, it is essential that the plane be replaced with a more reliable unit at the earliest opportunity.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to the items under "Police Force" and the figure of \$42 000 000. The Liberal Party in South Australia added a new twist to that notorious development in the English language called Newspeak. It is to do with election promises. This means that if the Liberal Party goes to the people prior to an election and promises to do something, the Party will do it if it gets the opportunity sooner or later. However, the Liberal Party's performance does not match the promises. In line after line during this debate we have asked the Government whether it will honour its promises, and time and time again we find that the Government will not. One of the interesting things about this line and the contribution by this Minister is that it is in direct contradiction to the information we were able to obtain from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Earlier in this debate last evening I pointed out to the Minister that an increase of 10 per cent in the line of public works meant that it would probably be reasonable to expect that there would be an increase in staff in that department.

The Minister went to great lengths to prove to me that a 10 per cent increase in funding would allow for only a few positions that needed to be filled and for expected increases in salaries and wages. A 10 per cent increase on that line involves no increase in personnel. On this line, however, one finds that a 10 per cent increase involves a large increase in personnel.

It seems to me that we cannot take any notice of what this Government says, as it changes its story to suit its argument. Twice tonight Ministers have made totally contradictory statements. Obviously, they are not serious about debating this measure. Rather, they find a ready excuse to try to deflect Opposition inquiries. I am sick and tired of this, because obviously the Opposition will not get the truth from the Government regarding these lines. The Ministers will use whatever argument comes to their minds at the time, and the fact that they contradict each other is of no concern. Some Ministers think that this is amusing, but I do not. This contradiction of arguments does the Government no credit.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I refer to the payment to the former Commissioner of Police for expenses associated with his return to the United Kingdom. Does this line relate to the cost incurred by Mr. Salisbury, who was sacked by the former Government, which sacking was one of the main causes of the former Government's deterioration that resulted in its losing office? The Salisbury affair cost this State dearly in the loss not only of a fine gentleman and Commissioner of Police but also of much money.

**Mr. Keneally:** He told lies to the Premier.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It is all very well for the member for Stuart to say that. No-one in his right mind would say that Mr. Salisbury was not an excellent man and Commissioner of Police. The Liberal Party, when in Opposition, forced the former Government to appoint a Royal Commission after the shocking sacking of that Commissioner of Police.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I rise on a point of order. The member for Glenelg has been on his feet for at least two minutes and has concentrated entirely on the sacking, as he calls it, of a Mr. Salisbury, and on a Royal Commission. To which line is he referring?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to which line he is referring.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I am speaking to the line that relates to the payment to the former Commissioner of Police of expenses associated with his return to the United Kingdom. The member for Stuart has said that Mr. Salisbury told lies.

**Mr. Keneally:** He did. He admitted it.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It is all very well for the honourable member to say such things. Members of the former Government know that this episode was the beginning of that Government's downfall.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the vote. There is nothing in these lines about the downfall of the former Government.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** We have had the member for Playford bleating about press advertisements relating to the election. His tears were dropping on his Leader's shoulders, and the Leader had to get out his handkerchief to brush them away.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. I ask him to confine his remarks to the vote under discussion. I point out to the honourable member that last year no money was allocated to the matter to which he was referring, but there was an expenditure. No funds are allocated this year, so I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the line before the Committee.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** You are ruling, Sir, that I am not allowed to talk to this line. With due respect, the Opposition has, at times during this debate, spoken about matters when no amount has been allocated to a line. Will the Minister explain what happened in connection with payment to the former Commissioner of Police of expenses associated with his return to the United Kingdom because he was sacked by the Dunstan Government?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Considerable expense was incurred as a result of the removal of the ex-Commissioner of Police, Mr. Salisbury, from office by the previous Government. No expenditure has been provided under "Chief Secretary" for the coming year. An amount of \$15 100 was provided last year, which was an expense associated with Mr. Salisbury's return to the United Kingdom. The Payment to the former Commissioner was financed from funds appropriated in the Supplementary Estimates.

For the benefit of the member for Glenelg, I will refer briefly to the Auditor-General's Report for 1979. At page 144, it identifies the expenses involved with what has been described as the sacking of Mr. Salisbury. Payment on termination of service was \$160 700, a payment made during the 1978-79 period. An advance was paid against retirement allowance of \$5 529. As I mentioned earlier, a payment for expenses associated with Mr. Salisbury's return to the United Kingdom, provided for in the 1979 period, amounted to \$15 100, which is identified in the actual payments made and shown in the document before the House.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** What type of replacements are involved in the line "Net cost of fleet replacements", and does the amount set aside include an amount for the replacement of a number of Q cars?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will make the detailed reply which has been prepared available to the member for Glenelg. Out of respect for members, I will make it

available to him at a later date.

Vote passed.

Auditor-General's, \$1 572 000—passed.

Correctional Services, \$10 408 000.

**Mr. McRAE:** As the Opposition is being muzzled on this all-important debate and not being permitted a fair opportunity to look at the very area of law and order on which the then Opposition came to Government, all I can do at the moment, as I am not allowed free speech or proper inquiry, is to ask the honourable gentleman whether he will undertake to get from his colleague the answer to my question. I refer to the line "Parole Board—members fees." What changes, if any, does the Government propose in the constitution and structure of the Parole Board? If it does propose changes, when does it propose to introduce those changes?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It appears from the notes that I have on this line that there is some change in the Parole Board's members' fees payable in 1979-80, and that these were at the approved rate on 28 June 1979. The other point raised by the honourable member can be answered by the Chief Secretary, and I will get replies for the honourable member.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** To what extent are remissions for good conduct granted to prisoners by the Parole Board?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will get an answer for the honourable member.

**Mr. McRAE:** Will the Minister undertake to get a report in due course as to the number of women prisoners currently in custody at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre and the total number of women prisoners who were in residence throughout the years 1977 and 1978, and 1979 to date.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will provide a report for the honourable member in due course.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I refer to the line "Probation and Parole Staff." Will the Minister say whether it is departmental policy to continue the study scholarships for those people on staff who, out of their own time and at their own expense, undertook study part-time and, in the course of doing so, obtained outstanding results enabling them to continue and complete their degrees full-time as has been the case in the past? Is it the Government's policy to continue that practice?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will ask my colleague the Chief Secretary to obtain a report on the matter raised and to provide it to the honourable member in writing.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I refer to a programme I had the pleasure of inspecting some months ago when I was Minister of Water Resources. I visited Cadell and inspected a programme carried out by the prisoners and staff in relation to the plantings of various trees of a type not normally grown in South Australia, which are likely to lead to marketable crops. What impressed me was that a careful operation was in progress, using labour at the centre and also a few staff members with a great deal of dedication. Will the Minister ascertain whether the Government intends to continue this programme? The idea of the programme is to develop plantings of trees (nuts and fruit), which may lead to payable crops for South Australian growers.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I doubt whether the programme outlined by the honourable member is catered for under that line. During 1978-79, over \$16 000 was incurred as a result of increased prices and the higher daily average number of inmates. Provision has been made this year for the maintenance of comparable numbers, plus an allowance for inflation in respect of materials and services. On that information, there does not appear to be specific provision for the matter the honourable member has

