

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 26, 1972

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

PETITION: INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. CARNIE presented a petition signed by 229 persons expressing concern at the apparent intention of the Government to introduce an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill to protect unions and union officials from the normal processes of the law, and praying that the House of Assembly would not vote this Bill into law.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry assure this House that he has not allowed union pressure—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Rubbish!

Dr. EASTICK: —to result in discrimination against employer organizations in the Government's drafting of the new industrial legislation soon to come before this House? I draw the Minister's attention to a report in today's newspaper that differences between the State Government and the trade union movement over the new legislation were discussed for nearly three hours behind closed doors at the Trades Hall yesterday.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I wonder whether the L.C.L. conference was open to the press on Saturday.

Dr. EASTICK: The article, which then refers to objections raised last week by at least two unions over sections of the new legislation, states:

The Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union claimed that the Bill, which included such provisions as a \$1,000 fine for an illegal strike and outlawing political strikes altogether, was anti-union.

It continues:

It is understood that it became clear at yesterday's talks that the unions, both of which were represented on the United Trades and Labor Council Revision Committee, had based their objections on the seventh draft circulated confidentially by the Minister.

The union pressure to which I refer is alluded to in the next sentence of the report, as follows:

Later amendments are said to have been made in the eighth and ninth drafts.

These amendments are hinted at in the next paragraph, which states that it is believed that

the provision banning political strikes has been eliminated, and that the penalty for an illegal strike has been reduced from \$1,000 to \$500 a day. My question to the Minister is based on the inference that can be drawn from this article that, on at least eight or nine occasions, draft legislation has been submitted.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That would worry you.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister now has the opportunity to inform not only the House but also the South Australian public whether that inference and the report that has been made are correct, and whether there have been eight or nine occasions when a draft Bill has been forwarded to an interested party, in this case the Trades and Labor Council. I should like to know whether this same consideration was offered employer organizations or whether we can expect to find in this legislation another typical example of union domination over the Australian Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been fairly liberal in allowing the Leader to give his explanation, but it is wide of the mark.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not know whose mailing list the honourable Leader is on. It has been suggested that I have been on the Communist Party's mailing list with regard to industrial legislation; I am beginning to think that the Leader is on the same mailing list. I ask the Leader and his colleagues to be patient, because the whole picture will unfold before their very eyes later this afternoon.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say whether the Government's intended legislation to amend the Industrial Code is based on State and Commonwealth Australian Labor Party policy and whether the intended provision in the Bill to allow for an age of 21 years is a recognition that this State Government does not consider an 18-year-old to be an adult in relation to adult wages?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As I have already said in reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, if the honourable member is patient he will hear the contents of the Bill later this afternoon.

ASSEMBLY OF TITLES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier say whether the Government will consider assisting landowners, especially those in Hills areas, with the assembly of titles? The Government is aware of the pressure that has been placed on landowners in the Hills,

including those in my district, to sell or develop their properties as a result of high assessments and council rates. It has been suggested to me that, where a person owns two or three adjoining properties, he is less likely to sell out to developers if he can assemble his separate titles into one title, thereby obtaining a lower overall assessment. Although the assembly of titles can be a costly business, it would be a worthwhile measure in the interests of conservation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the honourable member's request and see whether we can comply with it.

COMPANY TAKE-OVER

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Premier aware that an Adelaide company, established for over a century, is currently the subject of a take-over bid? The situation to which I refer has been reported widely in financial and commercial circles. This take-over bid could result in an almost monopolistic control by the company involved over certain hardware and building goods marketed in this State. The management, the employees, and the unions employed by the firm subject to the bid have expressed alarm at the possible loss of employment and of rights to those concerned if this take-over bid is successful. Small stores and traders have also expressed concern. Although I appreciate that under the provisions of the Companies Act the decision to accept this bid rests largely with the shareholders of the company, I should like to know whether the Premier is aware of this position and, if he is, whether any representations have been made to him on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware of it. Concern was expressed to the Government by workmen and by the unions involved in covering the employees of the firm that is subject to the take-over bid. As a result of the representations made to the Government, inquiries were made of the bidders about what their intentions were. A conference was arranged at which the Secretary of the union concerned was able to consult with the bidder about the security of employment of his members. I understand that a satisfactory assurance of intention was given and, since that time (after a conference at which the Minister of Labour and Industry was present), there have been no further representations to the Government from the workmen involved. The position generally of reduction in competition, of course, is not something that is in the hands

of the State Government. The honourable member would know that this matter now is covered, to the extent to which it is a matter of interstate trade, by the Commonwealth trade practices tribunal, but we would like the same tribunal to cover it within the State. The honourable member would know also that our endeavours to give that tribunal jurisdiction in intrastate matters were denied us in another place earlier in the life of this Parliament. Consequently, the Government cannot legally any longer be involved in the negotiations between the bidders and the shareholders. Whether the shareholders will accept the offer of take-over or the advice of the present directors of the company remains to be seen.

WASTE DISCHARGE

Mr. GROTH: Will the Minister of Marine ask his departmental officers to contact the Salisbury council with a view to ceasing the discharge of wastes from electroplating and cyanide into two lagoons at the St. Kilda rubbish dump? This practice should be stopped before contamination of the nearby marine environment occurs as a result of the possible build-up of quantities and concentrations of chemical pollutants. I have a report which has been made after samples have been taken from these two lagoons and which reveals that certain pollutants are being discharged into both lagoons. The report states:

Both lagoons are comprised essentially of sea-water seepage and lagoon No. 1 (near sea) is contaminated bacteriologically with levels of 1,100,000 coliforms and 450,000 *E. coli* I. a 100 ml, which are not inconsistent with levels found in raw sewage. Lagoon No. 2 has a low level of bacteriological pollution possibly attributed to the toxicity of the chromium present. The relatively high level of chromium (31.5 mg/l) and to a lesser extent the level of zinc (3.6 mg/l) indicate that wastes from an electroplating activity have been discharged into lagoon No. 2. The level of cyanide in both lagoons was low but, as this material is chemically unstable under such conditions, it is possible that larger amounts were initially present, particularly in lagoon No. 1, where the current level is 4.7 mg/l.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter investigated for the honourable member and bring down a detailed reply.

FIRE SERVICES

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question regarding a report on fire services?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has told me that he will be pleased to release copies of the working party's report to honourable members after it has been examined in

detail by Cabinet. It is not expected that the document will be available before the debate on the Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill now before Parliament. However, the Minister points out that the provisions of that Bill have no direct relevance to the content and recommendations of the report of the working party, which deals primarily with the organization of country fire services.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say on what days the House will sit for business next week?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended that Parliament will not sit on Thursday afternoon of next week, but otherwise the sittings will be normal. On Thursday afternoon a preliminary meeting of the drafting or working committee of the constitutional convention will be held in Adelaide, attended by two delegates from South Australia and delegates and officers from each State, and a request has been made to use the Assembly Chamber. As it seems to the Government appropriate that these officers should have the chance to do that, it is intended that the House will not sit on Thursday afternoon next week.

MARGARINE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about margarine?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that, in accordance with a decision of the meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held in Sydney earlier this month, a conference of State Directors of Agriculture considered the question of margarine on September 18, and it is expected that recommendations will now be submitted from that conference to a further meeting of the council. The honourable member would be aware that, under a long-standing gentlemen's agreement between the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Agriculture, decisions on the control of margarine are made by the Australian Agricultural Council, and it has never been the practice for a State to act unilaterally on this question. Therefore, until the council has decided on what future action, if any, should be taken on margarine, it is not intended to introduce legislation in South Australia to vary the present situation.

Nevertheless, the Minister of Agriculture made it clear to members of the council, and to the public, that, in his view, poly-unsaturated margarines and table and cooking margarines

should be more realistically defined, and that each type of product should be clearly labelled to enable consumers to know what they were buying. The Minister has also indicated his personal opinion that poly-unsaturated margarine, if manufactured wholly from Australian-produced oil seeds, should be removed from quotas. The Minister of Agriculture is not convinced that restrictions on the colouring and flavouring of margarines are an effective solution to the problem of adequate identification of these products.

WILLUNGA RAILWAY LINE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Acting Minister of Lands what restrictions, if any, have been placed on the public use of the land previously used by the old railway service from Hallett Cove south to Willunga? Members and the Minister would be aware that, at present, the rails are being removed from this land, and title has been, or is being, transferred from the Railways Commissioner to the Lands Department. Various uses for this land have been suggested, and this morning I was asked by a constituent what obstacles there were that would prevent local riding schools from using this property. The only obstacle I could see would be if they were trespassing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Acting Minister of Lands for a report.

WATERSHED REGULATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say what the Government intends to do about the size of areas allowed for subdivision in the water catchment areas? A radio news item at the end of last week indicated that the Government intended to increase the permitted area for subdivision in zone 2 of the watershed area from 20 acres to, I think, 74 acres. I cannot remember whether it was the Minister of Works or the Minister of Environment and Conservation who was mentioned in the news item.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certainly not aware of the announcement, which I can assure the honourable member was not made in my name. If it was stated that such was the case, it was certainly announced without my authorization. I am sure that, if the Minister of Environment and Conservation had made the announcement, it would have been qualified. Although he may have intended to talk to me about the matter, I have no knowledge of this. I can assure the honourable member that at this stage the

Government intends to leave the situation as it is: that is, no subdivision of less than 20 acres is permitted in the watershed area, except that one household block is permitted in a subdivision. Some of the statements that have emanated from certain quarters recently have caused me to wonder whether or not the present policy is sufficient to deter the activity that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is so concerned about, but it has not gone any further than that: it is only a thought in my mind. Some of the honourable member's colleagues have mentioned to me that it may be necessary to review the present policy of the department, but I can assure him that the Government does not intend to change the present policy. I am rather surprised to learn of the announcement referred to by the honourable member. However, it certainly did not emanate from me.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister confer with his Cabinet colleagues, particularly the Minister of Environment and Conservation, to determine just what is Government policy regarding subdivision of land in the Mount Lofty watershed area? I have now received a transcript of the radio news item which was included in the mid-day news on Australian Broadcasting Commission radio on Friday last and to which I referred earlier. As the Minister has obviously not heard it, I will read it. It is as follows:

An amendment to the Planning and Development Act will come before Parliament soon to prevent what is described as sporadic type subdivision in rural areas. The Minister of Environment and Conservation, Mr. Broomhill, said today that under the amendment the Director of Planning would have power to refuse permission for new subdivisions if they did not provide a compact extension to existing townships. Mr. Broomhill said the amendment was particularly designed to prevent this type of development between Adelaide and Murray New Town. The Minister also foreshadowed an amendment to the Planning and Development Act on the size of subdivisions in the Mount Lofty Range. He said the proposed legislation would extend control of the subdivision of any allotment from the present limit of 20 acres to 74 acres.

In view of that newscast which I heard (and which I know some of my constituents heard because they contacted me about it), I hope the Minister will appreciate the confusion that exists not only in my mind but in the minds of those hundreds of people who live in the metropolitan watershed. They are confused by the conflicting statements being made that have been repeated again today. Will the Minister confer with his colleagues with a view

to letting people know where they stand regarding the future of the watershed areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If my memory serves me correctly, the news item said that the Minister of Environment and Conservation also foreshadowed that this amendment was a possibility. If the honourable member knew anything about the functions of Government, I think he would appreciate that many communications between one department and another have to occur before a submission finally gets to Cabinet. If my Ministerial colleague said he thought this might be the case, he was perfectly entitled to say that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was stronger than that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He said he foreshadowed an amendment. I stand by the statement I made in reply to the honourable member, that no contact has been made with me or my department about this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The amendment has been foreshadowed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it has not. If the Minister responsible for planning and development considers this may be desirable, he is entitled to say so now, if he wishes.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And confuse the public.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the public takes this as read, that is its problem. Certainly the Minister has not approached me or my department about the extent of the subdivision that may be permitted in the watershed area or the Mount Lofty Range. I know that he will do so when he starts work on it. I will do as the honourable member suggests, conferring with my colleague to see whether he was serious in the statement he made about following this up. Certainly, no contact has so far been made. In reply to the honourable member, I said I had given some thought to our having to do something about the matter. Is the honourable member going to race up to his constituents and say, "The Minister is thinking about this"? Surely there is a difference between thinking and making a decision. I am merely stating that I have considered this matter, and surely that can go over the news as well as any statement that is made to the press. Although I will confer with my colleague, I think the honourable member is making a mountain out of a molehill.

TELEVISION NEWS

Mr. BURDON: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, take up with the manager of the South Australian branch of the Australian

Broadcasting Commission the question of altering the starting times of the evening television programmes in South Australia after the inception of daylight saving during the coming summer months? Representatives of the South Australian Dairymen's Association have asked whether the evening news service could commence at 8 p.m. and be followed by *This Day Tonight*, and this suggestion might have a wide appeal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and see whether he can make representations to the A.B.C.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Acting Minister of Lands to my recent question concerning service stations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that he understands that the location of the proposed new route for the Eyre Highway is currently under review. Until the route has been finalized he cannot consider whether alternative roadhouse and service station sites can be made available by the Lands Department. If an alternative site can be made available, it will be on the basis that the successful applicant must have the ability to install an up-to-date facility of a standard capable of meeting the needs of the travelling public. Any request for a site within the Aboriginal reserve would have to be taken up by the party concerned with the Minister of Community Welfare.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 14 concerning the cost of underground electricity mains?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Where distribution mains are placed underground in new residential subdivisions, the Electricity Trust requires the developer to do all trenching and back-filling at his own cost and pay the difference between the remaining cost of the underground system and the cost of an overhead one. During 1971-72, the trust spent \$460,670 installing underground mains in new residential areas. Developers contributed \$201,000 of this as the difference between underground and overhead costs, and carried out all trenching and back-filling required. The balance of \$259,670 represents the equivalent cost of an overhead system that the trust would incur in any case, whether the mains were installed underground or over-

head. These are items of capital expenditure and have no direct effect on the deficit.

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about the effect of daylight saving on Electricity Trust revenue?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is impossible to know precisely what the increase in the Electricity Trust's revenue would have been had there been no daylight saving last year, but the figure would have been about \$125,000. The factors mentioned in the trust's annual report as having a bearing on the year's revenue were those that were abnormal in the particular year. It was considered that daylight saving would not be confined to the year 1971-72. I think I said that when replying to the Leader's earlier question. In any case, the effect of daylight saving is a very small factor. If consumers save \$125,000 by using less electricity during daylight saving, the trust does not make a net loss of this amount, because the cost of the equivalent fuel will be saved. The effect of daylight saving could not in itself be the cause of a general rise in tariffs, because even \$125,000 is much less than one-hundredth of a cent a unit of electricity sold, and electricity tariffs are expressed only to hundredths of a cent. However, assuming that the effect of daylight saving could in some way be expressed in a tariff increase, it is fallacious to suggest that persons who were opposed to daylight saving would then be subsidizing those who were not. Both types of consumer gain by their share of the reduced consumption. A tariff increase needs to recover only the net loss to the trust, so both types will remain better off. In actual fact, the reduction in trust gross revenue due to daylight saving has not led to a tariff increase and is not likely to do so. Whether or not a consumer is opposed to daylight saving in principle, he has nevertheless benefited from his share of the \$125,000 reduction in electricity usage.

CHINESE TRADE

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier tell the House how a South Australian trade officer was invited by the Chinese Government to the trade fair in China?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. WELLS: This Government has made world headlines, having opened up with China avenues for trade that will benefit South Australia. It has been widely publicized that South Australia, which has been a progressive

State under this Government, was instrumental in having this invitation issued, despite the stupidity of the Commonwealth Government in refusing to recognize Communist China.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful for the expressions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River and the honourable member for Eyre must learn to contain themselves in this Chamber, or they will not remain here. The honourable Premier is replying to a question and is entitled to be heard in silence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful for the expressions of support that the Government has received in this matter, even those of the Prime Minister. I am not always quite certain whether he is a member of the same Party as that of the honourable members who have interjected. At any rate, he has said that the initiative taken by the South Australian Government deserves commendation. In 1970, when in London, I visited the British Commission of the Peoples Republic of China and explained our proposals for dealing with the trade corporation in China. At that time the commercial counsellor in London for the Peoples Republic of China made it clear that the attitude of the Chinese republic regarding trade was an ideological one: that it would give preference in trading to nations which recognized its existence and which supported its admission to the United Nations Organization, and that the Commonwealth of Australia did neither of those things. In consequence, the instructions of the commercial counsellor which came directly from Peking to communicate with me when I was in London were that the Australian Commonwealth would not be considered by the Chinese Government as a nation suitable to trade with it, and that it would trade only with nations which had the things it required and which treated it in the way it prescribed—that is, recognizing its existence and supporting its admission to the United Nations.

I made it clear that the South Australian Government did not agree with the attitude taken by the Commonwealth Government, and that the South Australian Government was willing to deal with the Chinese Government and, although we had no powers in foreign affairs or in recognizing China or taking initiative in relation to its entry to the United Nations, nevertheless Governments of our complexion

and persuasion were certainly willing to treat China on the same basis as the Canadian Government had already done. These representations were received with interest by the commercial counsellor, who said he would communicate this situation to Peking.

When the trade fair was announced, many applications to attend it were received from around the world, and limitations were placed by the Chinese on the number of people who could do so. The South Australian Government wrote to China asking that our trade officer receive from one of the trading corporations an invitation to the fair, as this would put us directly in touch with the trading corporations; otherwise, one has the difficulty of operating either through the Chinese Commission in London or the Bank of China in Hong Kong, and both these means of dealing with the trading corporations in China tend to be extremely long-winded and round-about. In due course (in fact, last week) we received an official invitation for our trade officer to attend the fair in China.

Other trade representatives from Australia will be attending that fair, although they will be representatives of private organizations. This is the first time that any Government official from this country has been recognized officially by the Government of the Peoples Republic of China and given an official invitation to attend a function in that country. This is a marked breakthrough which will be of benefit not only to South Australia but to Australia as a whole.

SILVER LAKE PROPERTY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry, in the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, say what action has been taken to stop the Silver Lake property at Mylor from being used for motor cycle competitions? The prevalence of motor cycle competitors attending this property on Sundays has annoyed local residents, disturbing as it does their peaceful way of life and generally creating havoc in the community. Having first contacted the Minister of Works on April 11 on this matter, I received a reply stating that his department would keep a close eye on the situation and that, as long as the promoters did not contravene sections 56 and 58 of the Waterworks Act, 1932-1971, he doubted whether his department could take any action. In May, I contacted the Minister of Environment and Conservation regarding the same subject, and on June 8 received a letter from him, part of which is as follows:

I have discussed this matter with the Director of Planning, who has informed me that the owner of this land, Mr. Reni, has been informed that under section 41 (5) of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1971, formal application has to be made to the State Planning Authority, through the Stirling District Council, for consideration of this change in use.

I have received no further comment from the Minister regarding the application that had to be made, although the track was used for motor cycle competitions on September 17 and it may have been used again on September 24. In a letter to Dr. G. W. Mussared of July 25, 1972, the Minister of Environment and Conservation stated:

I would like to thank you for keeping me informed on this matter. However, you are no doubt aware that the Director of Planning, under section 41 (5) of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1971, has refused an application from the owner of this land for a change in its use, thus preventing the development of this area as a commercially run motor cycle scramble circuit.

I have never received any notification from the Minister that permission for this change has been refused, and I believe that that shows a lack of courtesy by the Minister. However, the track is still being used even though the Minister states in his letter to the doctor that consent has not been given to a change in land use. I believe that the Government and the Minister have fallen down in the handling of this matter, and I ask the Minister to have the matter investigated.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will pass the honourable member's question on to my colleague.

GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture for the latest report on the hatching of grasshoppers in the Upper North of this State and on what precautions the Government is taking to combat a serious outbreak if it occurs? I understand that hatchings are occurring in the North of this State at present (although I cannot say to what extent), and landowners are especially worried about these hatchings because, as a result of poor rainfalls, the feed position is becoming serious. Farmers are afraid that, if there is a serious outbreak, the feed position will deteriorate further.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague whether he has the information that the honourable member seeks. Perhaps the grasshoppers to which the honourable member has referred could help to destroy the mistletoe to which he referred last week.

