

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 17, 1977

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY TITLES

The **PRESIDENT**: I said yesterday I would give a considered reply to the question asked yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Blevins, which I do now. The titular designation of "Honourable" for members of the Legislative Council in South Australia dates from 1856. The practice originated with a request by the Governor of New South Wales that this mark of distinction be conferred on the members of the Legislative Council in that Colony. Queen Victoria granted the request, and in a dispatch to the Governor of South Australia, dated October 30, 1856, the Secretary of State for the Colonies intimated that the Queen had been pleased to extend the privilege to the members of the Legislative Council in South Australia. The title lapses when membership of the Council ceases, but may be continued under certain conditions, on the recommendation of the Governor. In the dispatch to the Governor of New South Wales, the Secretary of State for the Colonies indicated that members of the Legislative Council, having become entitled to the titular designation of "Honourable" should be so described in the several Acts and instruments issued under authority of the Governor.

It has become a long-established practice in this Parliament to refer to members, both individually and collectively, in both Houses as "honourable members" and in this Chamber, more often than not, it has also been the custom when addressing members individually to use their proper title. However, it seems to me that outside the confines of this Chamber, a member may disclaim this title if he so desires. If any individual member feels this way, he may cease to use the title in any of his correspondence and he may tell his constituents, friends and relations that he prefers to be called Mr., Mrs. or Miss, or even Ms., and ask them to respond accordingly.

As for the long-established practice in this Chamber which I previously referred to, I personally intend to continue it from the Chair, but I would not regard it as being in any way out of order for members on the floor of the Council to address other members individually as Mr., Mrs. or Miss without using the title "Honourable". Indeed, this has been going on for some years anyway and I am not aware that any member has been offended, nor do I think the general dignity of the Chamber is in any way diminished by so doing. However, in saying this I give notice to all members that I will resist to the best of my ability any attempts to use the Christian names only and expressions such as "mate", "sport" or any other similar familiarity.

QUESTIONS

LABOR PARTY BELIEFS

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation, prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in this place.

The **PRESIDENT**: What is the subject matter?

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: The subject matter is Labor Party beliefs.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: Recently, a statement by the Premier of this State was reported in the *Australian* as follows:

We believe no development and no major change can occur without the work of an elite which acts as the activator of society.

Was the inspiration for this statement the Adelaide Club of the 1860's, Stanley Baldwin of the 1920's, or Idi Amin of the 1970's? Or, is this statement a statement of the modern thinking of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: One does not know how one gets described in a certain way any more than one knows what inspires honourable members opposite to make statements from time to time.

DROUGHT

The **Hon. F. T. BLEVINS**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture about drought.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. F. T. BLEVINS**: In the first edition of today's *News*, an article headed "P.M. pledges assistance for drought" states that the Minister of Agriculture indicated in his statement that Commonwealth approval for drought measures runs out on December 31. Has the Commonwealth Government's new-found concern for farmers been translated into extending the period for drought measures?

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: Not at this stage. We still have no indication from the Commonwealth Government as to whether approval for drought measures will go beyond December 31. All honourable members with experience in agriculture will realise that many farmers' financial problems will not reach their peak until early next year. Because the effects on their income will be most severe in the first few months of next year, it is absolutely essential that financial assistance to farmers be extended beyond December 31. It will make it extremely difficult for the State Government's planning if we do not receive an indication of the Commonwealth Government's attitude as early as possible. There will be administrative problems if we are notified only a short time before December 31. We therefore hope that we will soon receive notification of a continuation of the Commonwealth Government's assistance.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in this Chamber, about private members' business.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: On November 4, I wrote the following letter to the Premier about the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill:

It occurs to me that because of the Government's considerable legislative programme, there may be very limited private member's time in the House of Assembly. In this session I introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill dealing with child pornography as soon as possible and, with the co-operation of the Minister of Health, for which I am most grateful, the Bill has been expeditiously dealt with in the Council and has now been passed. My request is that time be allowed in the House of Assembly for the Bill to be debated. The second reading has been made an order of the day for Wednesday, November 23.

The Government has so far opposed the Bill. However, I do submit that it clearly does deal with a most important matter and one about which the public are concerned.

Also, in support of my request, I would refer to the history of this Bill and previous Bills in identical terms. I originally introduced an identical Bill giving notice on the first day of the second session of the last Parliament. Private members' time in the House of Assembly had already run out but this was the first opportunity which I had to introduce the Bill after it came to my notice and the notice of the public that there was a considerable quantity of child pornography in South Australia.

The Bill passed the Council and I wrote to you requesting that you allow it to be debated in the House of Assembly. You replied that you would not let the Bill be debated in the House of Assembly as an exception could not be made on this particular private member's Bill. I gave notice for the introduction of an identical Bill on the first day of the third session of the last Parliament. The Bill was again dealt with expeditiously and was in the second reading stage when Parliament was prorogued.

I gave notice for the introduction of the present Bill on the first day of this session. I do not blame the Government for the unfortunate history of these Bills to date, but I do suggest that there is a good case for requesting that this Bill on an important matter which is of concern to many members of the public, should be able to be debated in the House of Assembly at this stage.

I today received from the Acting Premier a letter dated November 10, 1977, although I received it this day, reading:

I have considered your request dated November 4, 1977, seeking time in the House of Assembly for your Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill, but, unfortunately your request could not be granted in view of the time needed for the Government's own legislative programme. Currently our Classification of Publications Board refuses to classify pornography depicting children, so the vendor of such material is already liable to prosecution. In addition, the Government proposes, of its own volition, to strengthen relevant legislation by increasing penalties under the Police Offences Act in the new year.

(signed) Yours sincerely, Des Corcoran.