raised. However, if some other line provides for it, I will ask my colleague to furnish him with the details of it.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** For "Purchase of livestock", under the heading "Country Gaols", in 1978-79 the vote was \$500, and no actual payment was made in that financial year. The allocation for 1979-80 is \$1 250, and I am tempted to suggest that the Minister of Agriculture advised the Chief Secretary to purchase some pigs, but I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, would rule me out of order.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member would be out of order on that matter. He must confine his remarks to the matter before the Committee.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** We are dealing with livestock, and pigs are livestock.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have not noticed anywhere in the lines a reference to pigs.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister ascertain whether that line includes the purchase of pigs in connection with country gaols?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Provision is made for the replenishment of livestock, which became depleted during 1978-79 when only modest replacement was undertaken. For the benefit of members opposite who may not be abreast of livestock prices, I assure them that the department is not going to purchase a paddock full of cattle or sheep for \$1 250. A nominal sum is provided to buy livestock. I do not have information available as to what the livestock will be. Perhaps it will be a horse or two.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There are too many interjections.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I know that the Minister of Agriculture is doing a wonderful job in representing the Chief Secretary, who is away on official Government business. I congratulate the Minister on the way in which he is handling the situation—the ridiculous situation caused by members opposite.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Glenelg must confine his remarks to the line under discussion.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I mention this fact only because some members opposite have contrary views and I thought I would protect my Minister. Regarding the line "Purchase of motor vehicles" under "Administration", will the Minister supply a report (I know it is difficult for him to provide information off the top of his head) regarding the proposed sum of \$80 800? What type of vehicles are to be purchased and how many will be purchased?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

**Mr. BECKER:** Will the Minister obtain a report on the rooms used by the doctors at the Adelaide Gaol? I have received reports that the medical facilities at the Adelaide Gaol have been, in the past, of an extremely poor standard. I believe that some upgrading has been undertaken. The gaol calls on the services of two doctors who are also liable to be called to other institutions in the city. The work load of those two doctors is such that one of them is, unfortunately, on sick leave at the moment. Those doctors work long hours and are liable to be called out at any time. The provision of medical services for South Australian gaols should be thoroughly investigated and equipment and facilities upgraded. More importantly, additional doctors should be contracted to provide a service and so reduce the work load of the present two doctors.

**Mr. Keneally:** I think the Public Accounts Committee should investigate it.

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes, and I will take you to the gaol. I

would like to place on record the services rendered to the gaol by the two medical officers. I believe that few people have worked so hard and made themselves available seven days a week, day and night, rendering prompt medical aid when required.

It is high time the Government recognised these two men by providing additional assistance and, above all, first-class equipment and rooms. The facilities are needed, and the prisoners are entitled to first-class emergency treatment.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The Chief Secretary will provide the material that is immediately available to him for the benefit of the member for Hanson. Meanwhile, in relation to the \$306 200 for provisions and expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance, during 1978-79 a significant upsurge of expenditure was incurred owing to increased prices and a high daily average number of prisoners held. Provision has been made in 1979-80 for the maintenance of comparable numbers, plus an allowance for inflation costs in materials and services.

**Mr. LEWIS:** The sum proposed for costs associated with education of prisoners has been increased from \$15 000 voted last year to \$49 000. Has this Government recognised the value of sensible treatment of people who have been placed in penitentiaries for crimes of which they have been found guilty? Has it recognised the extremely valuable services of the professional staff, the probation and parole staff, as well as those who work in the prisons? Does the increase in this allocation mean that the Government intends to attempt to rehabilitate prisoners more effectively than the previous Government ever bothered to attempt? The attitude of the previous Government was one of indifference and literally, through that indifference, violence. It has been the same kind of indifferent violence with which they have treated me as a member. Like the member for Playford, I will not get a chance to ask the questions I wanted to ask about other lines in other departments because of the way in which they filibustered earlier.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must relate his remarks to the line.

**Mr. LEWIS:** One of the things which has risen dramatically in our community recently and which needs to be corrected is the number of crimes of violence. This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report on page 6 of a union leader who has called upon us as a Government and on our correctional institutions to get tougher on bashers. I agree with him, and I think we should, but it is like the pot calling the kettle black, when I remember incidents that occurred in some of the builders labourers unions in recent years, and the sort of mess I have seen on the face of some unionists' children when they have come home from school after the unionist, in the preceding 24 hours, has sought to deviate from the union line at a union meeting.

That has been terribly unfortunate, and I ask the Minister whether he can clarify whether or not the Government intends to improve the capacity of our institutions, and the probation and parole staff to rehabilitate prisoners who have learnt nothing more than violence in that type of environment.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** That additional \$33 500 provided for the education of prisoners to some extent demonstrates this Government's desire to assist those persons in their overall rehabilitation back into society. The Government recognises that prisoners have a role to play, and that they must be receptive to education for a totally effective result. Prisoners have a contribution to make through a genuine effort to make the best use of facilities and education programmes available to them. Therefore, if we are to get the desired results it must be a

twofold project. The previous Government saw fit to spend \$15 665 under this line last year. This year the Government has increased that expenditure to \$49 000.

A joint prisoner-education programme has been undertaken with the Department of Further Education. The Minister of Education is always about the place assisting, guiding and making his services available to his various colleagues and other members of the Government. That programme is to commence in 1979-80, and the amount proposed includes the cost of equipment and material necessary to conduct that particular programme.

Vote passed.

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$2 742 000—passed.  
Fisheries, \$1 670 000.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I seek information about how the B-class licensing system is to operate in future. The Minister would be aware of the show-cause exercise about 12 months ago. At present the industry, particularly the A-class fishermen, are looking at the licensing system. Those fishermen are watching the Government's mood with interest. I would be grateful if the Minister would give some indication of the Government's policy in regard to B-class fishermen. If there is to be as phasing-out period, what conditions will it entail and how long will it take?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am delighted, on behalf of my colleague, to have the opportunity to report in answer to the member for Flinders, the Government's policy—

**Mr. Bannon:** This one's a fix.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I admit that I was a party to fixing it, and therefore I am proud to have taken it to the election as part of my Party's policy and that I am now able to announce it as part of the Government's policy.

The Government's policy in relation to B class scale licensees is that we will preserve the right of the present holders of those licences to continue their practice and we will phase them out by natural attrition. There is no plan to phase them out of the industry by any other system. The opportunity of transferability of their licences is not consistent with that which applies to A class scale fishermen and authority holders in other areas of the fishing industry. So, if a person moves out of the fishing practice as a B class licence holder, then there is no opportunity for that person to sell that licence or equipment and automatically convey or enjoy portability or transferability of the licence to another person.