NARACOORTE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the Naracoorte Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has been necessary to defer Naracoorte Primary School replacement because of (1) the limitation for financial reasons that has been placed on a number of projects which can be undertaken during the current financial year; (2) the number of projects on which work has already started or is about to start; and (3) the number of new schools in developing areas for which planning must be undertaken. The replacement of the Naracoorte Primary School has been approved by the Public Works Committee. Although the project has been temporarily deferred, all documentation has been completed and, as soon as circumstances permit, tenders will be called so that the project can proceed without delay. The honourable member will appreciate the difficulties involved because both he and I will have an opportunity of inspecting the existing school accommodation next week.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the sealing of the playing area at the Morphettville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The latest information I have is that the paving and resealing of the yard at the Morphettville Park Primary School has begun and is expected to be completed in about a fortnight.

ABORIGINAL EMBASSY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare have investigated the claim that Aborigines at the embassy site at North Adelaide have insufficient means of support? If they have, will he say what assistance the Government can give them to prevent a repetition of a schoolteacher's stealing food to supplement their diet for fear that they may otherwise suffer malnutrition?

The Hon. L. J. KING: People occupying the Aboriginal embassy at North Adelaide are in the same position as are other members of the community. Presumably they are either working and have an income or they qualify for unemployment relief if they are unable to obtain work. I know of no special provision that would be available to them. Social workers from the Community Welfare Department keep in touch with the Aboriginal embassy from time to time to see what can be done for the welfare of any people resident

there. I do not believe that any special provisions apply to the occupants of those tents at the embassy that do not apply to the rest of the community.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister say whether his department has considered providing a hostel for single Aboriginal men in Adelaide? Senator Neville Bonner recently visited the Aboriginal embassy at North Adelaide and was subsequently reported as saying that one reason why those people were manning the embassy involved the campaign for a hostel for single Aboriginal men. I understand that the Senator was informed that a hostel was available for single female Aborigines and, although there was much employment available for single men, no hostel was available for them. If this is so, will the Minister investigate the matter to see whether such accommodation can be provided?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If that was the only objective that the people manning the Aboriginal embassy were seeking to achieve, it would be easily achieved and there would be no continuing purpose for their remaining at the embassy. However, I should be most surprised if the objectives of those people were as limited as that. I would support the establishment of a hostel of that type if the Aboriginal people wanted it and if there was a real demand for it. The information that my department has received recently is that the demand for hostel accommodation has declined markedly in the Aboriginal community, as it has in the non-Aboriginal community. Indeed, hostels do not seem to be the in thing. People no longer like that type of accommodation as much as they did in the past. If there is a real need for a hostel of this kind, and if such a hostel were likely to be patronized, I have no doubt that funds could be made available to enable a hostel, having limited accommodation, to be set up in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Nankivell: Will you follow up that matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes. When I read the statement in the press I asked my officers to investigate the matter further, to sound out the feelings of the Adelaide Aboriginal community and to investigate the financial practicability of providing a hostel if it appeared, on investigation, that a hostel would meet the needs of these people.

Mr. BECKER: In view of the Minister's reply, can he say why was it necessary for a schoolteacher to steal food to supplement the diet of the Aborigines at the Aboriginal

embassy and for a court magistrate to compliment the thief on his achievements?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know why the schoolteacher took the action he took; the honourable member will have to direct that question to him rather than to me. Regarding the honourable member's statement about the magistrate's complimenting the schoolteacher on his action, I really think a member of Parliament should do better than that. I do not know whether the member for Hanson has read the newspaper report, but it is not really up to standard for a member of Parliament simply to repeat like a parrot a headline, without telling the House what the press report really stated. I read the report and I read the headline, which was completely misleading if the report of the magistrate's remarks was correct. All the magistrate said, as reported, was that there was no justification for the teacher's stealing but that he was to be commended on the humanitarian motive that he had in mind. How that can be construed as a magistrate's commending a man for stealing, I do not understand. It was a most unfortunate headline because it conveyed an imputation on the reputation of the magistrate. I am surprised that the member for Hanson, who talks about the obligation of people to uphold law and order, should repeat in this House a slur on a magistrate that was completely unjustified by the facts.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Venning: Why all of a sudden?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. If the honourable member for Rocky River does not cease interjecting, he will find out why. The honourable member for Hanson has asked a question and he should have the courtesy of an uninterrupted reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think the member for Hanson, like all other members of Parliament, has the responsibility to uphold the administration of justice and law and order. What he has just said in this House contributes nothing towards that. I know nothing about the schoolteacher or what led him to do what he did. It is obviously wrong for anyone to steal someone else's goods, no matter how humanitarian his motives may be. Beyond that I cannot offer any comment on the situation.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say whether the Government has considered providing an embassy for Aborigines to replace their present embassy in the park lands? I saw a newspaper report stating that a Senator did

not think too highly of the present arrangements. I am sure that members would be willing to buy a brick in the embassy in the same way as we assisted building the Trades Hall. If the Aborigines had a proper building in which to house their embassy, it would be much more dignified.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Some informal discussions have taken place. Although there is some merit in the honourable member's suggestion, it is for the Aboriginal people to consider what they want before any advance can be made. The matter is being kept under review.

PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Attorney-General say whether Willex International is a pyramid-type selling organization? I have been informed by a constituent that Willex International sells an all-purpose cleaner for domestic, industrial and commercial use but that it is also an organization where selling is carried out at various levels: it costs members of that organization a certain sum to sell at different levels. I suspect that this organization is of the pyramid type, and I should be pleased if the Attorney-General would ask for information on the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter investigated.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier hasten to make available to me an item of correspondence that he has had with the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated about succession duties? Some time ago, in reply to a question I asked, the Premier said that he would make available that item of correspondence. Since then, he also has said he would make it available. As he has not done this yet, I am wondering whether this is a furphy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry that I have not given it to the honourable member yet, and I will inquire what has happened to it. I certainly asked the department for it.

PINE POSTS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture for a breakdown of the costs entailed in growing pine post timber and producing treated pine posts? This matter has arisen from a motion passed by the zone 13 branch (at Penola) of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, asking me to obtain this informa-

tion in the House. I understand that the retail price at Mount Gambier of treated pine posts (that is, treated with creosote or acid) is \$55.95 a 100 for posts 3in. or 4in. by 6ft. and \$85.60 a 100 for posts 5in. or 6in. by 6ft. I also understand that the price for posts 3in. or 4in. by 6ft. from the Woods and Forests Department mill is \$50.35. There seems to be much confusion amongst the landholders regarding the price and the way to get the posts from the mill, hence the motion passed at the meeting of the U.F. and G. branch. The members of the branch would appreciate a breakdown of costs and information about how a farmer can get the posts from the mill at a reasonable discount.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to seek that information for the honourable member. It will be as interesting to me as it is to him.

TORRENS RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. COUMBE: My question is to the Minister of Works, and it may also be a matter for the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is not in the House at present. Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the recent pollution in the Torrens River? A few months ago similar pollution occurred near the Adelaide Zoo and last week oil escaped from the South Australian Railways yard into the Torrens River near the weir. I understand that this oil escape was corrected. Another report yesterday indicated that further slicks of oil were appearing near the Torrens weir. Therefore, will the Minister obtain a report on this incident, and say what action can be taken to prevent similar occurrences?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, this part of the Torrens River is under the control of the City Council and not that of the Government. I have not inquired of the council about what measures it intends to take to prevent a repetition of this pollution, but I will do so, if the honourable member wishes me to do that. However, I have a report that has just been handed to me by the Minister of Roads and Transport concerning the oil spillage from railway property. A plan is attached, a copy of which I shall be pleased to give to the honourable member if he so desires. The report states:

These drains were inspected by the engineering staff yesterday, and there was no sign of free oil present. There has been no oil spillage within the precincts of the suburban railcar depot within recent days; the waste oil treatment plant is operating correctly and the effluent to the river is running clear. The drain is coloured red on the chart attached. An inspection of

the river bank revealed no large quantities of oil on the surface. There was a slick forming from the bank where oil had collected last week, but cleaning was being undertaken by a City Council employee. It is understood most of the spillage from last week had been swept along the river bank to the weir and allowed to flow over. It seems, therefore, that the traces of oil reported in the *Advertiser* are some of the residue from last week's spillage: it is confirmed that there has been no further spillage of oil from railway operations, and our treatment plant is operating satisfactorily.

DOWNEY HOUSE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the \$60,000 offered by the Australian Mineral Foundation, and recently accepted by the Government, as payment for the land on which Downey House is situated is the only payment that will be made by the foundation for the land and building? In reply to a question I asked on August 24, the Minister was kind enough to send me a letter in which he stated that the Australian Mineral Foundation had offered \$60,000 to the Government for the land on which Downey House was situated, in the interests of expediting the construction of the proposed psycho-geriatric unit at the hospital and the vacation of Downey House to enable its earlier occupation by the foundation. The Minister stated that this offer had been accepted. As shown in the Loan Estimates, the cost of the psycho-geriatric unit will be \$550,000, and I want to know whether this means that the Australian Mineral Foundation is being presented with Downey House for the cost of the land alone.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, concerning the statement that a letter was sent in reply to a question, I remind the honourable member that during the Loan Estimates debate I said many times that I would obtain a report, and I wrote a letter to honourable members who had asked for information, rather than take up Question Time to reply to the requests. I think that action was a courtesy to honourable members.

Dr. Tonkin: I said you were kind.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Off-hand, I cannot reply to the question, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

OPAL MINING

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 13 about back-filling bulldozer cuts at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the policy of the Government, through the Mines Department, that persons who use declared equipment anywhere in the State will be

required, wherever possible, to return spoil to the excavated area and, if necessary, to mount the spoil over it. The key words here are "wherever possible". Bearing in mind that some areas at Coober Pedy have been extensively disturbed by earthmoving equipment, it may not be possible to achieve the desired restoration. However, in areas where there has been relatively minor disturbance, it should be possible to achieve the desired end result. On a long-term basis it will be the policy that all new excavations made by declared equipment will have to be back-filled.

NATIVE BUSHLAND

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider a method of purchasing environmental rights on native bushland properties in this State when the owners are agreeable to the purchase? If the Government was willing to buy environmental rights on the understanding that the owner did not develop the property but that it remained in its native condition, and if the Government accepted the part that related to council rating applicable to the valuation that was included in the environmental rights held by the Government and concessions for land tax and water rates were made available, the owner would be encouraged to keep the property in its native condition for the benefit of the State without the State having to carry the burden of acquiring the total property. If, in future, the Government wished to buy the whole property it could do so, or if the owner wished to develop the property he would have to make retrospective payments to the Government for the monetary benefits that he had gained in the past.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member suggests an interesting proposition, but I am not certain whether we can add this expense to the provisions that we are making in this matter. The honourable member knows that, in certain circumstances, land can be declared as land which is not to be developed but which is primary-producing land.

Mr. Evans: Expenses are still high.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, but there is a reduction in rates during the time the declared use continues to operate. However, we will consider the suggestion in order to ascertain whether anything can be done.

AGRICULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the agriculture

questionnaire that was distributed on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that it has long been recognized by Agriculture Departments in Australia and many oversea countries that working with farmer groups is a very effective way of getting information through to farmers. No department has sufficient staff to rely entirely, or even largely, on advice to individuals, and, while press, radio, and agricultural publications play a useful part, they are too impersonal to influence most people to change attitudes or practices. The group method has important advantages in that members of the group learn much from each other's experience, and the group serves as a communication channel whereby advice and information given to any member is passed on to others.

A knowledge of the groups that exist in a rural community can, therefore, be of great assistance to an advisory officer in the planning of his time and efforts so that new technical information is given the widest possible coverage throughout the rural community in his area. The questionnaire, which was distributed to farmers in the Edillillie area, therefore sought to gain information not only on technical matters but also on some aspects that may assist in identifying groups, which existed on the basis of friendship or common interest. The only use the department would make of this knowledge would be to ensure that relevant technical information was provided direct by the district advisers to each of these groups. The Director of Agriculture states that when it was known that some farmers had raised objection to section 1 of the questionnaire, this portion was returned immediately to all farmers who had filled it in.

PETERBOROUGH COTTAGES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question concerning Peterborough cottages?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although there are 20 houses scheduled for construction by the South Australian Railways during the current financial year, none of these is programmed for Peterborough.

UNLEY ROAD CROSSING

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on the replacement of the pedestrian traffic lights opposite the Unley post office by normal traffic lights of red, amber and green? At the opening of the Unley post office it was stated that the traffic

lights would be replaced. On many occasions, particularly at peak periods, one person crosses the road immediately after another. This causes a long queue of vehicles to form, v/aiting to proceed along Unley Road. Many near misses have occurred at this crossing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know who made this statement at the opening of the post office, as I was not there. I will make inquiries to ascertain the intended programme for this crossing, and let the honourable member know the result.

SECONDHAND MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Attorney-General say what is the function of the board that is to administer the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act? The appointment of members of the licensing board, which is to administer the Act, was reported in the press on September 21 and 22. I understand that the Act is to be administered by the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch. Will the licensing board be responsible only for accepting applications and granting licences for dealing in motor vehicles? Will provision be made in the regulations to prosecute anyone who deals in motor vehicles and who does not hold a licence? The Act lays down specific requirements for the granting of a licence. As it is assumed that backyard operators will not be able to satisfy the requirements of the Act, will they be permitted to sell motor vehicles?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The board will discharge those functions conferred on it by the Act, a perusal of which will provide the information that the honourable member desires. Although I do not think that I can take the matter further than that, I will examine the situation and see whether I can get any more information.

MATTNER ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about Mattner Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that private contractors will cart sand along Mattner Road for another two months, but by mid-November cartage for departmental purposes should be materially reduced. Arrangements have been made for the road to be graded at regular intervals throughout this period.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. WARDLE: I address my question to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray has the call. The honourable member for Kavel has already asked his question.

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 14 regarding the cost of running the fleet of buses between Tailem Bend and Murray Bridge for high school purposes?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The average cost a mile of running the four school buses operating between Tailem Bend and Murray Bridge High School is 32.7c. This figure includes drivers' salaries, petrol and oil, repairs, and depreciation.

NORTH FLINDERS MINES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier assure the House that in any arrangement made with North Flinders Mines Limited, about which I asked a question last week, due regard will be given to the likely return to State funds? One appreciates that the interest of North Flinders Mines Limited is in copper extraction, and that copper is, unfortunately, reducing in value on the world markets. We in this State have already seen the closure of the Mount Gunson enterprise because of low overseas copper prices. I have been told today that within a matter of days the factory that has been extracting copper from the slag in the Kadina and Wallaroo mines area is to be closed. With the closure of both the Mount Gunson and the Kadina enterprises, the immediate future for copper is in jeopardy and, therefore, any expenditure of State funds that cannot be recouped could be to the disadvantage of the people of this State. Although I accept the assurance given by the Premier earlier that he will obtain advice from his department before any action is taken in respect of the North Flinders mine, I ask that these other factors be considered as well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally enough, the Government has examined this matter in making any decisions regarding mining activities in South Australia. True, the world copper price fell to an extent that Mount Gunson, with its remaining reserves, was no longer a viable proposition. The cost of obtaining ore there was marginally below what would be a reasonable return for the mining operation. The prospects at Paraburra Hill comprise a rich lode of ore-bearing deposit. The question now is whether drilling should be carried out to establish that ore body. As several drilling teams are available, the general

provision regarding these teams would not be disturbed in this respect. It appears to the Government that this is a sensible venture: we do not see it as something being imposed on the people of this State. If we can obtain an ore body of sufficient value and quantity that it becomes economic to extract ore, that will be of benefit to the State: only if this appears to be a reasonable probability will we enter into any agreement such as has been forecast regarding North Flinders Mines Limited. However, at present no final decision has been taken on the matter.

POLICE PATROLS

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on September 12 regarding police patrols?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary reports that the reorganization that has occurred at Port Adelaide results from an extensive survey of policing requirements for the present and future throughout the whole of metropolitan Adelaide by the Police Department's management services. Further planning is currently going forward and it is expected that similar action will be taken progressively throughout the remainder of the area.

SOUTH-EAST QUARRY

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry, in the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, assure the House that quarry operations at Mount Monster will be controlled to preserve the area as a natural landmark and amenity for the people of Keith? Several people at Keith have drawn my attention to the quarrying operations in the area, expressing concern that the operation may be encroaching on Mount Monster itself. A gift of nature to the people of Keith, Mount Monster is a picnic spot that can be further developed. The need for a quarry of high-class aggregate is acknowledged for the progress not only of the district but also of the State. We have been given to understand that there is sufficient material in this area to meet the demands of roadmaking, building aggregate, and rail-track ballast without encroaching on the mount itself. There is a stone reserve and mining lease in the area, and I have always understood that Mount Monster was excluded from these areas. The people of Keith are concerned about this quarry operation. Mount Monster, Sugar Loaf and Christmas Rocks are three of the district's natural landmarks. The people of the district would appreciate the Minister's assurance that

this operation will be kept within bounds and that it will not dispense with a real and natural district amenity.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will see that the Minister of Environment and Conservation receives the honourable member's request. I was wondering whether the honourable member wanted to transfer Mount Monster to the district of Goyder.

OATS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, give an assurance that the oat-marketing legislation passed by this Parliament will be proclaimed only in the form in which it was passed? Concern has been expressed that the oat-marketing legislation passed by this House will not work, because of farmer-to-farmer dealings in oats. I therefore ask that, before the Act is proclaimed, if it is not in the same form as it was when it was passed, it be brought back to this House for further debate.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister may reply to that question if he wishes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Surely the honourable member must realize that that Act cannot possibly be proclaimed in any form other than the form in which it passed this House. What sort of set-up would we have if Parliament passed a Bill which became an Act subject to proclamation and which was then subject at a future date to change willy-nilly by the Government. As that is absolutely ridiculous, I am surprised that the honourable member has asked for this assurance.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is expected that amendments to the oats marketing legislation will be made before the legislation is proclaimed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague whether amendments are contemplated, and I will let the honourable member know.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General obtain a detailed report on the progress made in implementing the new provisions of the Juvenile Courts Act, with special reference to the provision of juvenile aid panels and the early treatment of first offenders? Much concern has been expressed in the community about recent publicity given to the treatment of juvenile offenders especially concerning the high number of absconders. In replying to my recent question about juvenile assessment

centres, the Attorney-General said that assessment was presently being carried out at Windana and, to some extent, at Vaughan House. However, I point out that this is exactly what has been the normal state of affairs up to this time. Although the Juvenile Courts Act has been proclaimed for some time, much concern has been expressed in the community because nothing very much has been happening.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am surprised to hear that nothing very much has been happening, because the burden of press publicity on this matter is that too much has been happening too quickly.

Mr. Mathwin: You know that you can't believe everything that you read in the press.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I take this opportunity to express my unqualified agreement with the member for Glenelg. The truth is that considerable progress has been made in implementing the new juvenile delinquency legislation. Juvenile aid panels have been established in the metropolitan area and in many country areas. As I recently told the honourable member, assessment procedures are operating, at Windana and, to some extent, at Vaughan House. Moreover, I believe that they have actually started at the central office of the Community Welfare Department concerning juveniles who have not been remanded in custody. I am obtaining a detailed report for the honourable member on that, following his earlier question. The procedures foreseen by the legislation are actually being implemented: the machinery is either operating or is about to be put into operation. Although certain structural alterations required at Windana and Vaughan House have not yet been completed, they are under way. We are generally proceeding apace to implement the legislation approved by this Parliament. However, I will obtain a more detailed report for the honourable member.

MOUNT BARKER SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question concerning the delay in occupation of the Mount Barker High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The major factor causing delay in occupation was the inability of the contractor to complete paving works around the building because of inclement weather. In addition, mechanical and electrical installations had to be checked by the Public Buildings Department and the Electricity Trust, and some delay occurred because of additional work necessary before these services could be

accepted. However, the school buildings have been occupied by staff and students since September 11. Keys were actually handed to the Headmaster during the vacation on Thursday, September 7.