I refer to the fact that notice has been given to introduce this Bill on the first day of three successive sessions of Parliament and that no opportunity is to be given to Parliament to decide whether the present law is adequate or not. One of my concerns is that Parliament is not to be allowed to debate this important issue. My other concern is for the whole democratic programme. It would appear that no private members' time at all will be allowed in the House of Assembly. This would appear to mean that, for example, the Bill currently before this Council relating to B.Y.O. licences will not be debated in the House of Assembly unless the Government considers wining and dining to be more important than control of pornography. My questions are: why will the Government not allow Parliament to determine whether or not it considers the present legislation satisfactory and, in the interest of the democratic process, will the Minister ask Cabinet to allow this and other private members' business to be debated?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not think the Deputy Premier's letter implied that it could not be debated—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Yes, it did.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If a Bill is passed here, it automatically goes on to the Notice Paper in another place. It is for your people not to withhold your private member's Bill when it comes along but to give it top priority. I am not aware that there will not be any private

members' business on Wednesday in another place, when the Address in Reply debate is finished.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But this is the last day of private members' business.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If your people want to talk that long, tell them to go quiet so that your Bill will get priority. It is not for the honourable member to ask the Government to do his business for him. Surely the Opposition in another place will see that this Bill gets priority on private members' day. The honourable member knows very well that Standing Orders do not allow private members' Bills to be considered while the Address in Reply debate is continuing, but they are waffling on in another place; they have already had one session of Address in Reply debate earlier this year. The honourable member should take it up with his own people first, and, if he stills does not get some priority, he can come back here again.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Do I understand the Minister to say that the Bill will be able to be debated in private members' time and that private members' time on Wednesday will be allowed in this session of Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My understanding is that private members'—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Answer the question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Oh! Ask it again at some other time or put it on notice.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has just answered the question; I think the Minister was perfectly right in his suggestion.

FOOD CONTAMINATION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Health without seeking leave or anything of that sort. Is the Minister aware of a press and radio announcement that in recent months there has been further food contamination in a particular firm, which I will not mention now but which I have mentioned frequently in this Council? Will the Minister say whether it is likely that the egg pulp and associated products concerned, to which the newspapers and media have referred, will be brought to South Australia? Also, does the Minister think that his department has been given sufficient warning to ensure that the South Australian public will not be endangered by the ever-increasing amount of contaminated food emanating from this company?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek a report for the honourable member.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Federal Government has clearly indicated that it is willing to assist with the destruction of old and weak cattle in drought-stricken areas of South Australia to the extent, I believe, of \$10 a beast. Will the Minister detail for the Council what steps his department is about to initiate in this regard, as I believe that the implementation of the destruction of these cattle is urgent? Also, has the Minister machinery in

readiness to enable South Australia to take advantage of this subsidy scheme?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes. I made a short announcement on the Australian Broadcasting Commission *Country Hour*, which was intended quickly to inform people in pastoral areas of the scheme. The scheme that operated until now did not include such areas. It was worked by local government bodies and not in pastoral areas.

We have made arrangements between the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the Pastoral Board, which will be administering the necessary arrangements for the slaughtering of stock. I have advised stockowners in pastoral regions to contact the board and make the necessary arrangements with it concerning the time at which they wish their cattle to be slaughtered. The board has agreed to provide the department with details of beasts that have been slaughtered. It is not intended to have an inspector present for all slaughterings. Instead, it will arrange with stockowners in the area a suitable method of identifying slaughtered cattle. As a result, an inspector will be able to call on a day subsequent to the slaughtering and certify that a certain number of cattle has been slaughtered. A certificate will then be sent to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and payment made.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Have you any further details of the scheme?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I made the point on the A.B.C. *Country Hour* that stockowners could contact the Pastoral Board and make the necessary arrangements. We do not want to be inflexible regarding scalping or other methods of identification but, if stockowners wish to suggest certain alternatives that the Pastoral Board thinks are satisfactory, we are willing to consider them. I therefore suggested that they contact the Pastoral Board, but that they should not undertake any slaughtering before making that contact. Regarding people in council areas, the arrangements will be the same as they were under previous schemes.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question is supplementary to the one asked by the Hon. Mr. Foster. It is not often that he and I are on anywhere near the same wave length. Does the Minister of Agriculture recall that two or three weeks ago I drew attention to the fact that the period for drought relief extended from October 1 last year to December 31 this year? I asked him whether arrangements were in train for the continuation of this period into next year, as that continuation was most essential. As I recall, the Minister stated that, as far as he was aware, some negotiations were going on at departmental level. As we are fast approaching the end of the calendar year and the end of the period under review, has the Minister, in view of the urgency of this matter, made direct Minister to Minister contact on this matter and, if not, will he do so?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: When the honourable member asked the question, I stated that there had been negotiations between the State and the Commonwealth at officer level. Since then, the Premier has taken the matter up at Prime Minister level. He has put the view of South Australia that the approval for drought relief measures should continue into next year because we expect that the number of farmers applying probably will reach its peak at the end of this year or in the first few months of next year, and it is all associated with the current drought and should be regarded as part of the drought relief measures.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Council. Can the Minister ascertain whether the Commonwealth Department of Social Security has introduced, or intends to introduce, a system of means testing for sickness benefit? Is the system to take effect from November 1? Is it a fact that for all money received by next of kin, or by a wife as in the case to which I will refer, in excess of \$6 a week, the sickness benefit entitlement will be reduced on a \$1 for \$1 basis? Will that mean that for a person who was a previous recipient under the scheme, receiving \$194 a week, if the wife receives between \$90 and \$100 a week, the benefit will be completely cancelled out? Further, I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that, on inquiring of the Department of Social Security today, in response to an announcement by the Commonwealth Minister, Senator Guilfoyle, that there would be no further advance payment as far as unemployment benefit was concerned, I found that, as yet, the department had received no direction. Many people are hesitant about applying for benefits, because of this threat, and I also wish to know whether there has been any alteration in benefits payable on behalf of handicapped children. I realise that the Minister would not have that information at his fingertips, but could he give it to me next week?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have been concerned about what is happening in the social security field, and I will seek the information.

DROUGHT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question is supplementary to the question asked previously of the Minister of Agriculture. I stress the urgency of implementing this destruction scheme as quickly as possible. A bullock grows only one tail, and it would not be difficult to implement such a system of identification to show how many stock had been slaughtered. To which officers will proof have to be made, be it scalps, tails or some other system? Which officers will run the scheme? Will they be from the Pastoral Board or officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department? When does the Minister expect the first slaughter to commence?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The point I sought to make was that we did not want to be inflexible and insist on scalping. The honourable member refers to the use of tails as a means of slaughter identification, and we are willing to consider any alternatives advanced by stockowners. The responsibility will be with the Pastoral Board, with whom contact should be made. I see no reason why contact should not be made immediately, which is why I made that announcement. As soon as a stockowner has consulted with the board about the arrangements he intends to take to ensure that they meet the board's requirements, he can proceed. When the slaughter has been undertaken the board will send an inspector in due course to check on the number of scalps, tails or whatever identification method has been agreed upon. As soon as that has been completed by the inspector we can make arrangements for payments through the Agriculture Department.