**Mr. Keneally:** Will you be changing the rights to long line, net, etc., under the B class licence?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** That is another issue altogether; if the honourable member chooses to ask a question about it, that is all right. I am making it clear what our policy is in relation to the matter raised by the member for Flinders.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Referring to the line "Purchase of boats and engines", the sum proposed is \$133 000. I ask the Minister whether that line is in any way related to any necessity to replace the engine in the *Joseph Verco*, the research vessel which I understand was a rather expensive floating accommodation or restaurant, call it what you like, given the previous Government's policy as to how it was to be used. After the master had run up a certain number of hours at sea, because there was no overtime available to him, he simply dropped anchor and stayed there until he had rested for the number of hours to which he was entitled, before proceeding at overtime rates. I am concerned to ensure that that does not happen again and that we do not duplicate that kind of mistake by purchasing other ships of this type with this sum of \$133 000. I am concerned that we should make good use of the existing equipment and facilities for the kind of

research that so desperately needs to be undertaken. I ask the Minister how that sum will be deployed; on what projects, in what way, and what is to be the role of the *Joseph Verco* if it is to be a part of that?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** This sum is provided in the Budget for the replacement of 18 small patrol and research vessels and the replacement of outboard motors and minor equipment for the existing vessels held by the department. The *Joseph Verco*, of course, is the queen of the research fleet, but I point out that the Department of Fisheries has a number of small vessels used by inspectors and in-shore water research officers.

Regarding research, another line provides \$795 000, being the total estimated costs, including salaries, wages, operating, travel, capital, publicity and promotion, etc., for the Fisheries Department's research programme. That line covers the substantial costs of research, including the operations of the *Joseph Verco*.

**Mr. Lewis:** Will you make better use of that vessel in future?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I certainly hope so. It is hard to find any identifiable use to which it has been put in the past. I notice the member for Stuart and other Opposition members smiling about this matter. They realise, as does the Government, how useless that vessel was under the previous Administration.

Vote passed.

Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous, \$5 000.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I notice that \$3 500 is proposed for fishing licence appeals. Does this indicate a change of policy in relation to the present freeze on licences, which will create greater activity for the licence appeal system, or is the freeze on licences to remain in force and, if so, for how long?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** As far as I am aware, the freeze will continue on the issue of new licences and authorities until my colleague makes certain determinations from the anticipated resource reports that are made available to him. He will then be in a better position to determine how many, if any, new licences will be issued within a scale fishing area or any other area.

It is important to realise that the Minister of Fisheries is at present in Queensland dealing with matters necessary to conclude the 200-mile zone agreement. I am sure that on his return, and in the coming months, the tremendous potential that this area provides for us will be appreciated. It may be that, as a result of the newly proclaimed area to which we will have some access, applicants will be able to be issued with licences that will enable them to go farther afield.

The sum provided for this purpose is to be found under the Department of Fisheries vote, whereas previously it was within that for the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. This is in line with the policy of conducting the Department of Fisheries independently.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I notice that \$500 is allocated for repairs to fishing-boat facilities. Is that amount for repairs to fisheries vessels from the Department of Marine and Harbors, or are there landings installed by the Department of Fisheries for its own use?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am not sure why this amount has been provided under this line. Most ramp and wharf facilities are provided by the Department of Marine and Harbors. It is clear that this \$500 is intended to be used as a contribution towards the costs of repairing fishing boats, shipways, ramps and facilities used by professional fishermen, in particular.

Vote passed.

Minister of Marine, \$12 503 000.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I seek information about marinas. Reference is made to maintenance of wharves, but I cannot find the line that has occurred—

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** If you can't find it, how the hell do you expect me to?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister cannot carry on like that.

**Mr. Wright:** I hope *Hansard* got that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair does not need assistance from the Deputy Leader. The Honourable members for Finders.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I seek information whether the Government intends to provide funds for the building of marinas. I am aware that the Department of Marine and Harbors is investigating and considering plans for a marina at Port Lincoln. What stage has that programme reached? Is it still in the planning stage, or is there some intent to proceed with the initial planning, with the breakwater, or some part of the marina? In previous years \$100 000 has been made available for marinas throughout the State. That is a relatively small amount when considered in relation to the Port Lincoln project, which will cost many times that amount. I am interested to hear what is the present intention of the Government about this project.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am unable to find any specific figure provided for the building of a marina at Port Lincoln. I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

**Mr. PETERSON:** Does the amount set aside for expenses incurred in the normal operation and maintenance of ports cover dredging operations? With the unfortunate accident involving the *H. C. Meyer* dredge recently, will future employment of Harbors Board employees be at risk because that dredge is out of action?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will obtain a report about this matter and make it available to the honourable member.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I seek information on the break-down and allocation of funds in the line, "Expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance of ports". I should be pleased if the Minister could tell me at some stage, on a port-by-port basis, where the sum of \$3 341 400 is expected to be spent over this financial year 1979-80.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Other Budget papers available specify the items for expenditure. I will ascertain the details for the member for Mallee. The sum provided for that works programme this year is slightly more than that provided by the previous Government, and the additional figure is anticipated to cover the additional wages. In other words, the new Government is proposing to continue with the rather vigorous programme of new works in and about the marine and harbour areas of the State.

**Mr. PETERSON:** I refer to the line, "Director, Commercial and General Staff". There is an increase of some \$16 000. What does that amount cover?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** There is provision in 1979-80 for a full year's salaries of existing staff in the division as at 30 June based on current rates and incorporating the carry-over effect of salary increases granted in 1978-79. We inherited a bit of carry-over, and the increase provides for that, as well as maintaining the staff of that division at the same level for the ensuing 12 months.

Vote passed.

Miscellaneous, \$904 000.

**Mr. LEWIS:** How is it proposed to spend the sum allocated under the line "Port sites—Investigations, etc." Will the Minister undertake to get information about Beachport? Has that ever been investigated by the previous Government in recent times since the establish-

ment of the wood chip industry in the South-East as a likely deep sea port from which the chips could be exported? Was it also investigated as being a place suitable for development for exporting South Australia's crayfish catch from that region, or for export and any other produce that is taken out of this State in substantial quantities to Victoria for processing and export?

We do not get the demurrage charges or the jobs involved in processing. I wonder whether the previous Government ever bothered to consider such implications when investigating port sites that might be appropriate for development in this State, particularly in my district.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The \$5 000 provided is obviously only a nominal sum for the purposes of catering for preliminary investigations. Any major investigation involving the future use of a port for the purposes outlined by the honourable member would require substantial sums. Obviously, this line is not designed to cater for that.