REGULATIONS

Mr. GUNN: In the temporary absence of the Premier, has the Deputy Premier a reply to my question of August 24 about the operation of the regulations under the Mines and Works Inspection Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director of Mines has reported that, on a recent trip to the Far West Coast, an Inspector of Mines, in accordance with the policy of the Mines Department, visited several district councils and delivered personally a letter setting out requirements under the recently amended Mines and Works Inspection Act. The contents of the letter were discussed. The letter explains that there is an obligation under the regulations to notify the Chief Inspector at least 21 days before of the intention to commence an operation. Realizing that this could be time consuming, the Chief Inspector in the letter suggested that councils may apply in advance for consent for all operations likely to occur in a 12-month period. Evidently the council concerned misinterpreted the reference to 12 months, there being no obligation under the regulations to give more than 21 days notice.

PORT AUGUSTA ABORIGINES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare accept the invitation of Mr. Bert Miller to see for himself the local Aboriginal problem at Port Augusta?

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: You can all go if you wish. The publican of the Great Northern Hotel at Port Augusta (Mr. Bert Miller), has issued an open invitation to the Minister to visit the hotel at any time, although he has asked that the Minister go there unannounced because, if he arrives with a fanfare, he will not see the real situation. Mr. Miller has said that the advice given recently by the Minister on this matter has been unrealistic, and that the position is now completely out of hand.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not intend to accept any invitation extended by the licensee of the Great Northern Hotel at Port Augusta. If I go to Port Augusta to look at matters relating to Aborigines or others, it will not be in response to an invitation by the licensee of any hotel. I do not see what could be the

value of my going to the Great Northern Hotel. The complaint of the licensee, if he has been correctly reported, is that certain of his customers who are Aborigines have behaved badly at his hotel, causing damage and acting in a disorderly way. I, at any rate, have told him that obviously his course is to refuse to serve people who behave badly in his hotel and to seek the assistance of the police if they are committing offences or breaches of public order. He has responded by saying that the hands of the police are tied, but he does not tell us by whom and in what circumstances. Let me say that not only are the police free to take the necessary action to prevent disorderly or unlawful conduct by Mr. Miller's customers but it is their duty to do so, and neither their hands nor any other parts of their anatomy are tied. They are not only free to act but they have a responsibility to do so. My reputation may be very fearsome and very impressive to Mr. Miller and other residents of Port Augusta in some respects, but I do not understand why they would imagine that I could succeed where trained police officers could not in restoring law and order in Mr. Miller's hotel. I assure the honourable member that I do not flatter myself that I could suppress disorder more successfully than could the police at Port Augusta. The plain truth of the matter is that, if there is a problem in the hotel as Mr. Miller has described it, it is a problem of customers of the hotel behaving in a disorderly and unlawful way. Only the licensee of the hotel and the police can deal with such a situation. There is simply no point in my going there and I suppose that, if any Minister were called on to go, it would be the Chief Secretary, as Minister in charge of the police, but I think we need to get the position perfectly clear. Aboriginal citizens of this State have the same rights as anyone else, and they also have the same responsibilities. If they are behaving badly at Mr. Miller's hotel in Port Augusta, it is a matter for the ordinary authorities, namely, the police. The Minister of Community Welfare is no more involved because the hotel's customers are Aborigines than he would be if the customers were of some other nationality or origin. The sooner we get it out of our head that, every time an Aboriginal or several Aboriginal persons behave badly, in some way that is a community welfare matter rather than a law enforcement matter, the better the position will be for the Aboriginal people and the whole community. For that reason, I have no intention of accepting this invitation from Mr.

Miller. I consider that the question of Aborigines in Mr. Miller's hotel is a matter to be dealt with by Mr. Miller, as licensee of the hotel, and, if he lacks the authority in his hotel to manage it, it is a matter for the police to deal with the situation.

LOXTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on the proposed programme for building the new primary school at Loxton? I think this project is included in this year's Loan Estimates, but I have not the details of it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the Loxton Primary School rebuilding project is due to go to tender fairly soon, but I will get the precise details for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

LETTER BOMBS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General say what provision the State Government is making to protect South Australian citizens against letter bombs and, particularly, what protection is afforded to members of State Parliament?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know that any protection against letter bombs is afforded. I understand that the Postmaster-General's Department has taken action, and that department would seem to be in the best position to deal with the matter. However, as the police may have given attention to the matter, I will ask the Chief Secretary whether the police are taking any measures and, if they are, whether it is appropriate that any statement should be made about the matter. I suspect that, if the police are taking action, it may not be appropriate to make statements about what they are doing.

MURRAY RIVER

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about undertaking a hydrographic study of the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is an observed phenomenon that all natural rivers have irregular courses, they tend to lengthen themselves, and their form is determined by flood conditions rather than by normal conditions. Deposition of material occurs at the inside of bends when the discharge and velocity of flow are insufficient for the stream to carry all the debris present in the water. The windings of the river develop until narrow necks of intervening land are cut through by high flows. This gives rise to the formation of the ox-bow lake, which is a common feature

of the meanders of the Murray River in South Australia. This is a continuing process and is present in the Murray River now as it was before the construction of the weirs and locks. Undoubtedly, local shallows have developed in recent years since the last occurrence of major floods, but these are minor events in the life cycle of the river. The Murray River in South Australia is the natural drainage channel for an area of about 400,000 square miles and the main stream is self-scouring to enable it to carry the large volumes of water that it must pass to sea in times of flood. The function of the weirs is to maintain the height of the river at predetermined levels in times of low river, when the stream could consist of a series of shallows and there would be no active change in the form of the channel. In times of high river, when there can be significant changes, all restrictions to flow are removed from the weirs and the river in effect flows in its natural state. Although local siltation can occur from time to time in periods of low flow and can be accentuated by reed growth or accumulation of sand behind snags, this should be kept in perspective and regarded as a minor event in the life of the river. A hydro graphic study carried out recently upstream of lock 7 indicated the presence of migrating dunes on the bottom of the channel. This is a natural occurrence in movable bed material and confirms that the natural transport processes are continuing in the locked river. There is, however, no evidence which indicates that the presence of the weirs and locks is giving rise to a situation that will markedly affect the general bed level of the river in South Australia.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works say whether he knows any of the details about the upgrading of the Gepps Cross abattoir, and, if he does not know, will he obtain the information from the Minister of Agriculture? A press report today states:

The Gepps Cross abattoir will be streamlined and the present board replaced.

Other detail is then given, and the report continues:

Agriculture Minister, Mr. Casey, said today control of the abattoir would be vested in the South Australian Meat Corporation, which would replace the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. Mr. Casey said the corporation's aim would be to make the abattoir economically viable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Earlier today I gave notice that I intended to seek leave tomorrow to introduce a Bill to give effect to

some of the matters referred to by the honourable member. I am sure that if he waits until tomorrow, when I give the second reading explanation, he will learn the facts about which he now seeks information.

STATE SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about accounting practices in the State Supply Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The suggestion that working expenses be charged against Consolidated Revenue has been considered before, but it has been decided that the existing practice should continue. However, in view of the Auditor-General's recent comments, the Director, State Supply Department, will discuss the matter again with the Treasurer. I have previously told the honourable member that it was necessary to have an accounting system to apportion costs between the various departments. I assure the honourable member that this discussion will take place. In regard to the Examination Branch, there existed for most of the year two vacancies caused through sickness and death of officers. Of the three remaining officers, two were transferred to duties associated with automatic data processing investigations in the State Supply Department. The branch will be brought to strength as soon as these investigations are completed.

ADELAIDE CUP HOLIDAY

Mr. RODDA: In the temporary absence of the Premier, will the Minister of Works give me a reply to my question of August 30 about the Adelaide Cup holiday?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier states that he has examined the suggestion that the Adelaide Cup holiday be held only in the metropolitan area, and has considered representations to this effect by certain chambers of commerce in country districts. Because all other public holidays are observed uniformly throughout the State, it would be impracticable for the Adelaide Cup holiday to be observed only in the metropolitan area, and it would create administrative problems if country areas desired a public holiday on a different date in lieu of the Adelaide Cup holiday in the metropolitan area.

Country areas can benefit from the Adelaide Cup holiday in May. For instance, the Cornish Festival is to be held at Moonta, Wallaroo, and Kadina at that time in the future, and this is being supported by the chamber of commerce concerned. In the circumstances, it is not intended to vary the present arrangement.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether any unexpected engineering or agricultural difficulty is being experienced at the West Lakes development project? It has been suggested to me that there is a higher than expected water table, which means that sewer pipes will have to be placed below the existing water level, and that water salinity is affecting the growth of trees and grass.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I do not wish to give an off-the-cuff reply as this is not my prerogative, I will ask Mr. Curtis (Managing Director of West Lakes Limited) for a report covering the points raised by the Leader. I am sure that, if there is any substance in these suggestions, the ability and ingenuity of West Lakes Limited will overcome the problems.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Education aware that a recent request to employ storemen to assist at the Correspondence School, North Adelaide, has been refused? The Minister may be aware that the off-set printing machine used to prepare material has been installed upstairs in the main building and that paper for it must be taken upstairs and downstairs. Some paper is being stored in the upstairs bathroom of the attached flat that is being used as a toilet by both sexes. There is no access to the main part of the building across the first floor, and the paper has to be taken upstairs, downstairs, upstairs and then downstairs. This situation is not fair to the teaching staff or the staff preparing this material, and a request was made that a storeman or other assistance be employed to do this work. However, I understand that this request was rejected. Will the Minister obtain a report about the situation and, in addition (and more importantly), can he take some action about filling the positions?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire about this matter.

KANGAROOS

Mr. RODDA: In the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain whether it is possible to grant a permit to control the number of kangaroos in the Big Heath National Park in the hundred of Spence, and will he also ascertain what are the plans to fence this area in order to control the fauna? This park covers an extensive area which is surrounded by farmlands. One landowner has complained

bitterly to me because he has a fine crop of oats adjacent to the southern boundary of the park and kangaroos are invading the crop in mobs of twenties and thirties and are doing all sorts of things whilst there. He says that they are literally "knocking hell out of the crop". The mobs of kangaroos beat a retreat back into the park, and the poor landowner is powerless to do anything about their grazing and love-making escapades. I should be pleased if a permit to destroy some of the offending fauna could be granted and arrangements to fence these areas were put in hand at an early date.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of chillers for storing kangaroo meat are there in South Australia?

2. What number of permits for shooting kangaroos were issued between July 1, 1971, and June 30, 1972?

3. What number of kangaroo shooters was employed at June 30, 1972?

4. How many are full-time shooters?

5. What is their average weekly wage?

6. How many of the shooters are under supervision?

7. What is the number of inspectors for each kangaroo meat processing factory?

8. What is the number of inspectors for each chiller?

9. At what frequency are the chillers inspected?

10. What is the maximum period of time between inspections?

11. What is the minimum period of time between inspections?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Current holders of keep-and-sell licences issued under the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964-1965, are not required to provide details of chillers: therefore, no records are kept of the number of chillers used. Under the new permit system to operate from January 1, 1973, a condition of issue will be that details of chillers will have to be provided.

2. 257.

3. It is not known how many kangaroo shooters were employed at June 30, 1972. However, 273 persons were licensed to sell kangaroo skins and carcasses under section 58 of the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964-1965.

4. and 5. Records do not indicate how many shooters work on a full-time basis, nor do they

indicate the average weekly wage of these people.

6. If the question means whether the shooters are under the supervision of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the answer is "No".

7. and 8. There is only one appointed inspector in the National Parks and Wildlife Service at present. Applications for additional inspection staff were called for on September 20, 1972.

9. At present the department does not undertake the inspection of chillers used for the storage of kangaroo meat in South Australia.

10. and 11. The inspection of chillers was, however, carried out by the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department intermittently prior to June 30, 1972.

RURAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. ALLEN (on notice):

1. How many children who received all their primary schooling by correspondence were granted rural secondary scholarships for 1972 in this State?

2. How many children who had received five years or more of their primary schooling by correspondence received rural secondary scholarships for 1972?

3. How many applicants for these scholarships received all their primary schooling by correspondence?

4. How many applications were received in 1972 from children who had completed five years or more of their primary education by correspondence?

5. How many rural secondary scholarships in total were awarded for 1972?

6. How many such scholarships for 1972 were refused on scholastic grounds?

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

1. Seven.

2. 13.

3. Nine.

4. 16.

5. 226.

6. 166.

EDWARDS'S PROPERTY

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How much did the Government pay for Lucy Mary Edwards's property of 2,500 acres situated at South-West River area, Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Portion of section 3, hundred of Ritchie, containing 2,298 acres, 1 rood, 4 perches was purchased by the

Government from Mrs. L. E. Edwards for \$30,000.

ABORIGINAL TRAINING

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What amount has been allocated in 1972-73 for the training of Aborigines:

- (a) in South Australia;
- (b) at Point Pearce Mission; and
- (c) at Granite Downs station?

2. What form does the training take in respect of:

- (a) Point Pearce;
- (b) Granite Downs?

3. Who are the instructors in each instance?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1 (a) Training of Aborigines is undertaken as a routine part of the activities of the Community Welfare Department, the Public Health Department, the Education Department, the several mission authorities and other organizations. Special training programmes for 1972-73 will be carried out as follows: South Australian Institute of Technology—training of the Aboriginal task force; Community Welfare Department—Aboriginal leadership training; Education Department—training of teacher aides; Highways Department—training of men on heavy road plant; Labour and National Service Department—seasonal work in Riverland districts; Public Health Department—home hygiene courses; and Ernabella Mission—garage workshop for adult education. From this it can be seen that the cost cannot be isolated from general costs of programmes of those departments.

(b) Point Pearce has been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The trust and the Point Pearce Aboriginal Council will be responsible for training activities there.

(c) There would be very few Aborigines at Granite Downs station, and no special activities are conducted there.

2. (a) and (b) Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

HOMOSEXUALS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many convictions for homosexual acts in private between consenting males were recorded for each of the years 1962 to 1972?

2. What was the charge against the two adult males convicted for homosexual acts with each other in 1971-72, and what were the penalties imposed?

3. What were the ages of the consenting youths concerned in the conviction of the 10 other adult males for homosexual acts with them in 1971-72?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Convictions for homosexual acts in private are included in the annual statistics under the classification of gross indecency and unnatural offences. Convictions for these offences for the years 1962 to 1972 were:

GROSS INDECENCY	
1962	61
1963	47
1964	55
1965	26
1966	29
1967	24
1968	19
1969	21
1970	20
1971	19
1972	24

UNNATURAL OFFENCES	
1962	27
1963	44
1964	55
1965	21
1966	16
1967	23
1968	34
1969	30
1970	41
1971	41
1972	46

When this question was previously raised it referred only to the past 12 months. It was then possible to extract the number of convictions relating to homosexual acts in private because the reports for that period were still on hand and could be conveniently researched. It is not practicable to carry out the same research over the period now mentioned. In the juvenile offenders' return, buggery and gross indecency are listed separately, but not all gross indecency convictions would involve homosexual behaviour, and there is no distinction between homosexual acts committed in private and public. The figures are also included in the overall totals for the State.

2. The two adult males were each charged with three counts of buggery committed on each other; and both were sentenced to 11 months on each count (concurrent).

3. There were 11 consenting youths concerned in the convictions of 10 adult males. Their ages were: 13 years (2), 14 years (5), 15 years (1), and 16 years (3). One adult male was charged in respect of two youths.

COUNTRY HOUSES

Mr. CARNIE (on notice):

1. How many houses were bought in 1971-72 by the Education Department in each of the country areas under the control of a district building officer of the Public Buildings Department?

2. What was the total cost of these houses?

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

1. The number of houses bought privately or bought (after erection) from the Housing Trust was as follows:

District No.	Geographical Location	No. of Houses
10	Yorke Peninsula.....	4 (2)
11	Barossa and the Lower North	1 (1)
12	Mid North.....	4 (3)
13	Lower South-East.....	9 (9)
14	West Coast.....	3 (1)
15	Lower Murray and Murray Mallee.....	8 (4)
16	Upper Murray.....	Nil (Nil)
17	Whyalla.....	10 (4)
18	Far North.....	5 (Nil)
19	Upper South-East.....	7 (4)
		Total 51. (28).....

The number of houses bought privately is shown in brackets.

2. The total was \$721,357. The value of houses purchased privately was \$371,727.

ROAD TAX REPORT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When will the report of the committee that inquired into the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act be made available to members?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On October 26, 1971, the member for Flinders asked me a similar question, as did the member for Fisher on November 11, 1971. In both instances I said that the report was not a public document and that no copies would be made available. That is still the position.

PLANNING APPROVALS

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. In each of the last four years how many approvals have been given by the Director of Planning pursuant to section 44 (1) of the Planning and Development Act?

2. How many of such approvals, in each of these years, have related to land upon which semi-detached business premises, such as rows of shops in separate occupation, have been built?

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

1. In 1968-69 the number was 174; in 1969-70, 174; in 1970-71, 276; and in 1971-72, 277.

2. No record is kept of the existing use of land referred to in applications submitted under

section 44 (1). An answer would involve an investigation of the documents relating to each application approved.

EVIDENCE ACT

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has Act No. 53 of 1972, the Evidence Act Amendment Act, 1972, yet come into operation? If so, when?

2. If not—

(a) why not?

(b) when is it intended that the necessary proclamation pursuant to section 2 thereof be made?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. (a) The necessary regulations to enable the Act to operate have not yet been prepared.

(b) I am unable to say.

GAS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the price paid for South Australian natural gas by the Electricity Trust of South Australia?

2. What price has been negotiated for sales to New South Wales?

3. Will future supplies to the trust be at the same price as previously, or what formula will be used to determine a price?

4. Can the price for any future South Australian supply be at a higher rate than that applying to New South Wales?

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

1. The price of natural gas is determined by a formula and varies with intensity of use. The average price over the last few weeks was 23.1c a million British Thermal Units delivered to Torrens Island power station.

2. The trust has no direct information but believes that the price is about 16c a million b.t.u. at the field, making a delivery price in Sydney in excess of 30c a million b.t.u.

3. The price for future supplies has not yet been negotiated.

4. It will not be higher.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. D. N. BROOKMAN

Mr. EVANS moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961-1969. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to increase the fines which may be imposed under the principal Act, in view of certain recommendations made at meetings of the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Marine. It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize the danger of the pollution by oil of our coasts and waters. Oil pollution of the world's seas and littoral zones results in the destruction of both marine and bird life. Sometimes, it is hazardous to shipping. Not infrequently, it fouls our beaches and tidal waterways, and it is difficult and expensive to counteract. The fines that may be imposed under the principal Act are quite inadequate in proportion to the seriousness and ever-presence of the problem of oil pollution. A new scale of fines, more realistic in range and deterrent effect than that existing, is proposed. The most significant particular of this proposed new scale of fines is the increase of the maximum fine that may be imposed for the primary offence, that of the unlawful discharge of oil at sea, from \$2,000 to \$50,000.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for an unlawful discharge of oil into waters from \$2,000 to \$50,000. Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for failure to fit equipment to prevent oil pollution from \$1,000 to \$10,000. Clause 5 amends section 9 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for failure to keep oil records from \$1,000 to \$5,000.