WATERING PLACES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 26, 1977, dealing with watering places?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My colleague states

that the problems for pastoralists associated with informal camping by travellers in the arid zones of the State are of increasing concern to the Government. The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and the Royal Automobile Association try to advise prospective visitors of their common responsibilities in relevant information literature. The Government is also examining various measures to minimise the evident difficulties confronting local landholders in these areas in terms of its future tourism planning activities.

JAM FACTORY WORKSHOPS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That in the opinion of this Council the Government should be condemned for its waste of public money at the Jam Factory Workshops.

Grants by the State Government to the Jam Factory Workshops (or the then Craft Authority) commenced in the 1973-74 financial year. Honourable members will want to be apprised of the exact amounts that have been granted by the State Government to the authority in subsequent years, including the amounts that the Government intends to pour into the Jam Factory Workshops in this current year.

For those figures and general background information to the Jam Factory on Payneham Road, I refer to the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1977. The Auditor-General states, under the heading "Jam Factory Workshops", the following:

The name of the South Australian Craft Authority Incorporated was changed to The Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated in June, 1977, without involving any major changes in the constitution and rules or in the organisation and operations . . . For the purposes of the financial statements and comments which follow, the two bodies have been regarded as one entity. The Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated is administered by a board of management appointed by the Minister. During the year the board was reconstituted and currently is comprised of three members in lieu of six under the previous authority. The functions of the workshops are, generally:

- (1) to promote and encourage the development of craft industries in South Australia;
- (2) to make grants or loans to craftsmen and associated industries;
- (3) to provide workshops and workshop advisory services;
- (4) to market the products of craft industries and to improve and extend the retail and wholesale markets.

Then in a paragraph headed, "Significant features for 1976-77", the Auditor-General states:

Grants for the year from Consolidated Revenue were \$570 000 and since inception have aggregated \$1 007 000. There was an operating deficit of \$391 000 for the year, compared with the previous year's deficit of \$222 000. Payments included \$34 800 related to an overseas visit of authority members.

Further in the report, the Auditor-General referred to the balance-sheet, and stated:

State grants—Since the association was incorporated in February, 1974, the following grants for operating and capital purposes have been provided from Consolidated Revenue—

	\$
1973-74	50 000
1974-75	148 000
1975-76	239 000
1976-77	570 000
Total to date	<u>\$1 007 000</u>

As well as the payments mentioned by the Auditor-General, I remind honourable members that in the Budget debate for this current year, the Government sought and was given approval by Parliament for a further \$585 000 to be appropriated this year for the Jam Factory Workshops. That line disclosed that in the year 1976-77, Parliament approved \$470 000, but that in fact \$570 000 was spent last year, as the Auditor-General mentioned.

The point I make in referring to the Budget debate and Estimates of Expenditure in Parliamentary Paper No. 9, is that the \$585 000 planned by the Premier, who is Minister in charge of this operation, for the current year is an increased amount on that spent last year and further continues the graph of expenditure upward at the Jam Factory. When one investigates, as best one can in Opposition, an activity of this kind, one would be failing in one's responsibility if this expenditure was not questioned very seriously indeed.

If in this current year, and in the Budget papers to which I have just referred, there was mention of some restraint or curtailment or replanning, or some change in hopes and aspirations there, so that it was obvious that some of the lessons might have been learned, then one could be excused for waiting and observing throughout this current year what replanning might be achieved. That has not been the approach; the Premier's approach has been to seek more money still for the Jam Factory in this current year. Added to that are some of the points raised as a result of the recent overseas trip which has gained considerable publicity in recent weeks.

If the Premier had announced on Friday in his Ministerial statement that he was accepting some of the views and recommendations of the former Chairman and Deputy-Chairman who went overseas, and intended to replan his Jam Factory Workshops as a result of that trip and that expenditure and that report, there again I think a responsible person in Opposition would have been prepared to wait and see what could be achieved as a result of those changes. That has not been the attitude of the Premier at all in the Ministerial statement he made to Parliament on Tuesday of this week, in which he stated:

The Government does not share Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier's rather uncomplicated view that the approach taken at the Jam Factory is mistaken. As I have mentioned before in this House, there has been room for improvement in the operation of the Jam Factory Workshops. The Government has not been blind to this. This year, in particular, strong action has been taken to improve management and accountability at the workshops and to develop better working policies for training, production and marketing. The process is far from painless, but the Government has persevered . . . The Government sees the road ahead not to involve abandonment of the Jam Factory Workshops, but improvement in their operations and complementary developments of the broad character advocated by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier. In order to achieve these aims, a working party will concentrate on developing practical means of implementing the proposals in concert with continuing work based in the Jam Factory.

Later in the statement the Premier stated:

As both of them had come to the personal conclusion that the Jam Factory did not offer the scope for craft development

the Government desired and therefore should in some way be abandoned or phased out, it did not appear appropriate to ask them to continue in significant roles at the Jam Factory. In effect, despite the grants which have been absorbed by this operation, despite the ever-growing deficits, despite the amount in excess of \$500 000 which the Premier has sought to pour into the operation this year, and despite this expensive trip, and therefore the expensive report that was prepared by these two people, the Premier turned his back on that report and proceeded to pour more money into the enterprise.

Therefore, it leaves me with no alternative but to move this motion, and to condemn the Premier and the Government for this wasteful expenditure. When one realises that over \$500 000 is going in grants this year, and by June next year the total grants will be in excess of \$1 500 000, I believe that one must accept that there has been exorbitant extravagance and wastage and one must condemn in the strongest possible terms such expenditure of public moneys. Therefore, Mr. President, I move the motion in the Chamber today.

If the motion is carried, this Council and the public will expect new and immediate action by the Premier to halt the expenditure and to adopt a more businesslike and responsible approach to that enterprise forthwith. In considering expenditure of this proportion, it is appropriate to ascertain what has been achieved as a result of it. To do that, we must take one by one the functions which I have read from the Auditor-General's Report and consider whether there is any evidence that those functions are being properly carried out.