I recognised, however, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Fisheries the rather intense interest the member for Mallee shows in port sites and in the requirements of the fishing industry, as well as the boating fraternity, around the coastline of his district. I am sure that, on my colleague's return, he will undertake to provide a detailed report on the matters raised by the honourable member, and we look forward to his continued interest in that direction.

Vote passed.

Local Government, \$8 922 000.

**Mr. BANNON:** Could the Minister show me where the line relating to the Director of the Department is in the salaries allocation?

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is on page 63.

**Mr. BANNON:** Director, Management Services Division; is that the Director of the Department?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I imagine that that would be the case. It is Mr. McPhail. It provides for his salary for 1978-79, for part year, and from 1979-80—26 pays.

**Mr. BANNON:** Under "Libraries Division", I query when the position of Librarian in charge of the public library system is to be finalised and whether there is provision under that line for that new position that has been created in the past six months.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The only information I have on that line is that it involves the national wage and other salary increases, but I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to bring down a report on that matter.

**Mr. BANNON:** For the Libraries Division, under "Contingencies", I do not see any reference to allowances to be made for development of the Archives and the archival collections of the State Library. Has any provision been made for this purpose, or will provision be made for it in the current financial year?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Again, I cannot see any specific reference under the Libraries Division, but I will obtain the information for the Leader.

**Mr. PAYNE:** For "Ethnic Affairs", it is not easy to follow what was voted in 1978-79, but that does not concern me so much. The amount actually spent was \$182 163, and the proposed sum is \$246 007. Has the Minister information that would indicate to the Opposition the Government's plans with respect to the department? Other headings refer to divisions; this line refers to "Ethnic Affairs—Adviser, Community Interpreter Service, and Clerical Staff". A healthy increase is mooted as against the sum spent last year. If the Minister has information, considering the fact that we are looking at salaries, wages and related payments in this line, I would be pleased to have that information.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** There is a substantial

increase. This proposed amount includes provision for the new position created and filled during the past financial year.

**Mr. PAYNE:** I take it that one person will not receive \$64 000 a year. I know it is not easy to represent another Minister, but I suspect that \$64 000 is the salary of more than one position.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I take the point made by the honourable member. My information definitely refers to one position. I shall be happy to check the information. The sum seems substantial in regard to one position.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Regarding the line "Local Government Division—Director, Administrator and Clerical Staff", there is about a three fold increase on the sum spent last year, from \$59 000 to \$219 000. There has been a rumour about what has happened in the Department of Local Government, under the control of the Minister of Local Government, about position movements and staff transfers. Is any information available about how the money proposed is to be spent?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is not my place to canvass the area mentioned by the honourable member. My information relating to the Local Government Division states that in 1978-79 the actual payments expenditure for a part year, salaries for up to 15 March 1979, have been charged to the Department of Transport. Regarding 1979-80, the sum provides for the full year's costs for existing staff. There is no proposed increase in permanent staff members.

Vote passed.

Minister of Local Government and Minister of Housing, Miscellaneous, \$2 787 000.

**Mr. BANNON:** What is the composition and function of the Community Development Fund Advisory Committee?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It provides the committee's fees and expenses incurred in relation to the administration of local government grants and provisions for community development. I do not have the composition of the committee, but again I shall be happy to get it.

**Mr. BANNON:** One of the functions would be to disburse moneys. A sum of \$425 000 is to be allocated for grants and provisions for community development. Where are those grants and provisions to go? Have applications been called for community groups for such grants?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I apologise that the information is not provided. With regard to grants and provisions for community development, this is funding to local government to provide assistance to voluntary self-help organisations on the recommendation of community development boards. The specific information will be supplied to the Leader.

**Mr. PAYNE:** The amount for the Litter Control Council is to be increased by about \$14 000. I am having difficulty in identifying this body. Has the Minister any information that will assist me?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It relates to the provision of funds based on the council's budget to undertake various media and advertising activities, to enable the work undertaken in recent years concerning public awareness of litter control to be reinforced. The members are the Lord Mayor (Mr. Bowen), Mr. A. J. Tanner, Chief Superintendent W. Jeffrie, Mr. C. Morrisson, Mrs. F. L. Pens, Mr. J. Snedden, Mr. C. Hall, Mr. R. G. Lewis, Mr. C. M. Hill, and Mr. J. Mitchell. The remuneration is nil. I have the names and areas represented, and I will provide that for the honourable member.

**Mr. HEMMING:** I understand that, at the recent Local Government Association annual general meeting, the Minister of Local Government undertook to rewrite the Local Government Act, I think as a matter of urgency.

Can the Minister say when the rewriting of the Act will commence? Will it take place within this financial year?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I cannot say whether that will take place this financial year, but it is an important part of the Government's policy. The Minister is treating it as a matter of priority, as is the Government. I cannot say whether it will be prepared in time for this financial year, but I assure the honourable member that the Minister is very keen to have it prepared as soon as possible.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** I refer to the line "Grants and provisions for community development", which has a proposed expenditure of \$425 000. The Premier has indicated that a certain amount of grants money was being transferred to Local Government from Community Welfare. Was this amount transferred from another department, because no moneys were voted on or paid in 1978-79? It is not shown in this line where this amount was previously provided. Can the Minister say whether that amount was transferred from community welfare grants?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I cannot provide the honourable member with that information. I have already related all the information I have to another member. However, I shall be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I refer to the line "Disposal of rubbish at Copley". Can the Minister say what that line refers to?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** That refers to a once only payment for the disposal of rubbish resulting from an incident involving Government earth-moving equipment.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I refer to the line "Ethnic Broadcaster Inc.". The previous Government dealt with this line through the Ethnic Affairs Department, but it has now been put under Local Government. Moves have been made throughout the State, and certainly in my electorate, for ethnic groups to set up facilities to broadcast in several different languages. The previous Government assisted these groups. I notice that the amount proposed for 1979-80 has not increased from that spent last year, and I question that, because I believe an increase should be considered.

I understand that ethnic groups in my own electorate desire to obtain a proper building to set up facilities to prepare programmes before they are put to air. Perhaps the Minister cannot give me a reply tonight, but I would very much appreciate it if he would take up this question with the Minister in another place and find out whether some consideration will be given to providing facilities for ethnic people to improve their facilities for broadcasting in languages other than English, and whether it is possible to provide these groups with further finances.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** First, relating to the line itself, the amount proposed is the same as that provided in 1978-79. That sum will provide for the salary of a coordinator and secretary, and for operating expenses.

The Minister of Local Government, who is the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, has been very much involved with the need to assist ethnic people; he is very committed in that area. I know that he would be doing everything he possibly could to assist in this way, and the Government sees this area as one of priority. I do not know whether money has been set aside but, following the question from the member opposite, I will consult with my colleague and provide an answer for the honourable member.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Minister say what mechanisms will be used by the Department of Local Government to determine who receives grants, and will community development boards have any role in the allocation of the money under the grants provision?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am not able to give that

information at present. The concept of community development boards under local government is a new concept under the present Government. I know that the Minister has formulated details relating to this new initiative. I will provide the details as soon as possible.