Clause 6 amends section 10 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for failure to report an escape of oil from \$400 to \$10,000 and by increasing the maximum fine for obstructing an investigator from \$400 to \$2,000. Clause 7 amends section 11 of the principal Act by prescribing a maximum fine for failure to provide satisfactory facilities, when required by regulation to do so, of \$5,000. Clause 8 amends section 12 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for a transfer of oil at night without permission from \$400 to \$2,000. Clause 9 amends section 13 of the principal Act by specifying that a regulation made under the Act may prescribe a maximum fine not exceeding \$2,000. Clause 10 amends section 14 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum fine for obstructing a routine inspection from \$400 to \$2,000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Parliament of South Australia, recognizing that the present legal relationship between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States needs to be revised, supports the holding of a representative constitutional convention which would, first, make a comprehensive examination of the Australian Constitution in order to assess its adequacy for present and future needs; secondly, determine the extent to which any adjustment in the present distribution of legislative, executive, and judicial powers between the Commonwealth and the States, and any other constitutional changes, are desirable; and, thirdly, propose to the Commonwealth Parliament and the people of Australia such necessary amendments to the Constitution as would give effect to the changes agreed upon by the convention; and agrees and resolves:

(1) That the Parliament of the State of South Australia should join with the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and the other States in a convention to review the nature

and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof;

(2) That it is desirable that the Parliament of South Australia should appoint delegates of the Parliament to attend any such convention;

(3) That for the purposes of the proposed convention 12 members of the Parliament of South Australia should be appointed as delegates to take part in the deliberations of the convention, eight of them to be appointed by the House of Assembly and four to be appointed by the Legislative Council;

(4) (a) That the eight members appointed by the House of Assembly shall be the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Dr. B. C. Eastick, Mr. S. G. Evans, Mr. E. R. Goldsworthy, the Hon. L. J. King, Mr. T. M. McRae and Mr. R. G. Payne;

(b) That the four members appointed by the Legislative Council shall be

and

(5) That each appointed delegate should continue as a delegate until he ceases to be a member of the Parliament of South Australia or until the House by which he has been appointed otherwise determines;

(6) That the Premier for the time being, as an appointed delegate (or in his absence an appointed delegate nominated by the Premier), should be the Leader of the South Australian delegation;

(7) That where, because of illness or other cause, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, or ceases to be a member of the Parliament of South Australia and so ceases to be a delegate, the leader may appoint a substitute delegate;

(8) That the leader of the delegation from time to time make a report to the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on matters arising out of the convention, such report to be laid on the table of each House;

(9) That the Attorney-General provide such secretarial and other assistance for the delegation as it may require; and

(10) That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this motion.

The purpose of this motion is to express the agreement of this House that the Parliament of South Australia should join with the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and the other States in a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, to prepare any necessary amendments thereto and to appoint delegates of this House to attend any such convention. The idea that a convention to review the Commonwealth Constitution should be held originated in Victoria. In October, 1970, both Houses of the Victorian Parliament passed a resolution in the following terms:

That the Parliament of Victoria, recognizing that the present relationships between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States, call for urgent review, and that a durable and acceptable adjustment of powers and responsibilities within the Federal system can only be achieved by effective amendments to the Commonwealth Constitution, request the Government of Victoria to invite the other States to join with the Victorian Parliament in preparing such amendments, and subsequently in conferring with the Commonwealth Parliament with a view to submitting agreed amendments to a referendum of the Australian people.

The Victorian Government then approached the Governments of all the other States, all of which agreed that a convention to review the Commonwealth Constitution should be held, that the task of the convention should be a thorough-going examination of the Constitution and of the constitutional relations of the Commonwealth and the States, and that the Commonwealth should be involved in the discussions at an early stage.

A steering committee of Ministers representing the various States (in fact, the Attorney-General in each case), which the Commonwealth Attorney-General subsequently joined, has been meeting to plan the details of the proposed convention. This motion embodies the recommendations of the steering committee of Attorneys-General. The majority of Attorneys-General have recommended that the convention should be a Parliamentary convention and that each State Parliament should appoint a delegation of a maximum of 12 members of Parliament to attend the proposed convention, the Commonwealth being entitled to a slightly larger delegation. The Attorneys-General recommend that the delegations should consist of influential members of Parliament and should be representative, as far as possible, of all views represented in Parliament.

It was agreed that, if any Parliament felt that all views represented in Parliament could be represented by a lesser number of delegates than 12, such Parliament could send a smaller delegation. Voting numbers will not be important at the proposed convention; it is a convention that will have no authority to decide anything; it will be designed to find a consensus of opinion. Any alteration to the Constitution must ultimately be decided upon by the people of Australia. Thus, the voting at the convention is not going to be of decisive consequence. The Attorneys-General considered whether representatives of bodies in the community should be delegates to the convention, but a majority of the Attorneys-General rejected such representation,

considering that the views of members of the community be sought by the Parliamentary delegations prior to the convention with the idea that the delegations would come to the convention armed with the submissions made by the interested parties in their own States.

Of course, once the convention is convened it will be master of its own fate and may well decide that it wishes to have other bodies in the community express their views to the convention. The Attorneys-General have considered that the convention may wish to accredit some bodies with the status of observer to the convention, such status conferring on the observers the right to speak if called upon by the convention but not the right to vote on any issue. However, it will be up to the convention itself to determine this matter. The Attorneys-General have recommended that each appointed delegate should continue as a delegate until he ceases to be a member of the Parliament of the State or Commonwealth, as the case may be, or until the House by which he has been appointed otherwise determines. The Attorneys-General considered that each Parliament should be able to revoke the appointment of any delegate, if it thought it desirable, but that normally the delegation would be there for the duration of the convention unless there was some change in the constitution of Parliament or something else happened to make it necessary for a Parliament to alter its delegation.

This motion embodies the recommendations of the Attorneys-General. Paragraphs (1) and (2) provide that the Parliament of South Australia should join in the proposed convention and that delegates of the Parliament should be appointed to attend any such convention. Paragraph (3) provides for the appointment of 12 members of the South Australian Parliament as delegates to the convention, eight to be appointed by the House of Assembly and four to be appointed by the Legislative Council. Paragraph (4) sets out the names of the delegates to be appointed by this House. Paragraph (5) sets out the term of office of delegates.

Paragraphs (6) appoints the Premier for the time being, so long as he is a member of the delegation, as leader of the South Australian delegation. Paragraph (7) enables substitute delegates to be appointed at short notice when an appointed delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention. Paragraph (8) emphasizes the fact that the convention is a Parliamentary convention, and provides that the delegation will report to Parliament periodically.

Paragraph (9) envisages that the delegation will need some secretarial assistance and perhaps will desire expert advice on some topics.

It is intended to introduce a similar motion in the Legislative Council, and paragraph (10) confers to this. The Attorneys-General have recommended that a meeting of two delegates from each State and four from the Commonwealth be held in Adelaide on October 5 and 6 next to enable the delegations to take over the planning of the convention, the first meeting of which they consider could be held in late March or early April, 1973, at Albury, New South Wales. It will be up to the delegates, however, to determine the date of the first meeting of the convention.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. There has been full and frank discussion between the Attorney-General and Opposition members regarding its purpose and that of the delegates, who are to meet as a steering committee on October 5 and 6. Members from both sides have determined the representation of that committee and, as the Attorney-General gave notice of this motion last Thursday, it has been on the Notice Paper and available for all honourable members to examine and discuss. No Opposition members have suggested that there should be additional discussion or that any amendments should be made. I therefore hope that the motion passes without further delay.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Is it in order for me to ask a question of the Attorney-General regarding one detail of the motion?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can raise his query in the form of debate, and the Attorney-General can reply.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir. Paragraph (7) of the motion, which is of interest to delegates, provides:

That where, because of illness or other cause, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, or ceases to be a member of the Parliament of South Australia and so ceases to be a delegate, the Leader may appoint a substitute delegate.

Two distinct situations exist: first, if a member of Parliament was defeated at a poll, he would obviously be replaced (in other words, another delegate would be elected); and secondly, I should have thought that if a delegate was ill during the course of a session of the convention he would resume his place as a delegate at the convention's next meeting. The words "substitute delegate" do not seem to define this situation. If a member of

Parliament who was a delegate was defeated, he would no doubt be replaced by another delegate, having lost all his privileges as a member of Parliament. However, if he was sick he would be replaced temporarily and a substitute found. It would seem unusual that, if a delegate could not attend a meeting because of sickness, he would be replaced permanently. As the paragraph to which I have referred seeks to cover two situations that are not complementary, I ask the Attorney-General in closing the debate to clarify this point.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am gratified that the House has, by the absence of debate, indicated its agreement to this motion. I am sure all honourable members join with me in the hope that the convention will produce an overhaul of the Australian Constitution, and that in the final outcome amendments can be agreed upon which will be approved by the Australian people and which will provide this country with a more effective Constitution, better adapted to the needs of the 1970's and the decades to come.

I refer to the point raised by the member for Kavel. True, two situations are envisaged by paragraph (7) of the motion. One is that a delegate becomes temporarily unable to attend a convention because of illness or some other cause; there the leader of the delegation, who will be the Premier for the time being, will have power to appoint a substitute delegate. Of course, if the delegate ceases to be a member of Parliament, the same power exists. How that power is exercised must be left, I think, to the convention on an understanding in the House itself. I have already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (indeed, the Leaders of the Opposition in both Houses) that the attitude of the Government is that a similar practice should be followed to that followed when a casual Senate vacancy occurs—that the delegate to be replaced would be replaced by a member of the House from the same political Party as that of the delegate, to maintain the balance between the Parties.

Of course, whether the substitute delegate was appointed for a temporary period or for an indefinite period would depend on the reason why he had to be appointed. If it was because of the illness of a delegate, the substitute delegate would obviously be appointed only for the period of the delegate's illness. If it was for some other reason—perhaps an overseas trip or something like that—the substitute delegate would be appointed only for that period. However, if the delegate

had ceased to be eligible to be a delegate because he had ceased to be a member of Parliament, the appointment of the substitute delegate would be indefinite: he would simply take the place permanently or indefinitely of the original delegate. It is a flexible arrangement that will be exercised by the leader of the delegation making the appointment, in consultation with the Leaders of the Opposition in both Houses, to ensure that the balance of delegates between the Parties and the Houses is the same.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to industrial conciliation and arbitration, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The present Industrial Code deals with two matters of the greatest importance to wage-earners and industry in South Australia: the provisions concerning the State industrial arbitration system and those concerning the working conditions that must be provided in factories, shops, offices, and warehouses. The Government considers that these two related but different matters should be dealt with by separate measures. This view is in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee on Occupational Safety, Health and Welfare in Industry and Commerce, which presented its report to the House of Assembly in April of this year. This Bill, therefore, is intended to replace the industrial arbitration provisions of the present Industrial Code. As well as providing for the repeal of the relevant sections of the Industrial Code, the Bill provides for the repeal of two Acts of the nineteenth century—the Trade Union Act of 1876 and the Masters and Servants Act of 1878.

It is of fundamental importance to the welfare of this State that good industrial relations be maintained between employer and employee and the Government considers that this can best be achieved by the maintenance of a system of conciliation and arbitration. It is suggested that one of the reasons why our system of conciliation and arbitration has at times failed to live up to its expectations is that, in the past, too much reliance has been placed on arbitration and too little on conciliation. Clearly a result that is arrived at

by agreement between the parties is usually better than one that is imposed on the parties by a third party.

We believe that good industrial relations will best be achieved by agreements initially arrived at between trade unions and employers and that only when genuine attempts to reach agreement have been unsuccessful should arbitration be necessary. The overriding principle, expressed in this measure, that the Government considers to be fundamental in the resolution of industrial disputes is that at all times the Industrial Commission or the chairman of a conciliation committee should make every endeavour to settle claims by amicable agreement. The emphasis is in fact seen from the very title of this Bill, which places the word "conciliation" before the word "arbitration". There are still many wage-earners in the State who do not have the protection of industrial awards. In fact, the last survey made by the Commonwealth Statistician in 1968 indicated that nearly 13 per cent of wage and salary-earners in this State were then not subject to any award. The Bill enlarges the range of employees who can obtain the benefits of an award and also ensures that all employed persons in the State, whether subject to an award or not, shall be entitled to annual leave and sick leave. I will explain these two major changes more fully.

The Industrial Commission is given jurisdiction to make an award in respect of any person employed for remuneration or reward. This is done by widening the definition of "industry" by not repeating the present limitation that industry must be "by way of trade or for purposes of gain". This will permit persons employed by non-profit organizations to obtain the benefit of an award. They, however, may be excluded from the provisions of the award if the Minister considers this would be in the public interest. A significant new provision in the Bill is that the definition of "employee" has been extended to take in a class of persons who though, in strict law, may be "independent contractors" in actual fact are, in their day-to-day avocations, hardly distinguishable from employees in the popular sense of the term. Taxi-drivers, owner operators of trucks, office cleaners, building subcontractors and others are brought within the definition of "employee" for the purposes of this Bill.

The policy of the Government that all wage-earners in this State, whether or not they are subject to awards, should be entitled to a mini-

mum standard of annual and sick leave is given effect to by this Bill. Clause 80 provides that every employee, under a State award shall be entitled to a grant of cumulative sick leave at the rate of not less than 10 days on full pay each year. Clause 81 provides that every full-time employee whose wages or conditions of employment are not governed by a Commonwealth or State award or industrial agreement shall be entitled to 10 days fully paid sick leave a year; however, in this case sick leave not taken will not accumulate. Provision is made for regulations to be made prescribing the conditions under which such sick leave shall be granted. Clause 82 provides that the general standard of annual leave determined by the Full Industrial Commission shall be granted to every full-time employee whose wages or conditions of employment are not governed by a Commonwealth or State award or agreement. This standard is to be published in the *Government Gazette*. Leave or payment in lieu of leave is to be granted at the rate of the employee's average weekly earnings for the previous 12 months or at the award rate (if any) or at the rate of his current weekly earnings, whichever is the highest. These provisions will not, however, apply to employees of the Government or Government instrumentalities who already receive superior annual leave and at least as favourable sick leave entitlements.

The granting of annual leave and sick leave benefits will affect mainly persons who are not members of unions, so it cannot be said that the Government is concerned only with trade unionists. We do, however, consider that it should be possible for the Industrial Commission and conciliation committees to grant preference in employment to members of registered trade unions. This power has been given for many years to tribunals established under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the Acts of all the other States. Preference to unionists has always been part of Labor Party industrial policy and similar provisions have been included in previous Bills. This is not compulsory unionism as some persons have previously asserted, but merely gives a discretion to the Industrial Commission, upon application and after hearing argument, to include such provision in awards subject to such conditions as it considers fair and reasonable.

The situation that arises when civil proceedings are taken in what is essentially an industrial matter is also dealt with in this Bill. All honourable members who have had experience in this field will be well aware that such civil

proceedings rarely resolve, but often make worse, the industrial dispute. The question has not been easy to resolve and the solution offered in clause 145 is in fact based on one of the earliest legislative approaches to this problem, namely, the Trades Disputes Act, 1906, in the United Kingdom.

In brief, acts or omissions when done in furtherance of or in contemplation of an industrial dispute that would give rise to an action in tort will under this measure not so give grounds for such an action. The acts or omissions excepted from this provision are such acts or omissions that cause death or physical injury, direct physical damage to property, or constitute libel or slander. Even if these acts or omissions are done in contemplation or furtherance of an industrial dispute, they will still be actionable at the suit of a party who suffers from them.

It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize that the consideration given here applies only to the civil liability of the associations and persons mentioned in the clause. The criminal liability of such persons is untouched by this provision. In the past, I regret to say, debate on provisions of this nature has engendered rather more heat than light, but on this occasion I look forward with confidence to a mature consideration of this provision by this House.

The Government is concerned at the fate of workers whose livelihood will be affected by the introduction of automation or technological change. We consider that employers have responsibilities and obligations to their employees so affected and, in particular, as management plans technological change, those workers to be made redundant should be given sufficient notice to enable them to find suitable alternative employment. Accordingly, clause 83 empowers the Industrial Commission or a conciliation committee, upon appropriate application, to insert in an award provisions relating to such obligations, duties and responsibilities of employers and for notice of termination of service to be of not less than three months. Advice of such notification is to be given by the employer to the Secretary for Labour and Industry, who in this measure is referred to as "the permanent head".

Following numerous representations from persons and bodies in the community concerned with the interests of female wage earners, the Government has by the equal pay provisions of the Bill removed the restrictions now placed on the power of the Industrial Commission to grant equal pay to women. The old Industrial Code expressly provides that the equal pay provisions

do not apply to work essentially or usually performed by females, but on which male employees may also be employed. Clause 78 does not retain this limitation. Furthermore, this Bill does not repeat the present requirement that the Industrial Commission must consider whether female workers are doing the same range and volume of work as males and under the same conditions when determining whether females perform work of the same or like nature and of equal value. These changes will allow the Industrial Commission a complete discretion in deciding whether female employees, in all areas of work, including those areas which are traditionally or mainly performed by females, should be granted equal pay. In order to expedite equal pay claims in the Industrial Commission, the Bill provides that such claims may be heard by a single member of the commission, either a Presidential member or a Commissioner, and not as at present by the Full Commission.

The Bill gives the Industrial Commission jurisdiction to hear any question about whether the dismissal of an employee was harsh, unjust or unreasonable. If the commission, on hearing such a matter, finds that an employee has been harshly, unjustly or unreasonably dismissed, it will have the power to direct the employer concerned to reinstate the dismissed employee in his former position on terms not less favourable than those which he had previously, and it will also have the power to order that the employer should pay to the dismissed employee full wages for the period between his dismissal and reinstatement. These are the major alterations which have been made to the industrial arbitration provisions of the present Industrial Code. Many sections have been reworded and consolidated, and a considerable amount of rearrangement has been effected. However, many of the clauses repeat existing sections of the Industrial Code, some with minor drafting alterations. In dealing with the Bill in detail, I will therefore explain only the clauses that differ significantly from existing provisions. For the benefit of members, a table has been prepared showing the equivalent numbers of the sections and subsections of the relevant parts of the Industrial Code compared to the clauses and subclauses of this Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the Acts set out in the schedule to the Bill and provides for the old Trade Union Act to have effect for one year only after this Bill becomes law. Clauses 5 and 7 contain the necessary transitional provisions. Clause 6 contains the

definitions. The definitions of "council" and "employer" have been changed from the present Act, and the definition of "declared industry" is new. I have already explained the other principal alterations. Clauses 8 to 14 provide for the constitution and composition of the Industrial Court. The Government considers that, in view of the importance of the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission, the President should have the status and salary of a Supreme Court judge, as clauses 9 and 11 provide. The only other alteration to the present provisions is contained in clause 13, in which provision is made for the appointment of more than one industrial magistrate, should this be necessary.

The jurisdiction and powers of the Industrial Court dealt with in clauses 15 to 19 are also left substantially unchanged from the present provisions, although by clause 15 the jurisdiction to hear and determine claims for sums due under awards to employees is vested in the court and extended to claims for amounts due under federal awards and to applications under section 12 of the Long Service Leave Act.

Clause 17 provides that the Industrial Court, except where it is constituted by an industrial magistrate, may state a case for the opinion of the Full Court on any question of law. The present powers of the court in interlocutory matters are also modified in this clause. Clauses 18 and 19, which deal with the procedure relating to claims for sums due to employees and the enforcement of orders, provide that an industrial magistrate will hear claims for amounts of less than \$1,000 and a judge will hear claims for a greater amount, otherwise they are substantially similar to the present provision. The constitution and composition of the Industrial Commission remains unchanged by clauses 20 to 24 of the Bill, except that clause 24 provides for the commission, sitting as the Full Commission, to be composed of either two Presidential members and one Commissioner or a Presidential member and two Commissioners at the direction of the President. Full Commission matters which do not involve substantial matters of law are to be heard by one Presidential member and two Commissioners.

Clauses 25 to 34 deal with the jurisdiction and powers of the Industrial Commission. In clause 25 in addition to the power relating to dismissal of workers, to which I have already referred, there is a new provision that, where a dispute arises involving employers and employees in their capacities as such and that

dispute does not appear to be an industrial dispute within the meaning of the Act, the Full Commission may declare it to be an industrial dispute for the purposes of the Act. Subclause (2) of this clause contains the overriding principle that the Government considers to be appropriate for resolving industrial matters to which I have already referred—that at all times the Industrial Commission shall make every endeavour to settle claims by amicable agreement.

Clause 26 expressly provides that a presidential member or commissioner may call a voluntary conference of the parties involved in an industrial matter in which mediation is considered desirable in the public interest. Clause 27 provides for compulsory conferences. I point out that a printing error has been made; the penalty should be \$500, not \$400. Clauses 28 and 29 give the Industrial Commission the same powers as those it presently exercises. However, the present limitation on the power of the commission to give its awards retrospective effect has been removed. In addition, the commission has been given power to include in any award provision setting out the procedure to be adopted in the settlement of any industrial dispute. This is similar to a power given to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

The present requirements for applications to the Industrial Commission are continued by clause 30. Clause 31 retains the requirement that the Industrial Commission shall not fix award rates less than the living wage. The period of operation of any award of the Industrial Commission is by clause 32 expressed not to exceed two years instead of the present maximum of three years. Clauses 33 and 34 are the same as the corresponding provisions of the Industrial Code. The present provisions relating to the living wage and variations to the living wage are repeated with one minor amendment in clauses 35 to 39 of the Bill.