The first function was to promote and encourage the development of craft industries in South Australia. The promotion and development of craft industries through Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated has been and is minimal. Many craftsmen in South Australia would claim that I am being far too generous in making that statement. For example, a weaver who said she was the first weaver to set up in business in that capacity in South Australia telephoned me a week or so ago to say that in her view a small gallery in the Hills which purchases products from craftsmen in the Hills area and, I suppose, from craftsmen throughout the State had done more for the craft industry in this State than the Jam Factory had done. Many other people take the same view; indeed, many have told me frankly that the Jam Factory and the Craft Authority have done nothing worth while to promote and develop craft industries in South Australia.

If the Government seeks to refute that claim, I ask the Government to produce evidence to support its view. The Government should provide details of what it claims is being achieved as a result of the expenditure of the immense sum to which I have referred. The second function that we see in the Auditor-General's Report concerns grants and loans which were to be made through the Jam Factory and the Craft Authority to craftsmen and associated industries. Two annual reports of the Jam Factory, those for 1975-76 and 1976-77, were both tabled in this Council on the same day—November 1.

The board has reported that \$5 672 was given in 1975-76 in either grants or loans to craftsmen or associated industries in this State, and in 1976-77 \$5 590 was given. So, only about \$11 000 has been granted in the last two years, despite the other huge sums to which I have referred. Surely it does not need the Jam Factory organisation, a Budget allocation of \$585 000, and \$1 007 000 in total grants, to set up an operation that appropriates only \$11 000 in two years in grants and loans.

The third function is to provide workshops and workshop advisory services. The 1977 report of the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated states:

Operations: During the year, the Jam Factory operated five workshops and maintained a shop gallery complex. I leave it to honourable members to decide whether or not they think that the following paragraphs represent a success story.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How do you assess success?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One criterion would be whether or not the craft association and its membership were making announcements and claiming that they were happy with the Government's approach to craft and the Jam Factory. When I am considering questions of this kind, I like to refer to the people actually involved. Another criterion would be to see whether the Auditor-General has complained about the general operation from the accounting viewpoint and the auditing viewpoint. I can read copies of letters in which the Auditor-General condemns some activities and practices at the Jam Factory.

Those two criteria lead me to conclude that this is not a success story. Referring to the third function of providing workshops and workshop advisory services, I point out that, after the granting of \$1 007 000 of public money, the following is what the board says about its function:

Jewellery workshop: Emphasis during the year was to establishing a production-oriented workshop. Qualified jeweller tradesmen under the guidance of a foreman produced a range of sterling silver and gold jewellery. Designs and overall supervision was provided by Crafts Director, Vagn Hemmingsen. This programme was unsuccessful so it has been decided to discontinue the emphasis on production and concentrate more on training, with production of exhibition pieces and new marketable designs next year.

Glass workshop: The workshop operated under the direction of Samuel Herman. At June 30, 1977, the team comprised two trainees and an experienced glass blower as foreman. The training programme under a production situation is a slow process. A considerable amount of equipment was fabricated. Production concentrated on a range of clear glass items and coloured paperweights. Following a very successful one-man show, trainee Rob Knottenbelt was awarded a travel grant by the Australia Council and later is expected to return to Australia to set up his own studio. Master Craftsman, Sam Herman, had four international exhibitions during the year. The effort to increase sales was partially successful. Emphasis on establishing additional interstate outlets was hampered by lack of marketing know-how and administrative difficulties.

Leather workshop: A Leather Workshop was established during the year under the direction of Italian Master, Pietro Salemme. Several trainees were hired and training was commenced. Due to turnover of trainees, language difficulties and the need to produce items suited to Australian market conditions, sales were limited.

Pottery workshop: Following the resignation of Master Craftsman, Walter Schwab, the potters, all qualified craftsmen, operated the workshop as tenants. Production was hampered by poor working conditions, limited equipment and the need for leadership.

Textile design workshop: There were two trainees in the workshop, Helen Bennetts and Melissa Manton, who completed their training in November, 1976. On completion of their study, Melissa Manton went to Europe to further her studies and Helen Bennetts set up her own workshop in Auburn in South Australia. During the year, many different rug techniques were learned.

Design jewellery: This workshop was established with two semi-skilled trainees under Frank Bauer as an experiment following receipt of a grant from the Australia Council on February 28, 1977. Teaching covered the following techniques: sawing, filing, forging and raising, soldering and

casting. Approximately one-third of the trainees' time has been spent on jewellery production work, mainly to their own design. Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated meets approximately 60 per cent of the cost of the exercise.

That is the story from the board itself upon the manner in which the function of the workshops—namely, to provide workshops and workshop advisory services—is being carried out; and that is being carried out after an amount in excess of \$1 000 000 of the people's money in this State has been provided for the authority. As one craftsman said to me recently, "It costs far more to train a craftsman here in the Jam Factory than it does to train a medical doctor." The whole thing is obviously out of proportion.

The final function was to market the products of the craft industry and, to some extent, provide a retail market. The report on this issue states:

Shop/gallery: The gallery held regularly monthly exhibitions. These mainly involved work from the Jam Factory. Other craftsmen were Vic Greenaway and a mixed show by Diana Boynes, Olive Bishop and Cedar Prest and Jo Caddy. In terms of sales, the exhibition met with varying degrees of success. No figures were available to indicate public attendance. The shop adjacent to the gallery continued to sell products made in the workshops as well as provide an outlet for local South Australian craftsmen. Popularity of the shop is indicated in the increase in sales for the year of 78 per cent over 1975-76.

I hasten to point out that I am not criticising in any way the people who are working in the Jam Factory or the people named in this report. The only bright note in this whole sorry story of the Jam Factory achievements is that it is indicated that there has been an increase in sales of 78 per cent in this shop gallery. The Jam Factory is now in direct competition with small galleries and other private enterprise. It is in competition with other craft galleries throughout the Hills. It pays cash within seven days for its wares. It is Government interference with private enterprise in the shape of small galleries, many of which have battled for years to make a fair living. Finding the State as a competitor is a problem. I do not agree with the principle of this kind of competition and I do not think the people of this State are prepared to have so much money poured into this operation if that is the only real success that can come out of it.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: They lose control of their products.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They sell their products.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: They do not sell on commission.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Unlike some of the galleries.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Some of the galleries do; some of them act as traders, but this unnecessary interference by a Government body is to be deplored. That is only half the story, because of this huge amount of money being poured into this Government body. That is worthy of strong criticism.