**Mr. PAYNE:** Can the Minister say why there has been such a large increase for the Building Fire Safety Committee for which there was expenditure last year of \$4 897, while the proposed amount this year is \$31 000? Is there to be some programme that we have not heard of? Also, I note that the sum of \$2 000 is proposed for the Interim Waste Management Committee. I understood that this committee would be coming to a halt. Is that figure likely to be the last payment, since we now have a Waste Management Authority?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** In relation to the Building Fire Safety Committee, the provision of \$30 000 is for committee fees and expenses incurred in relation to building fire safety regulations in all local government areas of the State. In 1979-80 the allocation provides \$6 000 for an overseas tour by the Chairman of the committee and \$10 000 for the engagement of outside consultants. I will get further details concerning the outside consultants. Although legislation has been passed to establish a Waste Management Commission, I am told that the interim committee will need to assist the commission for the first part of the financial year. Provision has been made to cover committee fees for the required period.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** I refer to the provision of \$425 000 for grants and provisions for community development. Given that the Department of Community Development no longer exists, can the Minister say whether this is the sole provision to replace the amount that was provided for that department and, if not, can he indicate the location in the Estimates of the other amounts which relate to the former department?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I cannot provide that information. As I have already said, this involves funds to enable local government to provide assistance to voluntary self-help organisations on the recommendations of community development boards. Obviously, the honourable member wants more information than that with which I can now provide him. I will therefore obtain that information for him.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I refer to the allocation for the Keith Hockridge Memorial Scholarship, actual payments for which in 1978-79 amounted to \$8 110. Most members, especially those who have had some experience in local government, realise that this is a keenly-sought scholarship and that only the best of local government administrators receive the benefit thereof. I am pleased to see that the allocation for 1979-80 has been increased to \$14 600. Does this increased vote cover two scholarships this financial year, or has the scope of the scholarship been widened, perhaps to include overseas travel?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** This scholarship was established in memory of Keith Hockridge, who was formerly Secretary of Local Government. Its aim is to allow one senior local government employee to go overseas and to have up to two months in which to study various sections of local government. In 1978-79, the expense incurred covered the cost of one overseas scholarship, including air fares, accommodation and incidental expenses, incurred by Mr. Harry Richards of Port Augusta. The 1979-80 allocation will provide funds for two scholarships, one of which will go to Mr. David Williams of Salisbury, that scholarship having been carried over from 1978-79. The other scholarship winner has yet to be decided.

Vote passed.

Arts, \$1 164 000; Art Gallery, \$1 062 000—passed.  
Minister of Arts, Miscellaneous, \$7 917 000.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** The Liberal Party said during the election campaign that, if it was elected, grants to the Jam Factory would be cut and that the money would be reallocated to other areas within the arts portfolio. I notice (and I am not complaining about this) that the Jam Factory Workshop is still to receive \$310 000 this year. Does this mean that grants will still go to the Jam Factory Workshops this year?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** This line provides a Government grant towards meeting operating and capital expenditure requirements in accordance with approved budgets that are reported on by the Arts Finance Advisory Committee. The committee members are Mr. Bachmann, (Chairman), Mr. Ian McPhail, Mr. Amadio and Mr. T. Starr.

**Mr. TRAINER:** What proportion of the grant of \$1 133 000 for the South Australian Film Corporation will be taken up with the purchase of new films for the documentary library of the South Australian Film Corporation, and how much of that proportion will go towards requests from the Education Department?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I will provide the information I have, and if the member is not satisfied I will seek additional information. Expenditure in 1978-79 included a basic grant of \$870 600 for the film library, \$20 000 for the film section of the Flinders University drama centre, a perpetuity grant of \$450 000 and a one-off debt servicing grant of \$65 000. The provision includes a basic grant for the film library, a perpetuity grant for the servicing of debenture loans and a grant to aid developing film makers. Obviously, the member requires more information, which I will get for him.

**Mr. PAYNE:** The projected amount this year for the progressive music Broadcasting Association is a sizeable reduction on the amount spent last year. That is not generally the case with the other items under the "Miscellaneous" heading. Is there a reason why that allocation has been reduced sharply?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I do not know that the amount has been reduced sharply. The information I have is that it involves the provision of a grant towards administration and operating costs following the establishment of the P.M.B.A. and the issue of FM broadcasting licences in 1978-79.

**Mr. Payne:** It is a distinct drop.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Yes, but not quite as sharp as the honourable member indicated. I will find out for the honourable member the reason for that decrease.

Vote passed.

Agriculture, \$16 963 000.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I note that the position of Director of Agriculture (as it appeared in last year's Budget) has been upgraded to Director-General of Agriculture with a corresponding salary increase. What increased responsibilities does the Director-General of Agriculture have? Some of his responsibilities have been transferred to the Minister of Fisheries, whose department has an Assistant Director rather than a Director-General. There has obviously been an increase in responsibilities by virtue of the change of name. What are those increased responsibilities over and above the loss of responsibilities provided for by the fisheries transfer?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Dealing with the last matter first, it was part of Liberal Party policy in Opposition to excise, in Government, fisheries from agriculture. I am pleased to report that, in accordance with our programme of upholding the previously announced



commitments, after the swearing-in ceremony on the Tuesday following the election of 15 September, a meeting was held between the Minister of Fisheries and his Acting Director Mr. Kirkegaard, another member of his staff, a couple of officers from the Department of Agriculture, including the Director-General, and myself.

In approximately 15 minutes the Department of Fisheries was effectively and officially excised from the Department of Agriculture. I mention that to demonstrate that the officers in both the respective departments, under the canopy of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (as it was), had read our policies and, after the election on 15 September, acted very swiftly to prepare themselves for the excise of Fisheries from Agriculture. During that very brief period involved in the official transfer of the responsibilities, it was noted for circulation amongst the staff that there would be no physical shift of the officers involved. Indeed, the officers attached to the Department of Fisheries are still located in Grenfell Centre where they had been previously. There has been no structural or physical disturbance caused by the implementation of our policy. Again, with the co-operation of officers of the department, the previous Budget preparations for the then Department of Agriculture and Fisheries were divided and the appropriate amounts applied to the respective singular departments for the purposes of preparing this overall Budget. Indeed, the mechanics of carrying out the Government's policy were understood and adhered to promptly and effectively.

As for the reasons that led up to our commitments in this direction, as shadow Minister of Fisheries in the Liberal Party for a couple of years, I put before our Party a recommendation to consider excising fisheries from agriculture on the premise that it was initially my belief (and after wards recognised by the Party) that hunters or farmers of the sea were never closely related to farmers of the land, that their practices were quite divorced from one another, and that, even though they both pursued primary producing interests, there was no affinity between the two primary groups. However, the affinity did exist between the pursuits of the fishing fraternity, both the recreational and commercial group, and the role of the Department of Marine and Harbors, that department being responsible for boating and wharf facilities and for the registration of boats and the safety laws relating to them and to the sea.