Clause 40 is a new provision to empower the President to make necessary arrangements for hearing cases and allocating commissioners to industries. The other provisions relating to proceedings before the Industrial Court or Commission as contained in clauses 41 to 47 are similar in substance to those in the present Code. Clauses 48 to 52, regarding the appointment of an Industrial Registrar and his staff and inspectors and their powers, are substantially similar to the present provisions.

No alterations in principle have been made to the present law in clauses 53 to 77, which concern conciliation committees, although

clause 55, setting out which conciliation committees take precedence over others if more than one committee is created which would apply to particular employees, is included in the Act for the first time. A provision of this nature was previously included in the Rules of Court, which it is felt was not the appropriate place for such matter. The jurisdiction of conciliation committees is similar to that of the Industrial Commission, except that an employee who is on an annual salary cannot be subject to an award of a committee.

In clause 74 the same requirement as applies to members of the commission is applied to chairmen of conciliation committees—namely, that they shall endeavour at all times to have the parties resolve their differences by amicable agreement. I have already outlined the significant way in which the provisions of the Bill relating to general conditions of employment alter the present law. They are contained in clauses 78 to 83 of the Bill. Clause 78 deals with equal pay, clauses 80 and 81 with sick leave, clause 82 with annual leave, while clause 83 contains provisions relating to automation.

Clause 79 and clauses 84 to 89 do not differ substantially from the present law. Clauses 90 and 91 enable sheltered workshops and hospitals conducted by religious orders and certain other non-profit organizations to be exempted in certain respects from provisions of awards. Clause 92, which is formal, is repeated from the present Act. The various provisions relating to appeals from the Industrial Court and Commission and the Industrial Registrar and references of matters to the Full Industrial Commission are contained in Part VII of the Bill, comprising clauses 93 to 106.

Clause 93 provides that the Full Court shall be constituted of not fewer than two judges, and appeals to the Full Court constituted of two judges only shall not be allowed unless upheld by both judges. Clause 94 provides for an appeal to the Full Court from an order or decision of the court constituted by a single judge but not where that order or decision related to an appeal from an industrial magistrate. Clause 95 provides for an appeal from any decision of an industrial magistrate to the court constituted of a single judge. Appeal to the Full Commission against an award or decision of a conciliation committee, or chairman of a committee or the commission comprised of a single member, whether presidential or not, is provided by clause 97.

Clauses 98 and 99 substantially repeat existing provisions with a few modifications. Clause

100 provides that the Full Commission may stay the operation of an award appealed against, but in addition provides that the comparable provisions of the prior award, modified if necessary, may be restored, and on dismissal of the appeal the provisions of the new award shall be restored retrospectively to the date from which they would have operated but for the appeal. Further, if no prior award or comparable provisions existed, the Full Commission may make an interim award in relation to the provisions under appeal.

Clauses 104 and 105 deal with appeals from acts or decisions of the Registrar. The Full Commission may grant leave to appeal and hear and determine appeals from acts and decisions of the Registrar, the Full Commission in these appeals (which largely concern questions of law) being constituted of two presidential members and one commissioner. The provisions relating to industrial agreements that are contained in clauses 107 to 114 of the Bill vary the provisions of the present Industrial Code only by the requirement in clause 109 that the term of operation of industrial agreements, as with awards, shall not be more than two years.

Clauses 115 to 143 deal with the registration of associations both of employees and of employers. Clause 115 expands the meaning of "employee" by enabling retired employees to continue membership of their association and also by permitting any person undergoing a course of training to be an employee eligible to join the appropriate association. The matter of the registration of South Australian branches of unions registered federally has now been clarified by references in clause 117 as well as in other appropriate clauses in Part IX to a branch or part of such an organization. In recent cases before the Full Commission it has been argued that, if there was any defect in the rules of an association when first granted registration, even though that may have been 40 years ago, the association has never been validly registered. To put beyond any doubt the validity of registration of all existing registered associations, clauses 118 and 138 have been included in the Bill.

Clause 119 permits the Registrar to adjourn an application for registration for the purpose of allowing the applicant to amend its constitution, whereas at present an adjournment is restricted to amendments to rules other than the constitution. The Industrial Court and not the Full Commission as at present is by clause 133 given the jurisdiction to consider applications for cancellation of registration, and

the Bill provides that such action may be made only by an association seeking its own deregistration or by any of its members and not by other associations or their members.

Clause 134 is new and arises following the implications of the Commonwealth Industrial Court's judgment in *Moore v. Doyle*. This new clause provides for a two-year moratorium period, during which associations can adopt such steps as are necessary to put their affairs in order and at the same time being free from a wide variety of legal attacks that could easily frustrate the achievement of such aims. Clauses 135 and 136 transfer the jurisdiction from the commission as at present to the Industrial Court when considering matters relating to union rules.

Various drafting and procedural amendments have also been made to clarify some of the sections in this Part. Apart from some drafting and procedural amendments to clarify some of the clauses in Part IX, clauses 115 to 138, to which I have not specifically referred, repeat the present provisions. Clauses 139 to 143 include provisions concerning the incorporation of associations which, although they have not been specifically provided for in the past, appear to be necessary.

Part X of the Bill deals with miscellaneous matters. Clause 144 repeats sections 2 and 3 of the Trade Union Act, 1876, by providing that any member of a registered or unregistered association shall not be liable to criminal prosecution for conspiracy and that agreements or trusts of such associations shall not be rendered void or voidable by reason merely that the purposes of the association are in restraint of trade. I have already referred to clause 145, which removes certain liability in tort for acts or omissions done in contemplation or in furtherance of an industrial dispute.

Clause 146 will enable the Minister to publish an *Industrial Gazette* if it is considered desirable to do so. Large parts of the *Government Gazette* now contain awards that are of no interest to a considerable number of subscribers to that publication. The present provisions in relation to strikes and lock-outs are retained by clauses 147 to 153, except that the penalties have been brought into line with other penalties in the Bill.

Clauses 154 to 175 deal with offences and include several minor alterations to present provisions. No change has been made in the penalties presently applying. Clause 154 simplifies the present law without altering it. Clause 156 provides that in every case where the complainant in proceedings under the Act is a

registered association any fine imposed shall be paid to the registered association.

Clauses 157, 158 and 159 are similar to present provisions, except that clause 157 includes a new provision prohibiting an employee from being dismissed because he is involved in an industrial dispute, and clause 158 now requires a dismissal to be for a substantial reason. Provision is made in clause 160 that time sheets in the building industry shall be verified each day by the employee concerned. Apart from that, the clause repeats a present provision.

Clause 161 is substantially the same as the present provision, except that, in addition to the copies of the legislation already required to be kept, a copy of the Workmen's Compensation Act must also be kept and made available to employees in any place where 20 or more employees are required to work or report. Clauses 163 to 175 are similar in substance to existing provisions. The President of the Industrial Court is empowered to make rules by clause 176, and clause 177 provides a general regulation-making power.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Continued from September 21. Page 1530.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to raise a matter of grievance and complaint on behalf of many of my constituents and, I believe, many other members of this House. The matter relates to the confusion that has been generated by public statements by some Ministers, particularly the Minister of Works and the Minister of Environment and Conservation, regarding the subdivision of land held mostly by primary producers in the watershed areas in the Adelaide Hills.

For some time the Minister of Works has been reassuring landholders in the Adelaide Hills area (the Mount Lofty Range and adjacent areas) that there would be no restriction on their subdivision activities and no alterations regarding the 20-acre subdivisions allowed within the watersheds, particularly in zone 2. The Districts of Heysen and Fisher cover much of the Adelaide Hills and the area involved may be even a larger area than my district, which takes in many of the primary producers in the Adelaide Hills. I think the

member for Murray may also represent some of them, although possibly fewer of them.

Several members on this side represent these people in Parliament, and I know from conversation with these other members that their constituents are disturbed at the conflicting statements that Ministers are making on this matter. The Minister of Works has reassured me that there will be no alteration to the 20-acre limit, but I refer to a news item broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission last Friday. I will refer to only one part of the item, which obviously has been issued by the office of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. That part of the item states:

The Minister also foreshadowed amendment to the Planning and Development Act on the size of subdivisions in the Mount Lofty Range. He said the proposed legislation would extend control of the subdivision of any allotment from the present limit of 20 acres to 74 acres. I heard that news item and my immediate reaction (and, I believe, that of most people affected in these areas) was to take the statement at its face value, which was that the Minister was foreshadowing some amendments. Any experience that I have had of foreshadowed amendments is that notice is being given that one intends to move an amendment. That is precisely what the words mean. One gives notice of one's intention to move an amendment, and in this case it is an amendment to the Planning and Development Act.

It is all very well for the Minister of Works to assure me that this matter is only being talked about. He has talked about it, but this statement in the news item is much stronger than the Minister of Works would have us swallow. The Minister of Environment and Conservation has foreshadowed a proposed amendment. This matter has been taken at its face value by the people who heard the broadcast. I was one, and it is implicit in the news item that the Government, through the Minister of Environment and Conservation, intends to introduce amendments to the Planning and Development Act.

If the Minister of Works can put on that news item any construction other than the one I have put on it, I should like to hear it. The Minister of Works has assured us that there will be no alteration to the 20-acre subdivision provision now being allowed in watersheds. If the news item does not compound the confusion, not only of the members but also of the people we represent, I do not know what it does. I have received telephone

calls, letters and other contacts from people who have been confused completely. One person saw me on Friday morning, with plans of the proposed subdivision of part of a property into 20-acre lots.

I have failed to mention that the Leader of the Opposition also represents some of these people who are affected, namely, those around Mount Crawford and the Williamstown area, where my district adjoins his. I told these people that, in conversation with an officer of the State Planning office, I had heard that there was a suggestion of lobbying to increase the 20-acre provision. I assured these people of the provision, but later I heard the news item on my car radio that the Minister of Environment and Conservation intended to introduce an amendment in these terms.

The Minister of Works probably knows more about watersheds than does any other member on the Government side. That Minister does try to acquaint himself with the problems in the watersheds, and the statements he has made over many months tended to assure me that there would be no alteration. I consider that the people in the watersheds, too, have been reassured. I repeat that these people are in a predicament, because they have been hemmed in by regulations and by-laws proclaimed under the Waterworks Act which restrict their activities and their ability to diversify in the interest of keeping their operations profitable. If their properties become unprofitable they are limited in the choice of options open to them. If their properties become unprofitable and they are precluded from raising poultry or pigs, or conducting dairying operations, the only option open to them is a job in some other sphere.

If they are to remain in primary production they will have to sell their properties, but no genuine primary producer is interested in buying an unprofitable property. The present holders of this land are worried not only for themselves but also about what will happen to their sons in the future. The people best qualified to work in primary production are those who have been brought up and have had experience on the land, in other words, the sons of people engaged in primary production. How will these people be able to set up their sons on a property if they cannot sell the one which they now have and which has become unprofitable? One way would be to divide the property into 20-acre lots or to sell it to the North Terrace farmers, the people who do not really make a living from tenure of

the land or from occupying or working it; it is merely an investment. It would be undesirable for us to have tracts of land taken up by so-called North Terrace farmers; indeed, the amount of land that can be taken up in this way is limited.

The only other prospective buyer is the man who has a job in town or in industry who is interested in the rural way of life and who can afford to buy a 20-acre lot, because the price of a 20-acre lot in these subdivisions is not prohibitive when compared to the price of a lot on the fringes of the metropolitan area, which might be several thousand dollars, such as in a place like Tea Tree Gully. The price he could obtain for a 20-acre lot is a viable proposition to the landholder because, if he can sell 10 lots for a few thousand dollars each, he has some capital to re-establish somewhere else. It is also a viable proposition to the person working in the city who fancies the rural way of life and who can afford to buy a 20-acre block in the Hills in preference to a building block on the fringe of the metropolitan area at a somewhat comparable price. However, in the long term, this is undesirable for several reasons.

If the amendment which, according to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, is to be introduced into the House is accepted, one other avenue of escape for the people in the metropolitan watersheds will be removed, because it is highly unlikely that many people employed in the metropolitan area or in the Hills could afford to buy a 74-acre block; nor could the primary producer offer the 74-acre block at a price cheap enough to allow the average person to take it up. Expecting these people to split their properties into 74-acre blocks for a reasonable return on the property so that they could set their sons up elsewhere is a completely unrealistic approach for the Minister to take. There is only one consideration in the Government's mind in this matter, namely, the consideration of the rights of the majority. In this case, the rights of the majority seem to reside in the rights of the people in metropolitan Adelaide to have a pure and safe water supply. No-one could argue that that is not a reasonable proposition: the water supply must be protected, but surely this must not be the only consideration in the minds of Ministers. Surely they must concede that the people who have lived on their properties for generations have some rights.

The proposed amendment to the Planning and Development Act will remove one avenue of escape which, in many instances, is not

attractive to the people concerned if they must split their properties into 20-acre allotments and build up what is left of their property or set up in primary production elsewhere. That is not a particularly attractive proposition in many instances, but it is the only one open to these people, who are faced with the complete and utter confusion that has been added to the situation by the announcement of the Minister of Environment and Conservation on Friday. The Minister's announcement has completely confused not only honourable members but some of the people we represent. It is high time the Government considered some of these important problems, which involve the very livelihood and rights of a large number of people that some of us represent, and thought about getting their heads together before going to the media, as indeed the Minister of Environment and Conservation did, without consulting the Minister of Works, who had been making public pronouncements on areas to be subdivided in the watersheds, or without consultation in Cabinet. This matter should have been discussed in Cabinet before that kind of announcement was made. This important matter has been in the public eye for many months (it has been on my plate since before the Government announced that it would buy up properties in Chain of Ponds) and it has been on the plate of members in watershed areas for longer than two years, going back to the time of the previous Government.

It is unrealistic for the Minister of Works to say that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has a right to say what he likes over the media: the Minister has no right to confuse the section of the public involved in this matter. Many of these landholders have taken steps to draw up subdivision plans, because that is their only escape from being completely hemmed in. It is completely unrealistic and unjust for the Minister of Works to think that he can justify the actions of the Minister of Environment and Conservation by saying that he has every right to give such a story. To say that an amendment is foreshadowed along these lines is completely irresponsible. It was completely irresponsible to make a public statement without first having discussed the matter with the Minister of Works, who is more involved in this matter, or with his Cabinet colleagues. If the Government believes that it can ride roughshod over these people simply to ensure the purity of water in the metropolitan watersheds, it is being completely unrealistic and showing that

it has no deep understanding of what democracy is all about. I always understood that minorities had some rights, but in this case these rights have been completely negated. I raise this matter because it is one of considerable grievance. The members for Heyson and Fisher and I have been approached many times by our constituents. Indeed, we have had so many approaches that it has become necessary to call a public meeting, which is being planned so that these problems, which are uppermost in the minds of all people holding property in the Adelaide Hills, can be clarified. We find it necessary to hold a public meeting in order to assess the situation and find out what action can be taken.

The Minister has said that we will find out what is contained in Bills when they are introduced, but I believe that it is then too late for the Opposition to ascertain what the Government intends to do. This seems to happen time and time again: we find out what the Government intends to do from the second reading explanation of a Bill. If the Government keeps the Opposition completely in the dark so that our constituents must wait until the legislation is introduced, it is being completely irresponsible. I will continue to raise this matter until the Government has adopted a realistic approach to it. I deprecate the announcement made by the Minister of Environment and Conservation, as I believe it was entirely irresponsible.

It is time that some of the Ministers woke up and began to talk to one another, and their departments communicated with each other, in the interests of the people for whom they are supposed to legislate. I am far from satisfied with the evasions of the Minister of Works, although I pay him due respect in the sense that I think he has probably got his finger on the pulse concerning the watersheds, much more so than has the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is now in the process of empire building. The Government decided to set up this Ministry, and it seems to be embarking on this project in a fairly experimental way. We have considered money provided in the Loan Estimates for this department and money has also been provided for the Environmental Protection Council, but I have the distinct impression that the Minister of Environment and Conservation is groping in the dark.

That impression has been greatly reinforced by the conflicting statements that have been made first by him and then by the Minister

of Works. I think the Minister of Works should take his colleague in hand. I have raised this matter because we need a clear Government statement about what it intends to do concerning these landholders in the watershed areas who are at a serious disadvantage.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support what has been said by the member for Kavel.

Mr. Jennings: You don't know what he said, so how can you say you support it?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He said it 10 times.

Mr. McANANEY: I will continue to support him, too. People living in the Adelaide Hills fear what is going to happen next. The quality of life seems to be one of the themes of the Labor Party, but many of that Party's actions interfere with the normal existence of many people and are causing fear in their hearts. Some weeks ago I first heard the rumour about 74-acre subdivisions. Surveyors in the Hills area were telling local people about this rumour. Recently I asked the Minister of Environment and Conservation about it and he said we would know all about it when he introduced the Bill. When I spoke to him subsequently, he did not deny that this might be contained in the Bill, so I was amazed when the Minister of Works said today that he had no knowledge of this matter.

People are frightened of what will happen next. Their properties are being assessed at higher values, simply because someone interested in race horses or in city activities buys land at prices greatly in excess of its productive value. As a consequence, their rates become higher and higher. Are these people to be forced out of the area? The Government has already created a precedent in buying properties near reservoirs and buying a pig farm near Macclesfield. The Government has assisted these people in the same way as it has assisted others around Blackwood and Belair who are causing pollution. Their problems have been solved at great expense to the taxpayer. We must have a uniform policy so that everyone in the Hills area is treated in the same way. If certain people are to be penalized for the benefit of the whole, the basis should be more equitable. A meeting will be held in the Hills shortly so that people can discuss these problems as a group and work out some approach to the Government in the hope of receiving justice.

I have spoken previously about national parks and fauna conservation. Inspectors have

been given great powers under which they are able to call on people who may be reasonably suspected of dealing in fauna or bird life. I understand inspectors have called on one person several times and have taken records, and so on, yet have not been able to proceed to a conviction. It would appear to me, as an outsider, that, irrespective of what this person is doing, anyone should show that he has had reasonable grounds to suspect that the man is committing an offence before entering his home. It should be necessary for a search warrant to be obtained from a responsible person before a person's home can be invaded in this way.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the remarks of the member for Kavel. I shall reiterate some of the points I have made in this House over the past few years in relation to the catchment areas. It appears there is only one way to achieve an objective in this place: to keep plugging away until at some stage the message sinks in and people take notice. I know the problem is not easy to solve, and the question I put to the Premier earlier today was not just the result of a thought that came into my head on the spur of the moment. I have spent much time trying to find a solution to the problems that exist in the Hills area. If it is possible for the Government to buy the environmental rights of a property that an owner wishes to sell and to accept the responsibility of paying portion of the rates that can be set against those environmental rights, some of the burden will be removed from the individual who is willing to retain his land in its natural state for the benefit of society generally. I do not say that this is possible; I merely raise it as a suggestion, as it could be one way in which some of the Hills bushland areas could be saved.

When the regulation regarding 20-acre allotments was promulgated, the Minister, who was a person of my own political complexion, knew that I objected to it. I said I did not believe it would serve a long-term purpose, and the Minister said that it would serve a short-term purpose. Now, one Minister says that the regulation is not to be altered; whereas the Minister of Environment and Conservation says that an area of 74 acres is to apply. I take it that that odd number of acres is being used to bring the matter into conformity with the changeover to the metric system.

What will happen in certain areas of the Stirling District Council where there is a massive increase in council rates, where properties are valued on the basis that they

can be subdivided into 20-acre allotments, where the assessment stands for seven years and where, suddenly, the Government amends the regulations so that land cannot be subdivided under 74 acres? Although some of the potential for subdivision value will be lost, those people will be asked to pay for about six years a rate based on an assessment exceeding the value of the property. If the Government intends to make this amendment, it should say so now, while the people of the area still have appeals before the council, and while they can still tell the council that their property is no longer to be subdivided because the Government is amending the law to provide that subdivisions of 20 acres will not be permitted. I ask the Minister of Works to return this matter to the Cabinet for further consideration.