From that information I have given from these official reports, it surely must be apparent that the record of the Jam Factory does not justify the expenditure that the Premier of this State is making in this enterprise with which he is so closely involved. He, of course, is responsible for this organisation, because he is the Minister responsible for the arts in this State. As well as these huge sums to which I have referred being granted by the South Australian Government, and therefore by the South Australian people, I have noticed, in the annual report of the board that the Australia Council also gave \$14 911 in 1976 and \$9 759 in 1977 to the Jam Factory, so about \$25 000 has been allocated to that operation from the Commonwealth.

All this expenditure and wastage and all this poor performance, which is the direct responsibility of the Minister in charge (the Premier), have been known to the Premier; the position has been quite clear to him for about four years. It is not something that has suddenly been sprung upon the responsible Minister; it has been getting worse year after year. It has been pointed out to him by responsible people whom he chose to send overseas recently, and he has in effect turned his back on their report and he continues to adopt his initial policy of pouring money into this organisation. For that, I think he and his Government should be condemned.

The Premier dreamed up the Jam Factory concept to assist craftsmen and the craft industry in this State and, as Treasurer, he poured public money into the venture in the huge proportions to which I have referred. He continues to do that.

His dream is an impossible dream because helping South Australian craftsmen as individuals requires a programme that is a direct antithesis to that required for a modern craft industry. As one craftsman said in today's paper, when pointing out the salient fact, which is the basic cause of failure at the Jam Factory:

There is industry and there are crafts and today's craftsmen don't want to be industrialised.

I continue by quoting from that letter, which is relevant. It continues:

The euphemism "crafts industry"—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Hill is about to read a letter. I point out that it is close to 3.15 p.m., when it will be obligatory to call on Orders of the Day. I suggest he does not read the letter at this stage. He can continue his remarks after the other item on the Notice Paper has been disposed of.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 797.)

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I support the second reading of this Bill, a measure that is long overdue. It will certainly enhance the reputation of the State. The progressive Dunstan Labor Government has been in office now for about 10 years, and we certainly have an environment that is very pleasant to live in.

Certainly, the introduction of this facility will enhance the quality of life of people in this State. I have heard of no opposition, either within or outside the Parliament, to this Bill, and apparently the Restaurateurs Association is perfectly happy with it. The Hon. Mr. Sumner pointed out some small problems relating to the Bill, although there was none that could not be fixed by a few small amendments, which, I believe, will be moved next week. As no-one has any opposition to the Bill, because it appeals to me personally, and because I want the Bill to pass as soon as possible, I will take up no more of the Council's time. I support the Bill.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I, too, will not take up much of the Council's time closing the second reading debate. I thank those honourable members who have contributed to the debate for the support that they have given the Bill. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Sumner said that he hoped the introduction of bring-your-own licences would lead to a reduction in restaurant costs. I agree that this could happen. This Bill will inevitably lead to competition, which, in the long run, usually benefits the consumer.

I do not believe that the introduction of a Bill such as this will damage existing licensed restaurants, because I believe that there will always be a demand for good restaurants. It may, however, affect those restaurants that

rely on wine sales to compensate for poor food and service.

The Hon. Mr. Sumner yesterday referred to a couple of matters which he wanted to examine and regarding which he might try to move amendments in Committee. I should like to deal with a couple of those matters, the first of which concerns new section 31a (1)(b), relating to liquor purchased at the express request of a person proposing to consume it from the holder of a full publican's licence or retail storekeeper's licence. I did not intend originally to include that provision in the Bill. However, I was advised by the people in Victoria to include it, as those concerned in Victoria have experienced certain problems when people have asked waiters or restaurant proprietors to go out and buy for them liquor to consume when, in fact, the waiter or proprietor has merely gone to the back of the restaurant where there has been a store of liquor, and supplied some of it to the customer.

The Victorian people considered that this provision would stop that practice, as it would put the onus of proof, in the event of an inquiry, on the consumer and/or the restaurant proprietor. The Hon. Mr. Sumner, with his legal mind, may see some difficulties in this respect. I must admit that I am not greatly fussed about it.

By way of interjection, the Hon. Mr. Burdett introduced another method of controlling this, that is, forbidding the storage of liquor on such limited licensed premises. This may be a way of ensuring that the proprietors of such premises do not store wine. The mere fact that they had storage would mean that they were breaking the law.

The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw asked about white wines, saying that there might be a need to store them. However, I believe that, if white wine was chilled when a patron brought it to the restaurant, and the management then provided an ice bucket, no problems would be experienced. This is far from an insurmountable problem; I think it could be dealt with easily.

Another problem raised by the Hon. Mr. Sumner was that of the court's having power to limit the type of liquor that can be consumed on licensed premises. I agree; I think there should be no restriction: if one has a licence, that is as far as it should go. This provision is taken from other licensing legislation, under which the court has this power. Again, this is something that can be dealt with in Committee without any great difficulty.

Another matter raised was that of corkage. As I said in my second reading explanation, the corkage fees charged in Victoria vary widely. I am told that most restaurants do not charge corkage, although they are permitted to do so and, if such a fee is charged, it seems to be 20 cents or 25 cents, although I have heard of some instances where \$1 has been charged. In Victoria, this matter seems to be left to the restaurant proprietor concerned.

Under my Bill, at least the court is given power to provide an upper limit for the corkage fee that can be charged. I hope that, when this Bill passes and bring-your-own restaurants are introduced, they will charge little, if any, corkage.

The final point raised by the Hon. Mr. Sumner related to one's being able to take liquor off licensed premises. I said in my second reading explanation that it was illegal for one to do so. However, I was dealing with the present B.Y.O. licensed restaurants. If any liquor is left over, it is illegal for one to remove it from the restaurant. I have been assured that this situation will not arise with the new type of licence. However, I have been unable to check that today. I will certainly do so before the Bill is dealt with finally in Committee, as I am sure the Hon. Mr. Sumner will also do. With those few remarks, and subject to the

amendments that are moved in Committee, I thank honourable members once again for their support of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

JAM FACTORY WORKSHOP

Debate on motion of the Hon. C. M. Hill resumed.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The letter I have been quoting continues:

The euphemism "crafts industry" (meaning factory production) as used by Mrs. Lemercier, Dr. Hackett and the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) only serves to emphasise the great void in their understanding of current crafts activities.