On that basis, it seemed more appropriate to separate the Department of Fisheries and have it recognised under a Minister of Fisheries, who should also be, if possible, the Minister of Marine. Indeed, that theory has been implemented, and reports I have received are that, under the administration of the Minister of Fisheries, the Hon. Allan Rodda, the policy is working extremely well indeed.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the Minister for his answer. In terms of the reason why the split took place, I am satisfied with the information provided. I understand that it was a Liberal Party campaign platform not only at the last election but also at the one before that.

It is well known that the proposal was to break up agriculture and fisheries into two separate sections. The actual question I was mainly concentrating on is the upgrading of the Director of the Department of Agriculture to Director-General. What was the exact reason for the upgrading? Why was there not a similar upgrading of the relevant head in the Department of Fisheries, where the present head remains as Assistant Director? Given the important tasks ahead of the Minister of Fisheries, including the implications of the 200-mile zone, it would have seemed logical that both these Ministries had a similar status head.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I appreciate the point

raised by the honourable member. Jim McColl is the Director-General of Agriculture at present, and he, under the previous Government, was the Director-General of Agriculture and Fisheries. His title and salary have remained constant and unaltered. He, in turn, in agriculture, has a number of Assistant Directors covering the various divisions of that department. Mr. Kirkegaard was the Assistant Director under Jim McColl when fisheries was with agriculture, prior to the election. Since the election, he has gone with the Department of Fisheries and is directly responsible to the Minister of Fisheries, and his title at present is not Assistant Director (because, indeed, he is in charge of the Department of Fisheries) but Acting Director. It is the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries, at his own discretion, to determine for what period Mr. Kirkegaard continues in that role as Acting Director of Fisheries and as to whether he ultimately becomes Director and/or Director-General of that department. I take it, from my limited knowledge of the staffing arrangement within that department, that it will not be necessary for him to adopt the title of Director-General because, as far as I know, it is unnecessary for him to have other Assistant Directors to administer his department. Therefore, if he becomes the permanent head of that department, his title will be Director.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** For the Extension and Information Services, I note that the proposed vote is down by about \$35 000 on last year's vote. I recall that, during the election campaign, a specific promise was made for all extension material produced by the department to be free of charge to consumers. As this will have a net cost on the Budget, does the vote imply that there will be fewer publications published, either in total or in titles? If not, how does the Minister propose that that sum is a realistic figure of the cost of the Extension and Information Services?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I note the diligence of the honourable member and his adherence to my request earlier that he follow the lines from beginning to end, thus making it easier for me. I am sure that the Opposition will appreciate how much more useful it is for them, also.

A sum of \$304 000 is proposed this year for "Extension and Information Services", about \$26 500 less than the sum voted for the previous year. This sum represents provision for the salaries of the staff at the Extension and Information Branch. The sum is less this year than it was last year because we have excluded the staff costs for those personnel who are now located in the regions.

The member for Salisbury may have noted before the election that it was part of our policy to put the men in the field, where the action was, wherever that was possible, and decentralise the extension services of the Department of Agriculture and have extension service officers distributed in the field adjacent to the rural community, where we believed the need was. Accordingly, we have provided for the additional expenditure involved in a line further down the same group relating to salaries, wages and related payments.

"Regional operations" has increased from the expenditure of 1978-79 of \$1 898 037 to \$3 419 000, about \$1 600 000 in additional funds for the added involvement of regional officers engaged within the department.

**Mr. TRAINER:** Regarding the line "Advance to Salger Proprietary Limited", \$10 669 was spent last year. The Auditor-General's Report (page 298) states:

The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries advanced \$11 032 to the company to June 1979.

Perhaps it is my lack of familiarity with accounting procedures, but there seems to be a discrepancy of \$363 between the amount stated as the actual payment in the

Estimates of Expenditure, and the statement for actual expenditure, in terms of the advance to the company, in the Auditor-General's Report.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will have to check that, but I think it is reasonable to note that the Auditor-General's Report was under print with material related to the previous Government's prepared Budget before it went to the election on 15 September. This Budget is the new Government's Budget. I can only suggest that that is why the Auditor-General's Report may differ slightly from what is listed in our Budget papers. That may not be the case, but at this stage that is the only explanation I can give for the slight discrepancy. However, regarding the advance to Salger Proprietary Limited in particular, that company is the exempt proprietary company of which the Treasurer and the Minister of Agriculture are equal shareholders. The company is used by the department to carry out dry land farming projects in Ksar Chellala in Algeria. Funds were provided in 1978-79 to meet expenses of the company, prior to its establishing credit facilities with the State Bank. The advance will be repaid in full this year from the contract income. That explanation covers the particular line and the amount applicable to this line in this Budget paper.

The matter of the discrepancy between the Budget line amount in this paper and that appearing in the Auditor-General's Report is covered by the explanation I gave. Should I be wrong, rather than mislead the member and the Committee, I will obtain a report from the Auditor-General's Department and from my department and provide the honourable member with the answers.

**Mr. TRAINER:** I am glad to accept the offer of reporting on the matter, but I would like to comment on the tentative explanation put forward for the discrepancy. I could not accept that it is because one figure is from this Government's Budget and the other is from the Auditor-General's Report. Both figures relate to actual expenditure for the financial year 1978-79, and that could not vary from one document to the other.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It should not, but it is the only basis I can offer as a reason for the discrepancy. I cannot imagine that the Auditor-General had time, between 15 September and the time when his report was tabled in this Parliament, to produce or amend details in his report, bearing in mind that the new Government was still preparing its Budget papers.

**Mr. Trainer:** Both figures relate to June 1979, and nothing much could have happened since then to alter them retrospectively.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** We had an election in September, and the new Government prepared its own Budget, whereas the Auditor-General is in a department which has been a fixture for some years, and he was under direction from the previous Government to prepare a report consistent with that Government's Budget.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I understand, from conversations with the former Minister of Agriculture, that some substantial reorganisation was planned within the Rural Assistance Branch that would have led to great cost efficiencies. The allocation proposed is \$302 000, compared to an actual expenditure of \$309 000, a decrease in real terms of some \$7 000. Is that the result of the reorganisation within the branch or of a cut-back in the service provided?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will get a report which produces in specific detail the justification for the proposed expenditure of \$302 000. I am aware that my predecessor undertook a substantial restructuring of the Rural Assistance Branch after adopting both the responsibility and the staff on transfer from the Lands

Department to the Department of Agriculture, and that that structural and personnel reshuffling project is still under way.