If the Government decides that subdivisions under 74 acres will not be permitted, and that decision is to be ratified by Parliament, in fairness to property owners an announcement should be made now so that they can submit their problems to the council and receive a fair assessment. That is one of the main reasons why I have decided to speak now—so that the people of the area will be considered as human beings and may retain the equity in their properties without having to pay unnecessary rates in future.

I refer also to another matter regarding the catchment area. The Minister of Works realizes that I have taken up this matter with him on many occasions and that I appreciate his difficulty. I refer to the extension of mains to blocks outside of reticulated areas. People are at present still buying houses on allotments that do not have a reticulated water supply. Some are building 15,000gall. or 20,000gall. water tanks to catch their own water supply; some are sinking bores (which will undoubtedly be a drain on the underground water supplies); and others are obtaining small tanks and buying water from the Emergency Fire Services or from people who sell it at a high price. I refer now to a letter sent by the Minister of Works to a Mr. O. M. Moriarty of Valley Road, Aldgate, part of which is as follows:

There are no proposals to change the departmental practice regarding the granting of water supplies to allotments in the watersheds of the metropolitan reservoirs. If you desire to extend private piping from your bore to serve allotments which do not abut existing water mains, the Engineering and Water Supply Department would offer no opposition in the matter but could not accept liability to compensate you should the allotments so supplied become ratable at some time in the future.

Although the Minister said that the Government was not willing at present to extend reticulated water supplies, he qualified that remark by saying that in the future the Government might do so. If that ever happened, the action taken would be criminal. It would be completely unjust for a Government department at one stage to say that it would not extend water mains because of the water catchment area and possible pollution problems, and then suddenly in five or six years to extend those mains, as a result of which people who had spent large sums of money to obtain a water supply, be it rain water or from underground, were suddenly rated.

The only people who will know about the Minister's reply will be those who read *Hansard*, and particularly Mr. Moriarty, to whom the Minister sent a letter. Anyone else who does not contact the department and who continues building and obtaining his own water supplies, at considerable expense to himself, will not know about it. Perhaps in future, either in the short term or in the long term, the Government would extend the water mains and these people could be liable to pay considerable water rates—60 per cent more than those that are imposed in the city.

The Minister's qualifying remark was indeed damaging and, if the Government is considering extending reticulated water supplies to these blocks of land to which I have already referred, it should say so now. Let us examine this matter and see what the problem really is. People who build houses outside of the reticulated areas install septic tanks and flush the waste away. The Minister may think that what I am saying is a waste of time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I did not say that.

Mr. EVANS: They flush the waste materials away, and it would be exactly the same process if reticulated water was taken to these houses: the same amount of pollution would be created. If we really believe that there is a possibility of increased pollution, we must tell these people that they cannot build their houses in the area and, if we do that, we must also tell them that the Government will buy their blocks of land, because it would be hopeless if a young couple, who had saved all their money to enable them to build a house, suddenly found that their block of land was worthless. Although this may sound ridiculous, this is how far the situation has gone. It is no good our trying to fool ourselves or to avoid the issue, because the problem exists. Indeed, we all should be conscious that it

exists and be willing to do something about it. I therefore suggest that the Minister seriously consider the matter and that, if possible, the water mains be extended (as the problem will be exactly the same if houses are built in the area, whether the water supply be obtained from mains, bores, or by natural means), as injustices will occur if these extensions are made later.

I refer now to the Silver Lake property, which is within 50yds. of the Onkaparinga River and within two miles of the head of the Mount Bold reservoir. Only last April I brought it to the notice of the Minister of Works, and in May to the notice of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, that promoters were conducting motor cycle competitions on that property on Sundays and that an admission charge was being made. I was informed by the Minister of Works that, as long as they conformed to the provisions of the Act under his control, he could see no way of interfering. I accept that; I believe that was the right answer. However, the Minister of Environment and Conservation told me on June 8 that he had discussed the matter with the Director of Planning and that the owner of the property had been informed that he would have to apply for a change of land use through the council to the State Planning Authority.

I have written to the Minister not only one or two letters but several, and I was completely ignored when the decision was made that the person concerned could not continue and that permission would not be given for changing the land use; but a person owning a property in the Hills and living within the metropolitan area complained directly to the Minister and received a reply on July 25, stating that the change of land use had not been granted. The member of Parliament for the area concerned was completely ignored. It is not just that the person who owns the block of land next-door and who lives in the city should be notified while the local member is not informed. If I had not been right on the ball and contacted the Minister, I would never have known unless there had been a court action over the matter. Taking it further, the property is still being used (anyway, until a week ago last Sunday, September 17) for motor cycle competitions, and no legal action has been taken by the responsible department or Minister to stop them.

How could one have any faith in a Minister and his department if that is the approach, when they have the power and they say they have issued instructions that the property is

not to be used for the purposes for which it is being used? The people of the area deserve protection. They want to have a peaceful life on Sundays. Would a member of this House accept motor cyclists racing around his property on virtually every Sunday? If it had been a member of this Chamber, regardless of which side of the House he was on, action would have been taken weeks ago to stop promoters conducting motor cycle sports; but, because it happened to be just a few people far away from the city who did not make much noise about it, they were forgotten. It is unjust and the position should be rectified as soon as possible.

I want now to make a different point. I refer to two comments—one by the Minister of Roads and Transport today and the other by the State Premier and Treasurer. The Minister of Roads and Transport is reported on page 7 of today's *News* as follows:

Mr. Virgo said the Commonwealth decision to provide a subsidy for the construction of a new oil tanker amounted to a gift of almost \$7,000,000 to the oil industry.

The Commonwealth Government makes a subsidy available to the shipping industry to keep people employed in this State. You know, Mr. Speaker, that in your area and the member for Whyalla knows that in his area if it was not for the Commonwealth Government subsidy thousands of men and some women would be out of work. The Minister of Roads and Transport has the hypocrisy to make that statement when his Premier on the very next page, on the same subject, is reported as follows:

Mr. Dunstan was commenting on a pledge made by Labor's shadow Minister for Shipping, Mr. Jones, who said the Australian Labor Party—if elected to Government—would provide up to a 45 per cent subsidy for ships built in Australia.

The Government referred to there is, of course, the Commonwealth Government. What sort of hypocrisy do we have from a Government when the Minister of Roads and Transport condemns the Commonwealth Government for paying a \$7,000,000 subsidy to build an oil tanker to keep people employed in this country while his Premier comes out with a statement supporting his Commonwealth colleague who says that his Party in Government would provide an even bigger subsidy—up to 45 per cent? How can one have any real faith when these statements are made by two people who are supposed to be responsible members of Cabinet?

As much as the Minister of Roads and Transport is seeking a further approach to try to denigrate the Commonwealth Government, which is striving to maintain employment in this State, I do not think he will succeed because the average man in the street will see the folly of such a statement. We must maintain a subsidy for our shipping industry if we are to have good employment figures in this State and in the country as a whole. Unfortunately, our cost structure is so high in this country that we are reaching the stage where we cannot compete with other countries—but that is another matter. I support the member for Kavel completely in his approach about the 20-acre and 74-acre issue in the catchment area. In particular, I object to the attitude that the Minister of Roads and Transport has taken when the Commonwealth Government is trying to keep people in this State in employment.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1530.)
Schedule.

Environment and Conservation, \$2,246,098.

Mr. EVANS: I raise the matter of the staffing of our national parks and ask what measures are being taken to train and obtain employees to act as park keepers and attendants in our national parks. Today, with the large increase in the number of our national parks, there is a need for more staff, perhaps with a better education and understanding of animals and plant life than may have been necessary in bygone years. The attendants are honest and dedicated workers, but are any special botany qualifications or other qualifications required now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I cannot inform the honourable member of the qualifications set out in the job specification for the additional departmental staff. I will inquire of the Minister and let the honourable member have a reply in writing as to the job specification.

Mr. MATHWIN: The vote of \$7,000 for members' fees of the State Planning Authority is nearly double the payments of the previous year. Is it expected that the board will have increased membership?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. It is anticipated that there will be more meetings.

Mr. EVANS: Are the works proposed earlier this year to be carried out to old Government House, at Belair National Park, currently being undertaken?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware the works are progressing. However, these are matters concerning the Loan Estimates works and do not apply to the Revenue Budget.

Mr. EVANS: Although the Woods and Forests Department nursery located at the Belair National Park does no real harm there, it is an intrusion. Has consideration been given to transferring the nursery to the experimental orchard in Coromandel Valley?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no knowledge of that personally, but I will direct inquiries in what I hope will be the appropriate direction. I will try to obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Regarding National Parks and Wildlife, will further staff appointments be made to supervise and run national parks in the South-East. The vote has been increased to \$353,959. What areas will this increase cover? I hope that that part of the State represented by the Deputy Premier and me will receive some advantage from the increase.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The \$353,959 is a marked increase because of the transfer to this line of other matters. If the honourable member looks at the footnote he will see the explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the sum of \$3,200 provided for the overseas visits of officers although it was not provided last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An overseas visit was made by a representative of the State Planning Authority to study new town development in England, the Continent and the United States.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I refer to the State Planning Authority and the item concerning special studies by consultants for which \$100,000 has been allocated. To what projects has this sum been allocated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Market analysis concerning recreation area requirements, metropolitan studies, Onkaparinga Gorge hydrological studies and Murray New Town.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the sum of \$140 allocated to the overseas visits of officers of the State Planning Authority?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is part of the cost of an overseas trip to Stockholm by the Director of Environment and Conservation. The remainder of the cost was met by the Commonwealth Government, because the Director was a Commonwealth representative.

Certain extra costs were borne by the State and the \$140 covers them.

Mr. EVANS: Is the fee received from land subdivision paid directly to the State Planning Authority or into a separate fund?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is paid into the development fund, but it does not show in the Expenditure Estimates. It is difficult for me to find out quickly, but I shall search through the Revenue Estimates and let the honourable member know.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the item "Office expenses, travelling expenses, motor vehicle expenses, plans and prints, library services, minor equipment and sundries" relating to the State Planning Office. Can the Treasurer say why the allocation for that item has been increased from \$31,500 to \$62,800?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The increase in the provision for 1972-73 is made up of increased costs for printing, \$14,000; library services (including a full-time librarian), \$5,500; development applications, \$5,000; motor hire and travelling expenses (because of the increased involvement in country areas), \$4,000; equipment, including tape recorders and typewriters, \$1,500; and insurance and office expenses, \$1,000.

Line passed.

Minister of Environment and Conservation, Miscellaneous, \$178,902.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In connection with the allocation for repairs and restoration of the foreshore, can the Treasurer say whether any new approach is being made this year that may have more permanent results? What was the purpose of taking the seawall farther out than it was previously?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot tell the Leader of any new departure, apart from what arose out of the investigations conducted by the Adelaide University. After the Culver report had been received, we received a further report from some consultants. The money is being spent in accordance with those proposals.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the allocation of only \$50 for the Beaches and Foreshore Protection Committee mean that that committee will become defunct? Can the Treasurer state the reason for the vast difference between the allocation for the Coast Protection Board and the allocation for the Committee on Environment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The sum of \$50 allocated for the Beaches and Foreshore Protection Committee is to provide for accounts outstanding as at June 30, 1972. The

allocation of \$1,500 for the Coast Protection Board is the estimated cost of fees and expenses of the new board, which replaces the Beaches and Foreshore Protection Committee. The allocation of \$18,000 for the Committee on Environment is to provide for portion of the salaries of staff, members' fees, office accommodation, printing of the committee's report, office expenses, etc. The committee, now a statutory body, has a continuing vast duty in relation to environmental measures throughout the State, and it is of quite a different order from the Coast Protection Board, which is a part-time authority related specifically to the expenditure of moneys for coast protection. So, the size of its budget is only a fraction of the size of the budget of the Committee on Environment.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Are the grants, each of \$1, for the Field Naturalists Society of South Australia and the Natural History Society purely notional amounts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The grants are in the Budget so that, if something should occur, we will be in a position to be able to spend money.

Mr. EVANS: Do all the officers of the Keep South Australia Beautiful organization work on a voluntary basis? Can the Treasurer say whether all the allocation for that organization will be spent on matters such as advertising and supplying rubbish bins?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, the organization is entirely a voluntary one.

Mr. BECKER: In connection with environmental protection, can the Treasurer say when members will receive the report of the Jordan committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members will receive the report as soon as it gets off the printing press; it is now being printed.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$4,539,304.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Marine state the reason for the vast increase in the allocation for expenses in connection with conferences of port and marine authorities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): That allocation relates to the conference of Australian and New Zealand port and marine authorities which will be held in Adelaide this year. The allocation provides not only for entertainment but also for typing, printing, etc.

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

Line passed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$5,200.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say what port sites may be examined during the year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I cannot. The provision is to cover any preliminary investigation work that we subsequently have to write off and to cater for any contingency that, may arise. There is nothing specific.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the provision of: \$200 for survey costs for West Lakes land. No payment was made last year, although \$200 was also provided then. The West Lakes company has the contract for the whole deal. What survey is likely to be required?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member examines the indenture between the Government and West Lakes, he will see that provision is made for boundaries of West Lakes Development Scheme, as defined in the indenture, to be extended if there is agreement and the Minister decides to acquire that area on behalf of West Lakes. That may lead to a survey, and the provision has been made in case this is required. I, as Minister of Marine, am responsible for liaison between the West Lakes company and the Government.

Line passed.

Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government, \$688,717.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister explain the activities involved in the provision of \$150,870 for Secretary for Local Government, field officers, inspectors, and administrative and clerical staff? Officers are interviewing councils about a possible redistribution of council boundaries.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Mr. COUMBE: I seek information about the committee in connection with Victoria Square. Provision is made for a contribution towards consultant services. I seek information about the work done by the Lord Mayor's Committee on Victoria Square. Is the project finished, and has a report been made to the Government and to the Adelaide City Council on this work? What will happen in future, and were guidelines laid down in the report about future activities in Victoria Square?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): The Committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Winston, concluded its work last year and the report has been printed. It constitutes guidelines for the future.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister say what projects the department has in mind in connection with the provision of \$100,000 for transport research projects?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At present the planning and development branch has in hand several projects associated with transport, particularly public transport.

Mr. Gunn: Dial-a-bus?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is one of the many projects. Already considerable study has been undertaken on that. This is an emotional matter that members opposite would like to latch on to. Honourable members did not realize that \$500,000 was allocated in the Loan Estimates. No definite plan has been arranged at this stage, and the \$100,000 provided is for those projects that more adequately and appropriately may be charged to the Revenue Budget rather than to the Loan Estimates.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the provision of \$64,841 for administrative staff and field officers of the South Australian Road Safety Council. The increase of about \$24,000 this year is a large one. Will the programme in the field be stepped up, or is this provision associated with the centre that is about to be opened? The provision may refer to suggestions from the public about how certain methods could be introduced to improve road safety in this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am encouraged by the suggestions put forward by the general public, as a result of the tragic situation that revealed itself last Easter.

Dr. Eastick: Unfortunately, it is still with us.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Not to the extent that it applied at Easter. I am always somewhat reticent to quote figures too pedantically on this question, but the latest information I have is that there were only two deaths more this year than in the corresponding period last year. I am always loath to talk too much about this matter, because I do not know what has occurred between then and the present time, and the situation could have worsened. Regarding the Road Safety Council, the Government, because of the legislation put forward with the concurrence of Parliament, has been able to embark on a much wider area of road safety than had hitherto been the case and, as a result, costs have increased, and this is reflected in the line.

We now have a considerable number of staff at the centre, now established at its new headquarters at Oaklands Road, Marion. I hope

that the Leader and all other members will accept the invitation that has been extended to them to inspect the whole project at the official opening. As I realize that at the official opening they will not see as much of the centre as perhaps they may like, if they would like to see the full impact of the centre, I shall be only too pleased to make the necessary arrangements. The increased costs are almost entirely associated with the establishment of the new centre and the increased activities flowing from it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the contribution towards transport research projects. Can the Minister say what determines whether expenditure will be charged to Loan Account or Revenue Account? I have always had the vague impression that capital works and projects that provided some tangible asset were charged to Loan Account and that working expenses were charged to Revenue Account. As the Minister said earlier, \$500,000 for transport research is debited to Loan Account and \$100,000 to Revenue Account, obviously for the same kind of operations. From the outline of the projects referred to in the debate on the Loan Estimates, none of these matters falls into the category which, one might say, would produce some tangible asset for the State and on which interest would be paid for the next 15 years. What determines to which account these operations, such as those envisaged in transport research, will be charged?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No strict rule is laid down, other than the general rules which apply and which were envisaged by the honourable member in explaining his question. In other words, where a project is regarded as a normal day-to-day operation it is charged to revenue. The reason for providing this amount in the Revenue Budget is to provide for the day-to-day operations that will be and are being investigated by the planning and development branch.

Mr. MATHWIN: A sum of \$3,500 is provided for maintenance of grounds. Is that for the maintenance of the new driving area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the line "Overseas visit of Minister and officers", for which \$3,000 is provided. I have noticed in several other places in the Estimates that money is provided for this purpose. It seems to me that the sum proposed would be inadequate to cover any kind of overseas trip by the Minister or his officers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that queries must be answered at the time the lines are dealt with; therefore, the honourable member cannot refer back to an earlier line.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not intend to go back to an earlier line, but I wanted to inquire what the sum is supposed to cover. What overseas visit does the Minister expect to make, what officers will he take with him, and will \$3,000 cover the visit, or is the sum provided because the Minister may contemplate such a trip?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reason for this \$3,000 being provided is that it is essential in the area of transport, particularly in the planning and development branch, that officers and the Director-General keep themselves acquainted with overseas developments. I may engender some controversy if I say that I think that my overseas trip was of great value to the people of this State.

Mr. Gunn: I agree: we are very charitable.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have read comments of other Opposition members that were not as charitable as those of the member for Eyre. At this stage, no plans have been made for overseas trips. However, because I strongly believe that we should keep ourselves acquainted with what is happening overseas, provision has been made to enable trips to be taken when necessary. There are no specific plans at present regarding who will go or where they will go. Although \$3,000 has been allocated for this purpose, I will, if necessary, have to convince the Treasury that more money is needed for a certain project, if and when it is formulated.

Line passed.

Highways, \$7,453,291.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister tell me what work is done by assessors, who are referred to in the line "Collector of Road Charges, Assessors and Clerical Staff, Traffic Inspectors"?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Assessors are engaged in the road maintenance area.

Dr. Eastick: Are they field staff or administrative staff?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As far as I know, they are administrative staff. However, I will obtain more information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Although no provision is made for pay-roll tax in other lines, \$200,237 is provided under the Highways Department administration section. Why is this?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member cared to check the legislation that was passed recently, he would find that pay-roll tax was still payable in this area.

Mr. CARNIE: The sum of \$370,985 is provided this year for the salaries of the senior materials engineer, the materials engineer, testing officers, and so on, an increase of about \$78,700 over last year's actual payment. Is this a normal increase in expenditure, or is some special project in mind in relation to this line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department technical staff has been understaffed for some time, much of its work having had to be farmed out to private consultants. Now that suitable staff is becoming more readily available, the Highways Department is building up its technical staff to enable this branch to do its own work. In addition, salary increases have occurred from time to time. These two factors are the reason for the increase.

Mr. ALLEN: The allocation for designing engineer (roads), bridge engineer, management services engineer, and so on, is about \$240,000 more than the sum actually spent last year. District councils have informed me that grant money is being held up because of a shortage of surveyors in the Highways Department. Is this correct?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although I cannot answer that question now, I shall try to obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: For the overseas visits of officers, \$9,000 has been allocated. Has a visit already been organized this year, or is this just a rough estimate of the sum required?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: One or two visits are contemplated. Basically, my attitude on this matter is similar to that regarding overseas visits of Ministers and officers, to which I referred earlier. I strongly support the view that officers of the South Australian Government should keep abreast of what is happening overseas and, as long as I am satisfied that there is value in it, I will always support an overseas visit by Government officers.