If high quality industries in fabrics, jewellery and ceramics are wanted, then these should be initiated as any other factory production enterprise would be set up, with proper engineering investigation and capitalisation.

If there is a real desire to help craftsmen, then a fraction of the money wasted on the Jam Factory, used to purchase and commission work, would do this most effectively and at the same time give the State something really worth while for its money.

By June next year, more than \$1 500 000 will have been granted to the Craft Authority, or the Jam Factory as it is now called. That money will have been wasted. Let us think of many other worthwhile ways in which some of this money could have been used. We hear these matters raised time and time again in the public arena and in Parliament. There are most urgent demands to provide money for employment opportunities, for education purposes, to assist ethnic people to retain their cultural identity, for drought relief in many areas, and for the commencement of hospital programmes about which the Government continues to blame the Federal Government for the non-availability of funds.

These are just some urgent matters on which public money in this State could have been spent and should have been spent, but the large amount to which I have referred is being appropriated for this unsuccessful Jam Factory operation. The Premier must awaken from his impossible dream, replan his whole approach in this area and turn to the craftsmen of this State for guidance and advice about how best they can be assisted. If he wishes to take the other tack and establish an industrial craft operation with emphasis on design, he must make a new approach and one different from what has been made in the past. What is most important is that, if this motion is carried, it will be a censuring of the whole Jam Factory as a project and as a waste of enterprise.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I support the motion wholeheartedly. The Jam Factory typifies the growing elitist attitude of this Government in many fields. There seems to be a tendency to believe that you keep promoting the top, whereas any move made should be in support of the people in the particular field, in this case the craftsmen. In the past two or three years, I have had complaints from craftsmen or other people associated with crafts about lack of access to the Jam Factory, lack of communication by it, and an inability for these people to have any say about what occurs there. The factory seemed to have been set up above them and not to be part of them.

The fact that so much money has been spent, without any seemingly worthwhile advantage for the people it should be assisting, the crafts people, it is an indictment of

the Government. It seems that, to get anywhere with this Government, one has to have an elitist attitude or be at the top. If a person is down lower, that person is left in a rut. This is typified by the fact that, when people leave organisations like this, they get the greatest handshake one could see. When Mr. Blackall left the Jam Factory, he received \$18 537·83c. This comprised:

	\$
Normal fortnightly pay	745·50
Accumulated leave \$1 839·15 plus 17½ per cent loading \$321·85	2 161·00
Six months pay in lieu of notice	9 691·50
Adjustment	16·10
Payment in lieu of superannuation	5 923·73

The Hon. N. K. Foster: How much did Steele Hall pay Currie when he was kicked out?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: How much did the Government pay Miss Adele Koh when she left? I do not believe she was sacked. However, we will not go into that, because that would be getting a little close to the bone for Government members. The Jam Factory has a sad history indeed. The Director, the Chairman of the board, and the Vice-Chairman have left. There seems to be no-one there. It is like people deserting a sinking ship, and one wonders why that has occurred. The report of the auditor from the Auditor-General's Department on the Jam Factory is dated August 30, 1977, and it states:

In accordance with clause 20 of the constitution and rules of the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated, I have audited the accounts of the Association for the year ended June 30, 1977.

- (1) The maintaining of stock control records continues to be inadequate.
- (2) Recording of fixed assets is inadequate.
- (3) Budgetary and workshop costing procedures were unsatisfactory during the year.

I should have thought that covered the whole show and, if there is any argument needed to back up this motion, it is contained in that report. The auditor states clearly in those three items that the whole organisation is badly run, and, as the Hon. Mr. Hill has said, taxpayers' money has been squandered to the extent of \$1 000 000 with a further \$500 000 to come this year. A letter to the Chairman of the Jam Factory from the Auditor-General dated August 30, 1977, states:

Herewith my formal report on the accounts of the association for the year ended June 30, 1977. By way of elaboration on the criticisms in that report, I make the following points—

1. Control of stocks
 - (i) There was no proper record and physical control of precious metal in the Design Jewellery Workshop.

Surely that is an indictment of the organisation, and it is an indictment of the Government for allowing the situation to arise. The letter continues:

- (ii) There were no records of raw materials for the weaving and leather workshops.
- (iii) The record of finished products of the glass workshop contained a high incidence of clerical errors.

That means that someone cannot count. The letter continues:

- (iv) Due to the lack of a total financial stock control system, it has not been possible to reconcile stock on hand per the financial statement at 30/6/76 to that at 30/6/77 per purchases, issues and sales.

That covers total production from stocks on hand through to the finished product. The accounting for those products is unsatisfactory, too. The Auditor-General then deals with what corrective action should be taken and under the heading "Overseas trip" he states:

Although expenditure has now been accounted for, the former board's minutes did not contain specific approval of the itinerary and estimated expenditure, nor were my auditors able to obtain any detailed budget from association records. The expenditure statement now prepared is limited in analysis (i) on a day-to-day basis, and (ii) by expenditure type.

Much has been said about that trip and, although I do not intend to go any further into it, it is interesting that the Premier first said that the expenditure was justified, and he then stated that the expenditure was higher than normal and that he had taken action to ensure that it did not recur. That means that expenditure was higher than normal. On examining the expenditure one finds that the amount spent was double that sum allocated to members of Parliament on a day-by-day basis when they make trips.

In the reply finally put out by the people involved in the trip it is stated, in essence, that the Jam Factory situation is not satisfactory, that certain changes should be made, but the Premier is not even going to follow that report. This situation is the same as every other situation encountered by the Government: a committee of inquiry investigates and a report is made. One can guarantee that if an embarrassment to the Government arises, an inquiry will be held as soon as possible to get that matter off the front pages of the press, yet when the report is produced the Government will not necessarily act on it.

After long discussions with people associated with the craft industry, after examination of the Auditor-General's Report and his lengthy criticisms in respect of every item from the beginning of production to the finished product, including the complete lack of control throughout the organisation, I believe a large shake-up is required. The Government needs to take another look at its whole approach to the craft industry in this State and start to realise that people are involved in it.

It should realise that crafts people are involved who can be of much more assistance to the Government by giving advice to it about their requirements. The Government's approach is totally wrong in continuing its elitist programme. Surely we can expand our home-grown crafts rather than trying to import crafts from overseas.