I imagine that that amount is principally provided for the completion of that restructuring. I am in the process of studying the function of that division within my department, but I cannot give any indication that any change will be made or is envisaged in relation to my predecessor's restructuring programme. There is no conclusive evidence to suggest that that programme was designed for anything but the improvement of operations within the department.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Will the Minister provide me with the same detailed break-down relating to that line. Obviously that line does not contain the funds that are likely to be made available, so I ask the Minister whether he could inform me what sums of money have been allocated over the last five years in rural assistance to farmers in South Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I can provide the member for Mallee with the details of the proposed expenditure of \$302 000 under this line. However, I cannot provide for him all of the financial details in relation to rural assistance, because this division has not been with my department for the last five years. The Rural Industries Assistance Act was previously administered by the Lands Department, and only recently the Minister of Agriculture adopted control. I will certainly obtain the details the honourable member requires quickly from my department for the period it has been under our control, and I will obtain the remainder of the information from the Lands Department for the period when this division was under its control.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I refer to the line "Advisory Board of Agriculture, Women's Agricultural Bureau Council and State Committee of Rural Youth Council—expenses". Can the Minister supply a break-down of those expenses showing how much money has been allocated to those three bodies?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Total expenditure proposed for 1979-80 under this line is \$28 000. Of that sum, \$15 000 will go to the Advisory Board of Agriculture; \$7 500 to the Women's Agricultural Bureau Council; and \$5 500 to the State Committee of Rural Youth Council.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** I refer to the line "Bovine Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Programme". There appears to be an increase of about \$150 000 for salaries, wages and related payments.

Under the heading "Contingencies—General", there appears to be a reduction in expenditure on the programme of about \$110 000. Can the Minister explain why that is so? There is a reduction in the amount of work to be done, yet an increase in the cost of that work.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I can appreciate that the honourable member might be confused by the mention of the line in two separate places and that the proposed funding is not consistent in both. There is a precise explanation for this. In relation to the line under "Salaries and wages and related payments", which is a direct responsibility of the State, there is provision for salaries and wages of animal health branch staff engaged in the brucellosis and tuberculosis programme. The other line refers to an Australia-wide programme directly funded by the States and the Commonwealth, and designed to rid Australian cattle herds of brucellosis and tuberculosis by the mid 1980's. I think the honourable member will also appreciate that this line is different in so far as it is funded by the States and Commonwealth on an agreed proportionate basis. The provision for 1979-80 consists of

two distinct components—first, \$728 000 for compensation for producers of cattle destroyed because of a positive reaction to tests for T.B. and brucellosis; and, secondly, \$1 588 000 to meet the operating, travelling and capital expenses of the eradication campaign.

I hope that that explains the situation to the honourable member, so that he understands that one is a straight-out salary figure which is measurable and identifiable because it belongs to our own staff in our own department. The other fund involves the travelling and mechanical expenses in the field, and it involves a fluctuating figure relating to the payments to farmers from the compensation fund to which farmers contribute by virtue of a levy on each beast sold when it goes to market. In that sense it is very difficult to forecast in a measurable form exactly what the figure will be. In any event, because of the Australia-wide nature of the eradication programme, there is an input from the Commonwealth as well as the States.

**Mr. LEWIS:** How is it intended to distribute the money allocated for control of pasture aphids? Does that include any salaries and wages, or is it all for the purpose of investigating ways and means of control? Does it include control of other nasty bodies such as millipedes? Can the Minister say where the millipede control programme is detailed?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I refer, first, to pasture aphids and the provision for operating, travelling and capital expenditure for the aphid task force. This financial year is the final year of a three-year campaign to develop biological control of pasture aphid and aphid-resistant lucerne cultivars. The Commonwealth Government has contributed \$450 000 over the period of the campaign to assist with the breeding and distribution of the parasite wasp.

I am pleased to say that a departmental officer engaged at Northfield, namely, Mr. Ian Kaehne, has done a tremendous job in his efforts to produce aphid-resistant lucerne. I have pleasure in referring to him in that congratulatory sense on this occasion in recognition of the work he and his team have done in this direction.

The member for Mallee also referred to the proposed control of millipedes, which raises an interesting point. As a matter of policy the Liberal Party announced before the election that, if elected, it would provide funds to assist with a programme for the future biological control of these pests. I realise that those who have not heard of or experienced millipedes treat the whole subject as a bit of a joke. However, those of us who have had these blasted little wogs around our houses know how serious a problem they are.

The Government has given the public an undertaking and, indeed, is prepared forthwith to meet that commitment. Indeed, the allocation of \$1 353 000 for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries includes a specific amount of \$10 000 that is to be used during the remainder of this financial year for the purpose to which I have referred.

That money will be paid to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation as this State's contribution to enable that organisation to set up its programme of producing an appropriate biological agent, which will be released as soon as the right one is secured, given, of course, that sufficient numbers are available to enable them to be effective. That sum is also the Government's contribution as an on-going recognition of this problem. In the coming Budget period the Government intends to provide \$30 000 for this purpose for the next full financial year.

In this respect I pay recognition to the member for Fisher. Every member who has been around this place in

the past few years would have heard the honourable member raise this subject several times in the House. He sought without success to have the former Government recognise the importance of this biological agent control and, by his persistence and on the evidence that he had collated and brought to his own Party's attention, that Party, in the lead-up to the last State election, agreed to take the matter on board as a matter of policy. I give the member for Fisher full marks for his diligence and persistence in that regard.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I thank the Minister for that information and assure him of the value it will be to the people in my electorate. There has been a reduction throughout most of my electorate of well over 100 000 acres of lucerne pasture, which produces, both in terms of fodder and in terms of meat and wool, many millions of dollars of income for the people who live in the area and depend on it for their livelihood, whether it is in the South-East or the area of Mallee west of the river, in Strathalbyn and Langhorne Creek, the latter area being infested with millipedes. We also have trouble with spotted and blue alfalfa aphids. I notice an allocation of \$4 000 in connection with the Consultative Committee on Pasture Aphids. Who are the members of that committee and what is its work in the short term?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I will get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I see an amount of \$500 allocated for the Swine Compensation Fund, under "Miscellaneous". I hope that while we are dealing with swine compensation the member for Todd might wake up and listen.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is nothing in the vote about the member for Todd. The honourable member will confine his remarks to the vote before the Committee.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** The Minister made a statement this afternoon dealing with the swine fever outbreak in Tasmania. I read in a newspaper yesterday that the complete piggery in Tasmania has been destroyed and the animals killed. If that disease enters South Australia, does the Minister think that the sum of \$500 is sufficient for compensation for this financial year?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The \$500 provided in this line is not for compensating owners for pigs slaughtered as a result of disease or for any other reason. It is simply to provide funds to pay the Chairman and members of the advisory board. The Swine Compensation Fund is used to pay compensation for pigs slaughtered in the State for a number of reasons, but mainly where tuberculosis is identified. The growers contribute to the fund in a manner similar to the system of levying the sales of cattle, and a swine tax is paid at the time of sale.