Mr. BECKER: I note that the total proposed expenditure on contingencies for the Government Motor Garage is \$42,600.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee has already dealt with that line.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information regarding the total proposed expenditure of \$7,453,291 for the Highways Department, all

of which is absorbed in the Revenue Account. The amount actually spent in this State on roadworks and so on, is about \$3,800,000. I think we are spending twice as much money on administering the Highways Department as on actual roadworks. It seems to be out of balance that nearly \$7,500,000 is to be spent on salaries, wages and running the department, while only \$3,800,000 is to be spent on actual roadworks. Is the department getting a little top-heavy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure how to answer that question; I am almost at a loss for words. The Highways Department is spending more than \$1,000,000 a week, yet the honourable member is questioning the administrative staff (engineers, surveyors, designers and others) costing the department \$7,400,000. As it seems to have been a naive question, the less I say about it the better. Probably the honourable member realizes he should not have asked it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister ever investigated the possibility of an exchange of Highways Department staff with similar staff from another country? Other countries would be well in advance of South Australia in respect of the pre-cast concrete and cantilever types of construction, so both parties would gain from a two-way exchange, which also would be inexpensive.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg is not abreast of the situation. He is reading only those sections of the newspaper that he wants to. If he had read them all, he would know that at present we have a team of about 30 people from nearby South-East Asian countries. He met some of them recently. That being so, I am at a loss to understand the purpose of his question. The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities, which is the national body of road authorities, engages in this sort of exercise nationally. We think the training given is of tremendous value not only to those people who come from overseas and learn from us but also to our own people, who learn much from them. I do not know how much further that can be extended.

Mr. MATHWIN: I think the Minister misunderstood me. My idea was that people from our State should be exchanged with people from other countries. For instance, we could exchange 10 people from our Highways Department concerned with planning and development and the making of pre-cast concrete and cantilever—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I can only allow the honourable member to seek brief information on that, because we are dealing with these specific lines.

Mr. Mathwin: I am only trying to explain my question.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not permissible to make a lengthy explanation; there is nothing in the lines dealing with that. I cannot allow a general debate on the point the honourable member raises.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know that I can add much to what I have already said.

Line passed.

Railways, \$45,367,151.

Mr. COUMBE: Under "Rolling stock Branch", less money is to be spent this year on "Mechanics, labourers" than was provided last year. Obviously, rolling stock work is done mainly at the Islington workshops. Earlier, when debating the Loan Account, it was proposed to spend \$4,200,000 this year as against \$4,600,000 spent last year. The Minister assured me that the level of employment there would continue. The figure of \$3,500,000 now proposed is less than the amount of money provided last year, which was roughly the amount actually spent. There is the amount of transfers between accounts to be considered, too. Will the Minister explain the transfers and how we arrive at less money being spent this year on mechanics and labourers than was provided last year and actually spent, quite apart from the engineers, who come under another line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because the work that was undertaken at the Islington workshop concerning the building of rolling stock (especially passenger vehicles) has almost reached absorption, there must be some decline in the level of operations. There will be no retrenchments at Islington, although there may well be a reduction in overall staff numbers through the non-replacement of retiring staff. By using a redundancy factor to cope with this situation, an endeavour has been made to reduce labour activities at the Islington workshop.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The total vote to the Railways Department is more than \$44,000,000, yet the railway deficit is more than \$20,000,000. Has the Minister plans in either the short term or the long term to reduce this large deficit, which is becoming completely unmanageable, by the infusion of additional moneys? If money has to be spent

in the short term to get a long-term benefit, that would be an advantage.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Although I will allow the honourable Minister to answer the question, I will not allow the debate to continue along these lines. This matter has already been dealt with by the Committee: on page 44 the sum of \$22,500,000 was provided for the specific subject raised by the honourable member, and the Committee cannot go back and further debate or seek information on a vote that has been already determined by the Committee.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In view of what you have just said, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how I can adequately answer the honourable member, because, as you have rightly said, the matter should have been raised earlier. I agree completely with the member for Kavel that it is absolutely essential that sums of money be injected into the railway system to make it viable. That this is necessary has been proved by the Bureau of Transport Economics, which is part of the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport. The report printed in this morning's press concerning that bureau was maliciously quoted by the member for Fisher.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I deny that I misquoted—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has the right to raise a point of order when it is not a matter of explanation. The honourable member for Fisher started off by denying something, and the Chair interprets that as being an explanation. The honourable member cannot make an explanation in taking a point of order.

Mr. EVANS: I object to the Minister's statement that I maliciously misquoted him when I read the report printed in this morning's press. I ask through you, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister is prepared to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In accordance with the wishes of the member for Fisher, I ask the Minister whether he will withdraw the statement he has made.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Fisher finds the statement I made objectionable to him, out of deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to qualify it by saying that the honourable member claimed to quote me but merely quoted a few lines. This had the effect of being a misquotation of the purpose for which I had made that press

statement, and the member for Fisher knows that better than does any other member in this House. He knows that he was referring—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Kavel asked a question, which I said I would allow, but only for the purpose of obtaining a brief answer on the information sought. I ruled at that time that the Committee could not go back to an earlier line and, therefore, in view of what has taken place, I am ruling the matter out of order.

Line passed.

Motor Vehicles, \$1,515,395.

Mr. VENNING: From my observations the provision for pay-roll tax applies for the first time this year to Government departments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked honourable members to seek information only on the line under discussion. This question refers to a matter with which the Committee has just dealt.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the grant in connection with losses on operations of the *Troubridge*.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That matter is out of order.

Mr. ALLEN: Although no money was allocated for the printing of the Road Traffic Code booklet last year, \$3,880 was actually spent, and this year \$9,000 has been allocated. Can the Minister give some further information on this item?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government intends that the booklet will be reprinted, because it is valuable in combating the ever-rising road toll. It is for that reason that the allocation has been made.

Line passed.

Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$318,900.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister estimate what the losses are at present in connection with the operation of the *Troubridge*? The Minister has said that it is not intended that the *Troubridge* will be run at a profit.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have been operating the *Troubridge* for only three months, so a figure is not yet available. I do not believe that I said that it was not intended to run the *Troubridge* at a profit; I believe I said that it was not expected that it would make a profit, but we would be willing to pick up the tab for the losses involved, in an endeavour to meet the needs of the rural industry. If private enterprise does not provide necessary services for the rural industry, it behoves the Government to come to the aid

of rural industry. The State Labor Government, which has been maligned so often by the honourable member and some of his extreme right-wing colleagues, is always ready to assist the rural industry in its hour of need.

Mr. ALLEN: Because only \$300 has been allocated for the committee of inquiry into the establishment of local government in outlying areas, can it be assumed that that inquiry is almost finished?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is a continuing process, but regrettably some members do not give it as much support as I believe it deserves. Be that as it may, I am fairly confident that there will soon be significant changes in the areas administered by local government. Notwithstanding the attitude of some members in outlying areas, I believe people in those areas are beginning to learn that the guff uttered by some members is incorrect and that a different form of administration would be preferable.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister give further information on the allocation of \$500 for expenses of referees appointed under the Building Act?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because the honourable member was (and perhaps still is) a member of a council, he should be familiar with the work of referees, who officiate when disputes occur. The provision has been made for that purpose.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister explain the provision of \$200 for the Woomera Board for dog registration?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Offhand, I cannot do that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am familiar with the work of building referees; I was wondering whether the Minister could provide further information about building referees acting on behalf of the department in connection with zoning regulations. Can the Minister give further information on that item?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The item is self-explanatory.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister carried out any further investigations into the area at the Crafers-Piccadilly junction, in relation to making it available to the Elderly Citizens Homes organization and the Crafers Tennis Club? It is 12 months since I first raised this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not recall the case, but I should be very surprised if that matter was associated with the provision for public parks.

Mr. GUNN: Because only \$3,989 was spent out of the \$7,000 allocated for the Kangaroo

Island Ferry Committee and only \$200 is provided this year, am I correct in assuming that the Government does not intend to have any further investigations carried out into that project?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member's assumption was correct, there would be no provision in the Budget. If the honourable member checks the numerous statements I have made on this matter and if he consults *Hansard* in relation to the questions the member for Alexandra has asked, he will clearly see what the position is. It is very difficult for me to satisfy the honourable member.

Mr. Gunn: You make so many statements that you confuse me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If one tries to explain something, one is accused of making too many statements. If one does not give all the information that the honourable member wants, one is accused of being secretive. I wonder what the middle of the road course would be for the honourable member. I know that he is an extreme right winger.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Line passed.

Community Welfare, \$10,451,753.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the provisions made for training centres. Community welfare, particularly the training to rehabilitate juvenile offenders in this State, should not be a Party-political matter. As a rule, it has not aroused Party-political controversy here. The present Premier, in his period of about two years as Minister in charge of the department, did good things in this field and my Government followed up many of them when it came to office. Subsequently, the present Minister, whether he likes to hear this or not, has built on the foundations of what we did. I think particularly of the amalgamation of the two departments, and the appointment of a new Director, the opportunity for which occurred when I was in office.

I also want to say as a preface, that this is a difficult and challenging field, merely because there are no easy solutions to the problems that must be faced. When I was Minister I, like all other Ministers, certainly had problems. I had problems of the same sort as we are experiencing now, but I do not consider that they were of the same magnitude.

I regret having to raise several criticisms of the present administration. The most serious one, which goes to the root of what I think is a genuine public uneasiness at present, is the Minister's penchant for secrecy, his dislike of criticism, and his disinclination to disclose to

the people of this State facts that filter through the press to them. I suggest to the Minister that it would be much better if he frankly acknowledged the problems that he had and explained what he was doing, or intended to do, about them.

One thinks of several examples of this disinclination to face facts and this desire to avoid issues. One thinks of the suppression of the Beerworth report about 12 months ago, a matter that caused much controversy and hostility towards the Minister. Several recent newspaper reports also have been quite disturbing. They have been published particularly in the *Sunday Mail* during September. As a result of them and as a result of other reports that had come to me, a few weeks ago I asked another Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Community Welfare, whether I could visit several institutions.

Mr. Payne: You're not going through all that again, are you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I think it is part of the whole picture.

Mr. Payne: I've heard it all before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member may have, but I am not particularly concerned about him. I asked the Minister whether I could see those institutions and, after I had asked three or four questions, he said that I could. I also asked whether I could speak to the staff, and this second request brought forth a rather remarkable tirade from the Minister, who stated:

However, regarding the suggestion that the staff members in those institutions should be exposed to interrogation by the member for Mitcham or anyone else, I have not the slightest intention of exposing them to that sort of experience.

I did not know whether to take that as a compliment or as an insult, but I had no intention of interrogating anyone. I simply wanted to go there and discuss with members of the staff what was going on in the institution. The Minister also stated:

The staff members are engaged to perform a professional function. They do it extremely well, and they are entitled to expect to be protected from the sort of interrogation that the honourable member apparently has in mind.

I do not know how the Minister could have known what I had in mind. However, doubtless that was an automatic protective mechanism that the Minister adopted. Eventually he allowed me to visit these institutions, with which he knew I was quite familiar, because I had been through them several times when I was the Minister and, while I was there, I did speak to those who took us around.

Mr. Payne: As did other honourable members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and they could not have avoided it. I spoke to some girls there and came to several conclusions, some of which I intend to mention at random now. First, it was quite obvious from what members of the staff at Vaughan House and Windana told me that the recruitment and training of staff still was a big problem. I acknowledge that. For probably as long as any of us can remember, we have had difficulty with this, and it is a problem particularly now, when new programmes are being tried and it is necessary to train present staff members in those new methods.

I think some action more positive than is being taken at present should be taken on other matters. I was told at one institution that now there are no incentives: there is no system of rewards to try to encourage those who live there to make an effort in any field. Everything is given to them, almost on request. This point was made to me by a staff member to whom I spoke. This, to me, seems to be against common sense and the experience of anyone who has been a parent or who has had anything to do with children, and I cannot understand why that should be so.

Another point I noticed at Vaughan House was that the girls now smoke. They did not smoke when I was Minister. I was told that a couple of years ago a meeting was held at which the girls then living at Vaughan House were asked what they wanted. They said what they wanted most was to be allowed to smoke, as the boys did at McNally; so the girls are now allowed to smoke.

Mr. McRae: And save smashing up in the process. The staff told me that as well. You were there, and that was the explanation.

Mr. Payne: You want to be careful about what you go on to say.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have thought that the member for Mitchell and the member for Playford would be grateful for my organizing the visit, because if I had not made the request I do not think even they would have got there.

Mr. McRae: We'd like an accurate report.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Those two honourable members should make a contribution to the debate other than by way of interjecting.

Mr. Payne: The best contribution would have been for you to stay away from both those places.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was responsible for those two institutions for over two years, and

I have a great interest in them and in what is going on.

Mr. Payne: I am referring to this visit. It was ill advised, by all of us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be the opinion of the member for Mitchell.

Mr. Payne: I am referring to the effect on the inmates, not on the staff.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the member for Mitchell will make his contribution later, other than by interjection. The girls are now allowed officially to smoke, I think one cigarette after each meal and one at suppertime.

Mr. Payne: Your accuracy is improving.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Three of them, however, when I spoke to them at morning tea-time asked me most vigorously to be allowed to smoke at will. I told them in a half-joking fashion that I did not think that cigarettes were good for them, but they were not willing to listen to that. I cannot see why smoking is allowed at Vaughan House or in any of these institutions. However, I acknowledge that it is more difficult at a boys' institution, where there are lads up to 18 years of age, to stamp it out; it would probably be impossible, but I think the practice is undesirable. One of the most undesirable aspects of this matter is that only those over the age of 16 years are officially allowed to smoke at Vaughan House or anywhere else, because the law says that smoking is forbidden to those under 16 years of age. There are girls at Vaughan House, and no doubt boys at McNally, between the ages of 14 years and 18 years mixed in together, yet only those over a certain age are allowed to smoke. This, of itself, must inevitably cause trouble, but that is the rule and I do not like it.

I noticed some of the marks of damage that was done in the craft room, I think, at Vaughan House. One had only to look at the ceiling and see how it had been scraped and scratched during the disturbance there a few months ago; the other damage, by and large, had been repaired, but the damage to the ceiling of the building will no doubt remain for a long time. Those were a few of the random points I noticed during our time there. None of us was able to speak to the Superintendent (Miss McMenemie) at Vaughan House because she was away, having been injured in, I assume, a fracas, but the Deputy Superintendent (Miss Warlimont) showed us around. I have nothing but admiration for her and for the other members of the staff at Vaughan House and for Mr. Jack Oates and other staff members at Windana.

I was impressed, as I have been impressed before, by the extent and quality of the equipment there. There is nothing one would think wanting in equipment in these two institutions, but the tragedy is that it is little used because there is little motivation among those who are there to use it. Another thing that struck me (and this has not changed since I was Minister) was the number of keys that must be used. It is impossible to walk around these institutions unless accompanied by a person who has the keys. One cannot go more than a few yards down the corridor without a key having to be used to unlock a door. This practice makes nonsense of the pretensions to freedom and lack of security which, I understand, is now the policy of the department and the Minister.

The Hon. L. J. King: It would be more accurate to say that it makes nonsense of the criticism that suggests that there is no security.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not so. Perhaps in this case we are both trying to have it each way. Certainly it cannot possibly give a girl at Vaughan House any feeling of lack of restraint when it is necessary for her to be accompanied by someone to unlock a door before she can go upstairs, and the same applies at Windana. Why, if there is such strong internal security, is the external security lacking? I cannot speak for McNally in the last couple of years, because I have not been there. I do not know whether it is the same there as it is at Vaughan House. I hope that I shall be able to visit McNally in the measurable future and see for myself. I shall not mention any of the other impressions I had during that visit. I found it a valuable visit, and I hope that other members also found it valuable. I felt, in watching their reactions, that it was valuable for a number of members who obviously had never been to such institutions before.

Mr. Payne: You could be wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that the member for Mitchell lived in an institution as a child, because he told me that several times.

Mr. Payne: I was not speaking of that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Personal references to other members are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the member for Mitchell invited me to say that.

Mr. Payne: You are wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule that the remark is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In my observation, a number of members who had never been to

such institutions before were obviously impressed, if not moved, by what they saw.

Mr. Payne: I wasn't moved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I turn now to the newspaper reports that caused my original request to go to these institutions. The first is contained in the *Sunday Mail* of September 2, under the heading, "Welfare in Chaos. Staff Go in Fear." The report states, in part:

Two people employed by the Government in the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs claim its treatment of juvenile offenders has broken down and is in chaos. They say that over the past two years that section of the department has "literally fallen apart" behind a cloak of Government secrecy that includes the suppression—The article mentions the Beerworth report. The same page of the *Sunday Mail* also contains a report on what happened some months ago regarding absconders. The report states, in part:

The Government managed to weather a storm of criticism over its handling of juvenile offenders in April without calling a major investigation.

It is a very disturbing report, and the Minister is aware of it. For example, one very senior Government official is known at McNally as Father Christmas because, apparently, he will give them anything they like. As I do not know the identity of that person, I can only guess at it.

The Hon. L. J. King: You don't even know that is true, do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I am sure it is the Minister's intention to make sure that I never know whether it is true. Unfortunately, that is his whole attitude on this matter. Another point was as follows:

At a meeting of the Public Service Association last week concern had been expressed for the safety of staff at the institution.

When one knows what happened on this occasion has happened before to Miss McMenemie one can share that concern. The following week the following article headed "Three in four bashed by girls" appeared:

Three-quarters of the staff of Vaughan House have been injured in attacks by teenage inmates in the last two years, a public servant claimed today. He said that the staff wanted a Royal Commission into the Government's handling of institutions for juvenile offenders over the last two years.

It is a long article, so I will not go through it all again. Apparently, the first article had some effect on the Minister, because on this page there is a photograph of the Minister being driven away in his motor car during a

series of visits to State institutions for juvenile offenders, when he is reported to have talked to the staff. Again the details of that report are disturbing. On September 16 there was another article under the heading "Crisis claim at Windana", part of which is as follows:

Windana Remand Centre staff claimed this week the State Government would fully carpet the institution for juveniles—but no finance was available to ease a critical staff shortage.

The staff disagreed with a statement by the Community Welfare Minister, Mr. King, that windows fronting public areas at Windana had been remodelled to prevent the passing of material to residents.

Only in this morning's paper one finds that some lads escaped on Sunday night because of a file or hacksaw that was passed to them through a vent. Therefore, whatever the Minister has done has not been successful. The final article to which I refer is that which appeared in the *Advertiser* on September 16 and which was written by Mr. Stewart Cockburn. I have already raised this matter here because, after the Minister's treatment of me, I discovered that Mr. Cockburn had been invited by one of the Government's press officers to visit McNally and to write an article about it.

Mr. Gunn: Do you think he was trying to gloss things over?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Undoubtedly. I have no doubt it was hoped that he would write an article that would be entirely sympathetic to that institution and the new methods that are being tried by the Minister. It stands in stark contrast to the Minister's attitude when members in this House want to visit institutions and are told that they must not discuss matters with the staff, for example. I have a great admiration for Mr. Cockburn, whom I regard as balanced, sensible and reliable in the information he puts in his articles. There are many points in that article which I believe should be canvassed and upon which the Minister should say something in reply. I think particularly of his points about the ease with which boys may get away ("abscond" is the word we use, but it means to get out of or leave) from McNally. The writer of the article reminded us of the Minister's admonition of Mr. Cameron Kingston Stuart, S.M., when he made some remarks from the bench at Port Adelaide about boys walking out of institutions at will. Although the Minister said it was not so, Mr. Cockburn came to the conclusion that boys could leave McNally at will and, indeed, were doing so. I particularly stress this point to the Minister.

In discussing this matter of absconding Mr. Cockburn says:

At the same time, the rest of the community would seem to have a right to be protected against his law-breaking—

that is, the absconder's law-breaking—

and welfare authorities must surely be expected to balance their sense of duty towards him against the right of other citizens not to be used as virtual guinea pigs in rehabilitation experiments.