I do not deny that we might obtain some expertise in some areas from overseas, but we have crafts people here who can be sent overseas and who can gain these skills for themselves and bring them back. Indeed, that way we know they shall remain here. I refer to the number of experts who have been brought in, but many of them have left before they contributed sufficient to give any assistance to crafts people in this State. That in itself is a waste of money. We should select crafts people from this State and send them overseas to determine whether they can gain any skills and, more importantly, we should encourage our own home-grown crafts. The Government has ignored that aspect in the same way as it has ignored all crafts people in South Australia.

The Government has continually supported people who claimed to have knowledge of the crafts but who, in fact, had never worked with crafts. That is an important distinction in this matter. That resulted in enormous sums of taxpayers' funds being poured in for little or no return in such a way that even the Auditor-General had to criticise in respect to almost every item. The Government stands condemned for the manner in which it has operated the Jam Factory Workshops and the manner in which it has ignored the crafts people of this State. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): The Hon. Mr. Cameron has claimed that too much has been spent on the arts and crafts. What would have been the

outcry from members opposite if insufficient had been spent? No wonder people are ringing me on the telephone to say how thankful they are that the Hon. Mr. Hill is merely a shadow Minister who hardly casts a shadow because, as far as the arts are concerned, they would be completely ignored by him. I am fascinated by the battle that seems to be on again between the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Cameron, who is seeking the Hon. Mr. Hill's position. The Hon. Mr. Cameron, too, is obviously not interested in assisting the arts.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You're just as elitist as the others.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member referred to small people in the arts, but the Government is not supporting elitists. People involved in the arts pay their taxes the same as other people do, and they are just as entitled to a share of those taxes, in the same way as farmers are entitled to hand-outs when things get rough.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: They are not getting it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member has participated in hand-outs through the superphosphate bounty, and he cannot deny that.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It's a—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron is out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The motion signals an obvious attempt by the Opposition to cover its embarrassment and confusion, as well as its ill-based and slanderous attacks to cover the embarrassment and confusion it has suffered over its attack on two former members of the board of the Craft Authority.

There is no doubt that it came a cropper in trying to create a scandal last week. Liberal Party members have now shifted ground and seek to cover their embarrassment. Even the *Advertiser* would not have a part of what the Hon. Mr. Hill and his colleagues said in relation to those two people.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Can you quote that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Cannot the honourable member read? I refer to his embarrassment yesterday. The honourable member said that he was concerned, but it was just a smear campaign and an attempt to slander two honest people in this State who have given valuable service to it. However, the shadow Minister is not interested in the slightest in the arts. Today, he had the cheek to suggest that the funds spent by the Government on the arts should have been spent on hospitals, yet last week he suggested that I was spending too much on hospitals. That is the sort of attitude we have come to expect from members opposite, who change their mind three times during the course of a day.

The honourable member asked a series of questions implying dishonesty and hinting at scandal in the use of public money. However, since the Government's statement in response, he has suddenly grown very quiet and, although he has not had the decency to retract his allegations and apologise publicly, he is now attempting to divert attention by moving on the the broader question of the operations of the Jam Factory. It cannot be expected that the Opposition will grasp the complexities involved in encouraging activity connected with the development of arts, crafts and design work in our community.

Opposition members have no understanding in this area. The honourable Shadow Minister of Health has a long way to go; in the same way, he was happy when his Government was spending 7 per cent on health. Our Government is spending 21 per cent. The honourable member does not know the complexities of that part of his Shadow Ministry either. One would have hoped at least

that the Opposition would have taken the bother to understand some of the fundamentals of the Government's craft policy and appreciated the significant action that has been taken to improve the management performance in this new area of endeavour for the State.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It is about time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it is about time, and we are doing something. If it was left to Opposition members, there would be no arts or crafts in this State, and there would be no Government interest in them. This Government has sought for a long time now to promote the development of craft activity in South Australia. The aims have been firstly to provide as wide a range of craft products and gainful employment through craft activity as we can, not only in the creation of new industries with numbers of employees in the workshop situation, but also in the provision of home-based small or individual craft workshops. Secondly, the Government is seeking, through activity in the craft area, to improve public appreciation of good design and to increase the use of craft products.

This does not appeal to Opposition members. In pursuing these objectives, the Government recognised that to develop craft-based industry there was a need to create first a suitable climate in community attitudes, and that to do this required time and an attack on several fronts.

Before deciding how it would approach these objectives, the Government carried out considerable research. As far back as 1971, a working group of experts in arts, crafts, gallery operation, industry development, education and design studied the South Australian and interstate situations and material on overseas experience, and reported to the Government. On the basis of that group's first report, a visit to South Australia of Mr. James Noel White, a leading figure in the promotion of crafts in the United Kingdom, was arranged at the expense of the British Council, to work with the committee and to advise the Government.

The advice given at that stage and accepted by the Government was that, while marketing expertise was a fundamental requirement for the development of craft industries, the standards of craft in South Australia first needed to be raised. Mr. Noel White insisted that adequate standards of work could not be established in the community without the presence of a number of master craftsmen of world standard, and that these should be brought in where necessary and provided with workshop facilities. In this way, local students who had graduated from tertiary education courses could be trained to a higher standard, and the methods and standards of master craftsmen could be put more effectively before the community.

It was on this basis that the Government established the South Australian Craft Authority. Very soon after its establishment, the authority was fortunate in being able to gain tenure of the Jam Factory premises from the Commonwealth Government on very favourable terms as the base for its operations. In the early period, considerable time, effort and expense was necessarily involved in setting up, seeking out and engaging suitable master craftsmen, establishing workshops and a gallery, promoting crafts generally and the Jam Factory in particular, and in setting up administration for a quite unique enterprise. Operating deficits of \$26 981 and \$110 656 were incurred in 1973-74 and 1974-75, respectively. The cost to the Government grew in the following two financial years to \$222 079 and \$390 895 in 1975-76 and 1976-77, respectively. These deficits were accepted by the Government as they represented to a considerable extent the level of annual investment required at that stage

to improve craft standards and the level of public appreciation through the presence of master craftsmen of international standing and the training of locally established craftsmen in the *atelier* situation. In addition to these amounts, \$177 024 has been capitalised at the Jam Factory, giving a total Government expenditure there over the four years of \$927 635 (including the cost of the oversea trip). Early in 1976-77, it became apparent to the Government that there was room for improvement in the operation of the Jam Factory. Budgeting and financial control problems arose and production schedules were not being met consistently. As outlined previously, the Government took significant steps to improve financial management and accounting at the Jam Factory. More importantly, it became apparent that the board was having difficulty in maintaining the balance between the training and commercial objectives which the Government believed the Jam Factory should pursue. An emphasis on achieving commercial viability was developing at the cost of raising craft standards in the State. In the Government's view, the situation had not yet been reached in South Australia where standards had been raised sufficiently to sustain the greater commercial emphasis. To meet this situation, the Government made organisational changes at the Jam Factory, which were announced publicly, and it took steps to ensure that the financial systems at the Jam Factory and the management policy recognised the Government's intention to support both the raising of craft standards through the presence of master craftsmen, and the furthering of the skills and talents of local trainees.