The honourable member also referred to the vesicular disease that has been identified in Tasmania. Slaughtering that has occurred there has so far incurred a loss of about \$100 000 in total. By an all-State agreement in this nation, we in South Australia are required to contribute to those cost, so far. Our proportion of contribution is 4.4 per cent in a formula which has been previously calculated and which is agreed to as a matter of long standing. Should the figure of compensation increase as a result of further slaughterings and/or structural burnings, we are committed in the State to continue to contribute on that sharing and formula basis.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for recognising that you, and not the member for Napier, have the right and exercise the prerogative to determine how many questions may be asked of the Minister on the lines. I well recognised the comments made to me by my colleague about the behaviour of members opposite, including the member for Napier.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Mallee to confine his remarks to the vote before the Committee. There is nothing in the vote about the behaviour of the honourable member for Napier or any other member.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I know that, when he gets stuck into the pig lines, that is possibly something to do with his narcissistic preoccupation with members of his own species. I refer to the purchase of motor vehicles. In this instance I relate an anecdote that I can vouch for. I will not too closely describe the location in which it occurred, other than to say that one of my constituents who is an officer of the Department of Agriculture had, for four years, a departmental light-weight one-ton truck which he had maintained in his own time and which he used for the work he was doing on the research station. It was perfectly servicable and he was happy to retain it, as it enabled him to most efficiently use the fuel at his disposal and thus the taxpayers' money for the job that had to be done by a vehicle of this type.

However, under the previous Government's administration that one-ton truck was taken from him. He was given a five-ton truck in its place which he could not fit into the shed provided for its storage and which was less than half as efficient in its use of the fuel. It also cost more for the maintenance of tyres than did the smaller truck. I ask the Minister whether he could give me an assurance that he and our Government will not be guilty of such stupid bureaucratic insistence on waste.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is far too much conversation across the Chamber.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am amazed to learn that such bad management has occurred under any Government administration. I hope that sort of caper will not occur under our management. I do not really believe that it will. My association with the officers of the Department of Agriculture at every level so far encountered leaves me somewhat impressed with their administrative ability.

I am confident that the type of incident which is alleged to have occurred down in the Mallee District hopefully will not recur. The provision, of \$760 000, referred to by the honourable member, provides for the replacement of 148 passenger vehicles, in line with current Government policy of 40 000 kilometres or two years plus, and six four-wheel drive vehicles deemed to have reached the end of their economic life. I am surprised to see that so many vehicles are involved in the ensuing 12 months, but it is a field labour and advisory intensive department.

**Mr. Keneally:** How many cylinders?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am unable to tell the honourable member whether the vehicles are four, six or eight cylinders. Most of the department's vehicles that I have seen about the place to date have been six cylinder. I take it that the honourable member has raised the question rather lightly, and does not need that information. It would seem that I have already covered the several points raised by the member for Mallee, and I do not need to expand on that matter any further.

Vote passed.

Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous, \$5 932 000.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I seek information in relation to the fees and expenses of committees of inquiry. Reference was made to the money expended last year on the working party on the entry of meat into the metropolitan area. I take it that that report has been concluded, because no further money has been provided, unless it is on a different line. On the findings of that committee, will the Government act in relation to the metropolitan meat area?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Yes, the report was tabled in Parliament in the latter part of last year. I take it that the honourable member is referring to the John Potter Report, which contained a number of recommendations, probably the most significant of which included the abolition of the quota system in South Australia and proposed that the currently known Samcor area, the inner metropolitan Adelaide, should become a free trading area for licensed meat processors, where on-site inspection occurred and, indeed, where the premises were upgraded to a standard of hygiene satisfactory for human consumption. This is a subject of great interest, and, although no money is provided for further working party reports, the report received demonstrates that we are ready to move in relation to meat hygiene. Members will be aware of my recent notice of intention to move in this place for the appointment of a Select Committee, and that subject will be proceeded with next Tuesday, when, I hope, that this debate will be over.

Following the setting up of that committee, it is intended to introduce legislation in the early part of the autumn 1980 session to make provision for an appropriate standard of meat hygiene in licensed abattoirs; those licensed abattoirs, when subject to meat inspection, will be able to deliver meat into the metropolitan area, an area to be defined precisely in the legislation. Competition trading will be proceeded with in this popular market area of Adelaide without encumbrances other than those I have mentioned, and certainly without the encumbrance of quotas.

It is intended that the Government's policy in relation to recognition of local government will be given effect to, and, in order to recognise the smaller operators at slaughterhouse premises level throughout the State, those premises will be subject to general inspection by local boards of health, under the canopy of local government. Local government will be provided with a code of hygiene practice on which it will be guided in its inspection and control of premises. Those slaughterhouse premises that are upgraded to that level will be able to trade within their respective local government areas and not be eliminated, as many of them would have been if the previous Government's meat hygiene legislation had proceeded.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I refer to the line "Dingo Control Fund Subsidy", and the Minister could be forgiven for mistakenly believing that I am referring to members opposite, but that is not true. I am genuinely concerned about the increase in population of dingoes and the economic consequences of the activities of dingoes in Mallee. I would have asked my question in relation to the lines under the Department of Environment, had it not been for the fact that you fellows wasted time earlier, so I will ask my question now.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BANNON:** I rise on a point of order. I think the term "dingo" is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Can the honourable Leader show how the word was used?

**Mr. BANNON:** I think the dingoes referred to were in Mallee, but the term could well have reflected on members in this House.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I cannot uphold the point of order.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Actually, the Leader was mistaken; the word I used was "fellows", not "dingoes". If the Leader sees himself as such, it is not up to me to deny him the right—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Mallee must return to the matter under discussion. He

must not imply that honourable members are dingoes.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I meant "fellows". The Leader might see himself as one. I am interested in the way in which the Dingo Control Fund subsidy is distributed, and whether or not the number of warrigals in country Chandos and adjacent farmlands have skull dimensions similar to those of wild dingoes in the North of the State.

They are doing considerable damage, and their numbers have increased with the rabbit population and the increased cover available to them. It relates to inadequate management programmes in the recently declared national park in that location, which has enabled the wild dogs to build up in number. These matters are of genuine concern to many of my constituents, and I want the Minister to reassure me that, if the population begins to get out of control, some additional assistance will be available to landholders to stop the stock losses from increasing at the rate which has prevailed in recent months.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I appreciate the honourable member's concern. When I was in his district a couple of weeks ago, I spoke to the Chairman of the Lameroo council on this matter. The Lameroo council, as well as his constituents, would be proud of the honourable member for raising the matter on their behalf. Section 17 of the Vertebrate Pests Act provides for subsidies to be paid annually to the authority, based on rates collected in dingo control areas. The provision that we referred to initially covers scalp bounties, administration overheads, scalp freight charges, and dingo bait programmes.

Vote passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.8 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 November at 2 p.m.