To suggest that public money has been wasted at the Jam Factory indicates a failure to recognise the fundamental need to raise the standards of craft work in South Australia if benefits to the State generally are to be derived from Government investment in this area. There is no point in commercial considerations dominating the Jam Factory operation until success has first been achieved in these areas and this can be expected to take a number of years. The Government's investment in the Jam Factory programme is directed at objectives well beyond those of an arts subsidy. It is related to long-term objectives of providing gainful employment in craft-based industries, and to general improvement in community appreciation of design.

Given this context, the money spent so far by the Government at the Jam Factory has been well invested, contrary to what members opposite say, because, as I pointed out, they have no interest in this matter. They are always saying that something should be done, and here something is being done about it which is grabbing the imagination of people. Opposition members are attempting to denigrate the Government's support in this area. The Government believes that it has a responsibility to people interested in the arts and crafts. The Hon. Mr. Cameron said that when anything bobs up, the Government makes inquiries. Of course the Government makes inquiries. It is a pity that Opposition members do not make inquiries before they make statements without the slightest bit of truth in them, more often than not. Every section of the community has a right to assistance. If there are people interested in the arts, they have a right to assistance from the Government, the same as people who are interested in other ways of spending their time. I ask members opposite to vote against the motion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In reply, I refer to the wild antics and comments of the Minister in opening his address today. He was on his soapbox in the extreme.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He was telling the truth.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He was not telling the truth. It was totally inappropriate in my view for the Minister to

make such wild and ridiculous statements in a debate which should be conducted on factual and sensible lines. He was completely out of date with his first wild accusation thrown across the Chamber, to the effect that members of my Party have done nothing for arts and crafts and would do nothing for arts and crafts if they were in Government.

I was interested in the Labor Party's criticism of the Liberal Party's arts policy during the last election campaign. Not once did I hear or read any criticism of the Liberal Party's responsible approach to financing the arts. The Liberal Party promised to proceed with expenditures on the arts in the same proportion as those expenditures, in aggregate, that the present Government incurs, but that does not mean that we would waste the money. We would spend it carefully and place special emphasis on arts administration. Through good management we would widen the range of persons and groups whom we would aid financially. More people and groups would be helped by the Liberal Party than have been helped by the Labor Party.

The Minister also referred to the oversea trip made last year by the two people concerned. Time and time again when that issue was before the public, I went to great pains to point out that it was the Premier whom I was criticising, and it was he who should never allow people to go overseas with, in effect, an open cheque. The Premier has admitted his fault because he has since confessed that he has laid down guidelines to ensure that that sort of thing does not happen again. I stress that, previously, he gave certain people an open cheque. So, it is the Premier whom I am criticising in my motion.

The Minister accused me of saying that the Government was spending too much on hospitals, but I did not say that. What I really said was that the Government was spending too much at this stage at Flinders Medical Centre at a time when more money should have been and could have been spent on other hospitals whose programmes have been deferred for years and years by the present Government. I sought a reallocation of funds for hospital construction.

The Minister claimed that the Government had changed its plans in regard to the board, and he said that, therefore, everything should be fine now. However, the new board that he put in did not last very long. The three-member board suddenly found itself with a resignation. The Minister admitted this week that one of the three members was not now a member of the board—Mr. Herman. Is that an example of the benefits of the great change? Actually, they are still in the wilderness and still uncertain as to where they are going.

The Minister said that planning for the operation went back as far as 1971. Actually, I had held him to a period going back to 1974, but more condemnation can be levelled at him if \$585 000 is being allocated in this year's Budget and \$1 007 000 has accumulated in grants after seven years of planning. This throws into even greater relief how incapable has been the planning in this area.

Then, the Minister had the effrontery to say the sum had been well invested. Where are the dividends from this investment? The Minister could not give details of the dividends other than saying that some sort of base had been established. That is all right for the small number of elite to whom the Hon. Mr. Cameron referred, but I assure the Minister that many craftsmen and many members of the general public outside regard his claim as rubbish.

The Minister is not giving sufficient evidence of turning away from the course previously set: a huge sum is being poured down the drain, and the Government does not seem to be acting to stop the trend. This is a very serious

matter affecting the ordinary taxpayers, who provide the money.

I would have hoped that Government members would at least have said that they would ensure that there is sufficient change to reverse the trend, but they have not done that, nor are they heeding the warning given in this Council on behalf of the people at large, who lose respect for a Government that acts in this way.

I could not ascertain anything from the Minister's speech that gives me more reason to believe that there will be any worthwhile change at the Jam Factory. I am therefore more convinced than ever that this Council should condemn the Government, and I ask honourable members to support the motion.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

The PRESIDENT: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. Motions of this type calling for condemnation of or no confidence in the Government frequently come before this Council, and often they are of a very political nature. I do not know that I can say that this one is highly political, judging by the debate that has occurred. I have said on

other occasions that in this Council the Presiding Officer should take a quasi-judicial attitude because his casting vote is, in effect, a deliberative vote. Had it not been for the fact that Standing Order 231 actually requires me to give a casting vote, I would have refrained in the circumstances of this case. Incidentally, I note in passing it may well be that Standing Order 231 is in conflict with section 26 of the Constitution Act and it is a matter that the Standing Orders Committee might look at. I have listened to the arguments on both sides; it seems to me that they are about even and represent two conflicting points of view. In the circumstances, I am not prepared to condemn the Government; I therefore give my casting vote to the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Art Gallery of South Australia—Upgrading.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.11 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, at 2.15 p.m.