That is absolutely true. I believe it goes to the core of our trouble. The department over which the Minister presides has gone too far in the direction of freedom and lack of discipline.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What is the difference in the security at McNally now from when you were Minister?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I noticed the Treasurer go down and speak to the Minister of Community Welfare, and then return to his own seat so that he could interject.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you answer the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The difference now is not perhaps (and I do not know precisely whether or not this is so) in the physical security but in the—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: None at all in the physical security.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then why have abscondings increased so much? That is the complete answer to the Treasurer's interjection and I will come to this matter shortly, relying upon Judge Marshall's report.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Any discussion along these lines must be on the physical aspects in accordance with the lines, not on the material aspects.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite so, Sir. The answer to the Treasurer's interjection is that the new methods that are apparently being used at this and other institutions are, of themselves, encouraging abscondings.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What new methods?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer apparently does not believe there are any new methods.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What encouragement is being given to abscondings?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the Treasurer will be willing to make his contribution to this debate other than by way of interjection.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are not giving me any cause to do so, other than to show how genuine your queries really are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Treasurer wants me to go into this matter I can refer to a few sentences of Mr. Cockburn's article, in which he deals with this, and to show the Premier (if he does not already know) that Mr. Cockburn was invited by his own officers to go to McNally to write an article.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is all right; we invite people to go to gaols, too. That does not mean to say that we must agree with what they write.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On this point, Mr. Cockburn says:

As matters stand, I think the chief criticism which could fairly be levelled at McNally is that too many boys are being given too many tempting free choices too soon with too little effective supervision. For tough boys, I believe there should be some high walls and no "escape-prone" outings.

That is the answer I give to the Treasurer.

Mr. Venning: You've upset the Treasurer again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has had enough and has gone away to the quite seclusion of his room again. I hope I will be given an invitation, as was Mr. Cockburn, to visit McNally and to speak to Mr. Graham, the Superintendent, and other members of the staff, in the same way as Mr. Cockburn was invited to. I certainly have not had an invitation yet, and I had to wring the last invitation out of the Minister with some difficulty.

The Hon. L. J. King: Yes, you had to ask once, I suppose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Four questions were asked before any arrangement was made.

The Hon. L. J. King: You know it was agreed to the first time you asked. Stick to the facts.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Cockburn continues:

In this atmosphere—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The article continues:

In this atmosphere, I believe, staff dare not attempt any "repressive" supervision and tough boys increasingly do what they like.

He goes on in the same vein and deals with the figures on absconding. I believe Mr. Cockburn's article calls for an answer, and there has been no effective answer yet, as far as I know.

The Hon. L. J. King: I do not get my answers printed, anyway.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently, the Minister complains that he cannot get his answers printed. Perhaps he can say something tonight.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remember that a few days later the mother of a boy at McNally got in touch with Mr. Cockburn and supported what he had said. Her story was on the front page of the *Advertiser*, and so was the Minister's photograph. I do not know what he is complaining about, because all the Minister could say on that occasion was that he regretted there was any publicity on the matter; he thought there should not be. Are not the people entitled to know what is going on in this field? Of course they are. This is a matter of public concern and, at the moment, of public disquiet, mainly because of the Minister's attitude. I know that one must in this as in other things strike a balance between, on the one hand, publicity which will be injurious to those who are in institutions and whom it is hoped to rehabilitate and, on the other hand, the public, who are entitled to know what is going on in the institutions and expect to be reassured. Above all, they are entitled to be protected against those who leave institutions and commit further offences—which is what is happening. Too many of these people are getting out and causing a lot of trouble and damage. An insurance man only a few days ago was complaining in the newspaper and making a suggestion along the same lines as the motion on the Notice Paper in the name of the member for Fisher.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought it was a very good motion; I propose to support it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham, the same as every other member of this Chamber, when he is called to order must abide by the Chairman's ruling. I rule out of order remarks about motions on the Notice Paper. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will now read Judge Marshall's comments on this matter from his report tabled a few days ago. This is what he says at page 13:

In the period under review there was a large increase in the number of absconders from institutions under the control of the Department of Social Welfare. Many of these absconders committed further offences whilst they were at large and, as most of them were eventually brought before the Adelaide Juvenile Court, the effect was to bring about an increase in the number of offenders, the number of offences committed and the number of children

who came before the court on a second or subsequent occasion, called in this report "recidivists". As will be seen in Table No. 1, the number of children charged with absconding increased from 134 in 1970-71 to 281 in 1971-72.

I wish the Treasurer had stayed a little longer. The report continues:

However, the figure of 281 absconders in 1971-72 is not completely reliable for the reason that some of the absconders were charged by the police with other offences and not specifically charged with absconding.

The implication from that is that the figure is higher, in fact. The report continues:

Many of the absconders were charged with multiple offences, particularly the offences known as "break, enter and larceny", "larceny" and "illegal use of a motor vehicle", and this is a substantial factor to be considered when having regard to the increase in the number of charges in respect of these offences during the year under review.

One of the worst things about absconding is that, in the nature of an absconding, a lad will commit another offence within a few hours of leaving McNally or wherever he is being detained. He must get clothes, money, transport, and food. That must happen. This is bad for the boy and bad for the community. It is a damned nuisance to the police and to everyone. That is why absconding should be discouraged and, we hope, reduced and wiped out. It seems to me that at present the Minister and his departmental officers believe that any sort of discipline is undesirable and will have an unfavourable effect upon those concerned.

The Hon. L. J. King: Are you attributing that to me?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I said, "It seems to me". Whether or not the Minister said it I do not know. It seems to me that this is the case and I hope (and I trust the Minister will agree with me) that discipline does not do anyone any harm, whether he is an offender or whether he is one who has not offended. Indeed, discipline has done most of us much good, and I believe there is not sufficient discipline at these institutions at present. That is where we are falling down. I could say much more on this but I do not propose to, members will be glad to hear. I do not suggest for a moment that there is a need for any public inquiry or Royal Commission on this matter but, if the Minister continues his present practice of not telling the people what is going on and not frankly admitting the faults of his department, that will be our only recourse. I hope it will not come to that. I have raised these matters because

I feel strongly about them and because I hope it will now give the Minister an opportunity to reply to the points I have made and so reassure members of this place and the public about the institutions in the department under his control, which are his responsibility.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): I think I may omit references to several matters that have been reshaped continually by the member for Mitcham and previously discussed, and I particularly omit any further reference to his mis-statement and misrepresentation of the series of events leading to his visits to the institutions of Vaughan House and Windana, because I have previously dealt with them. When looking at some of the concrete matters to which he referred, we note that he said that at the institutions there were now no incentives and, as I understood him, he had been told that by someone—I do not know by whom. I believe that the training and rehabilitation of juveniles is a matter for professional people who are trained in that branch of knowledge and skill. I do not claim that I have any professional qualifications in that regard, and I am sure that the member for Mitcham has none. Both of us, if we are wise, must listen to advice given by professional people. It happens of course that from time to time we have to make decisions on the extent to which we will adopt professional advice, but I believe we are approaching the question from the wrong standpoint if it is suggested that the Minister or the Government should tell those people running the institutions how they should run them. I believe that the superintendents and the staff, and beyond them the Director of Treatment Services and the Director-General of the department, are all aware as well as the member for Mitcham and I am aware that the provision of incentives is an integral part of the training of young people. Why the honourable member should accept something apparently casually said to him by a person who was dissatisfied with some areas of his work to the extent of saying that there are no incentives in his work, I do not know. Obviously, training in institutions is based to some extent on both incentives and the deprivation of privileges as a result of poor behaviour. The honourable member referred also to the rule which permits smoking at Vaughan House by children over the age of 16. The Superintendent of Vaughan House has taken that view and I see it to be extremely difficult, even if it were desirable, to enforce a prohibition against smoking by

girls who are accustomed to smoking before they went to the institution.

Mr. Mathwin: It might cure them. It might stop them dying a bit earlier.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I suppose that we could cut people off from the source of smoking, from cigarettes and tobacco, but what is achieved by so doing?

Mr. Mathwin: Five years extra life.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Does the honourable member think that over the six, eight or nine months that a girl is in Vaughan House the prohibition of smoking will save her life? Does he really think that a girl who is deprived of cigarettes against her will and who has no desire herself to give up smoking does not wait only for the time when she gets out to start smoking again? Does the honourable member think that anything will be achieved regarding that girl through arbitrarily cutting off the supply of cigarettes? All that is being done is the introduction of a further source of disturbance to the girl. There are only 25 girls at Vaughan House and they are obviously the 25 most disturbed girls, regarding their behaviour, in the State. They are already disturbed, some socially disturbed, others emotionally and some psychiatrically disturbed.

The object of training is to endeavour to re-establish their lives, to get the girls into a position where they can go back into the community and live useful and responsible lives. Is a contribution made to that endeavour by adding a further source of disturbance, namely, the arbitrary and sudden discontinuance of a habit acquired by those concerned prior to their entering Vaughan House and which is a habit they have no desire themselves to stop? Surely that is absurd. I would be the first to subscribe to any efforts made to encourage the girls in this institution to give up smoking. I would be the first to agree that any facilities required should be made available to people willing to go there and talk to the girls about the consequences of smoking and trying to inculcate a frame of mind in the girls through which they would voluntarily give up smoking. However, I do not believe for one moment that any person's bad habits are cured by forcibly depriving them of their means of gratifying their smoking habit. Indeed, smoking simply becomes an obsession and the girls wait only for the time when they get out and can resume that habit.

What is most dangerous, and I can agree only with the authorities who have allowed the girls to smoke, is that at a time when an attempt is made to train the girls (to

rehabilitate them into a better frame of mind), a new disturbing factor is introduced into their lives which makes the training so much more difficult. Certainly, at the age of 16 years and above, it is impossible to enforce a no-smoking ban. It is impossible in a domestic situation, and it is impossible in an institution. I cannot disagree with that course of action and, although I am not saying that, if the Superintendent took the view taken by the member for Glenelg or the member for Mitcham, I would do anything about it, because it is a matter for the judgement of the Superintendent. However, I am personally in agreement with the decision that has been made. It is a wise and sensible decision, and the only way in which those girls will be persuaded will be by education and example, not by force.

The member for Mitcham attached considerable weight to articles which have appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. All of those articles were based or were purported to be based on information which had been given to the *Mail* reporter by one or two or more people who claimed to be staff members of the institutions. There is no way of verifying that information, and I can say only that what was printed in the *Mail* is completely exaggerated. I find it, difficult to believe that any person associated with the institution could have used the expressions that were there used. However, if they did, I can only say that they were acting quite irresponsibly because, to talk about the juvenile treatment services, and I think the words used were "having broken down"—

Mr. Millhouse: Falling apart.

The Hon. L. J. KING:—"falling apart" is just so much nonsense. There is simply nothing to support that and the situation is quite the reverse. South Australia is making real advances in this area. True, there are many difficulties relating to the treatment of juvenile delinquents. There are problems that will have to be wrestled with indefinitely, because I do not believe we will ever reach a perfect solution in this area, but real advances are being made and they are being made in several ways. In the institutions themselves I believe that the most important advance is that more and more of the superintendents and the staff are attaching importance to assessing the individual needs of the inmates. More and more of the staff are realizing that they cannot deal with children in institutions as a body and that externally imposed disciplines, which treat all alike, are valueless as a means of training and rehabilitation; that it is neces-

sary to look at each individual case, the individuals's background and the individual needs of the children. I read in this morning's press a letter by Dr. J. H. Court on this topic. He made some points, and I believe he drew wrong conclusions from the points, but I think his points were valid.

Mr. Millhouse: He is one of those professional people.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, he is. He made two points. First, some children come from backgrounds that lack discipline and in those cases what is often needed is a period of discipline to stabilize their lives until internal controls can be developed and take over in the management of their lives, and with that I entirely agree.

He also said that some children come from backgrounds with misdirected discipline and with a degree of brutality; in those cases what it needed is a relaxation of discipline to enable the children's personalities to develop, and with that I entirely agree. For some reason he drew the conclusion that there was something wrong with the present treatment services. Of course, those services are based on that very approach—that it is our task to ascertain the individual needs of the children and to try to devise training programmes suited to their needs; hence the treatment given at the McNally Training Centre and the new programmes and policies. I only regret that the member for Mitcham should have appeared to give credence to the statements made in the *Sunday Mail* that do no more than repeat what purports to be a statement handed to that newspaper; it is not only unsubstantiated but also unrealistic.

What I said, on the information supplied to me, was that the windows at Windana had been secured to minimize the opportunities for absconding. Let me remind the member for Mitcham that these institutions were not constructed during my term of office and, indeed, many of them are quite inadequate from the security viewpoint. A good example is the dormitory at Windana from which the boys escaped on Sunday night. It was impossible to close the upper sections of the windows because, if they were closed, no air could get into the building. So, for ventilation purposes, it was necessary for the windows to remain open. In this case, someone passed a hacksaw through the window, and I have since learnt that a bolt cutter was also passed through the window. The escapees used those instruments to remove the four iron bars and they then

escaped. I agree that we ought to have institutions that are more secure so that it is more difficult to get those instruments into the institution. Plans are in hand to erect a screen wall outside the windows that will make that kind of escape impossible in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! During the remarks of the honourable member for Mitcham I ruled out of order any reference to the material aspect. Remarks on this item must be linked with the staffing of the institutions rather than the building of the institutions. The honourable Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: If I can prompt the Minister—

The CHAIRMAN: Any prompting will be out of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I wish to refer to the suggestion made in Stewart Cockburn's article that somehow I was wrong in suggesting that inmates could not walk out of the McNally Training Centre. If the member for Mitcham examines the article he will find that, in the examples given of the ways in which boys abscond, there was no case in which the boys walked out. They either broke out, ran away, or escaped in some way from lawful supervision, but in no case was there any question of walking out. Indeed, the member for Mitcham stressed the use of keys and locks at Vaughan House. It was said that high walls were needed. In his article Stewart Cockburn did not mention the maximum security section at McNally Training Centre, which houses 20 boys and is complete with high walls, barbed wire and the other accoutrements of a maximum security institution.

Mr. Millhouse: You will deal with the great increase in the number of absconders, won't you?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes. I wish to deal with two more matters. The first is the question of absconding. I do not understand the point of view that absconding is unimportant, and I was extremely surprised to hear the member for Mitcham, I think, attribute to me (although I was having a little difficulty in following whether the blame was attributed to me) the suggestion that absconding was unimportant. To my mind, absconding is completely inconsistent with the successful training and rehabilitation of juveniles, and it is also inconsistent with the public's life, limb and property. It is a primary duty of those in charge of juvenile institutions to eliminate absconding.

The first duty of anyone in any institution is to keep the inmates there; I have stressed that throughout the time I have been Minister

of Community Welfare. I believe that the superintendents and staff of our institutions have an extremely difficult task in this regard, and they had an extremely difficult task while the member for Mitcham was the Minister in charge of this matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was more difficult then, because they had him as Minister.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know what the member for Mitcham contributed in one way or another while he was the Minister, but I know that we have open institutions and we also have security sections. We have institutions without walls and barbed wire.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by "without walls"?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member knows well what I mean—without external walls. That means that the superintendents and staff are faced with a considerable difficulty, but the difficulty is really one of being able to identify the types of child likely to abscond. Obviously, some children have to be allowed out into the yard. It is no use having sweeping lawns if we are frightened to let the children out on to them; someone has to be let outside. Further, some children have to be let out on trial leave and on outings. The art is to identify the children who can safely be given these rights and to identify those who have to be kept in more secure situations. This is a very great responsibility for the superintendents and staff, and they have my entire sympathy and support in their efforts to exercise that responsibility.

I agree that in the last year the number of abscondings has increased. I do not know of any change in policy or method that has made any contribution to that at all, and certainly there has been no discouragement of any measures that are considered proper to be taken in connection with absconding. On the contrary, it is the first responsibility of the superintendents and staff to ensure that people do not escape. We must renew, even redouble, our efforts in the department to reduce absconding to an irreducible minimum. There will always be absconding from this type of institution. This is the price society has to pay for retraining and rehabilitating juveniles, but absconding must be kept to an absolute minimum.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you explain why there has been an increase in absconding?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know, and I do not think it is possible to say exactly. I think that absconding has probably increased over a period, certainly over the last four

years. Possibly the superintendents and staff have made some greater use of the grounds of the institutions for the youngsters. To some extent (this is difficult to know) the increase may be the result of endeavouring to concentrate on the individual needs of children. I think it is probably easier to prevent absconding when everyone is kept in formation, marching up and down, and when these people are treated as groups. When an attempt is made to make the groups smaller and to treat people as individuals, probably the danger of absconding increases. However, it all gets back to the assessment of individuals and to the use of the capacity to judge which individuals can and which cannot be allowed latitude. Finally, I think it gets back to endeavouring to encourage and support the superintendents and staff to take all necessary and reasonable measures to reduce the absconding rate. The member for Mitcham has attributed to me a curious view that discipline has an undesirable effect on children. I do not know when he ever heard me express such a view.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't say I had.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member used the expression, "The Minister seems to think". Either I say something or I do not say it. What there has ever been in anything I have said or done, in relation to either my portfolio or any other action of mine, from which anyone can infer that I think that discipline has an undesirable effect, I do not know. I believe that such a view would be absolute nonsense. I will say that I believe that uniform discipline, applied to inmates of an institution simply as a group and irrespective of their individual needs, has an undesirable effect. However, I believe that discipline, applied to inmates and having regard to a proper assessment of their needs, is an absolutely essential part of their training. I do not think anyone can be trained unless guidelines and rules are set and adherence to them insisted on. This is one of the first lessons that has to be learned about living in society. There is no justification for the suggestion that there is some policy against discipline. There is no such policy: it is no part of any method, new or old, used in juvenile institutions.

As I have said, much has been written (and I believe much nonsense has been written) about what takes place in the juvenile institutions. True, efforts have been made by officers of the department, acting on the best professional advice, to encourage the superinten-

dents and staff to apply more individualized treatment methods to the children. It may be that some members of the staff of juvenile institutions find it difficult to grasp and apply the new methods. Some may find change difficult or distasteful. I think that this applies to only a few, but I do not doubt that it applies to some. Few changes do not produce irritation or reaction in some quarters, or some inability to cope. Possibly there are people such as that who, not being able to cope, have found that they can no longer maintain proper discipline and control. Where that turns out to be the case, obviously training of staff is the answer.

The method that we seek to adopt is to train additional residential care workers, if we can get the newly trained staff into the institutions to bring out the existing staff for further training in an understanding of modern methods and their application. Fortunately, the staff in our institutions is excellent, for the most part being skilled and experienced. However, obviously where new methods are abroad it is necessary that they keep abreast of them, understanding them and their application. If anyone in any institution (as the *Sunday Mail* suggests) has an impression that there is some policy against discipline, I can only say that he has completely misunderstood the policies that we seek to implement.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although the Minister said that new methods were being used, he did not say much about them. He hinted that there was less group activity in the institutions, with emphasis being placed on treating those in institutions as individuals. I believe that in this type of institution emphasis must be placed on rehabilitation. My experience of young people has shown that it is always those who come from disadvantaged circumstances, especially broken homes, who get into trouble, simply because they do not have the security that comes with normal family life. I have always believed that understanding their problems gives a far better insight into how to deal with them. As a teacher, I always had a distaste for corporal punishment. My own boyhood experiences contributed to this feeling. I think that this type of punishment should certainly be the last resort in attempting to rehabilitate people.

I have no first-hand experience of institutions. I am sorry that, being unaware of the visit made by members to the institutions, I did not join them, and I hope that I can make a visit in future. The Minister has said that there are no walls at these institutions. I do not

know whether he meant that statement to be taken literally. I wonder whether in some cases these things are not taken too far. I can recall when the Glenside Hospital was known as the Parkside Mental Hospital and was surrounded by 6ft.-high walls.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! On several occasions I have informed members that we are dealing with the physical side of the institutions concerned, rather than with the material side.

Mr. Millhouse: Is there a difference?

The CHAIRMAN: The difference is that we are dealing with wages and costs of administration of the various institutions and that matters concerning the material side would be better discussed in the debate on the Loan Estimates. As I have already called honourable members to order about this, I ask the honourable member for Kavel to link up his remarks to the staff and staff duties at these institutions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I intend to link up my remarks by referring to the difficulty being experienced in dealing with absconders. I am drawing an analogy and saying that, whilst the wall around Glenside at one time was about 6ft. high, later it was cut down to about 18in. The effect was supposed to be psychological, in that the place looked less like a prison and what had been done created an air of freedom.

I refer now to the amount voted for provisions, clothing, travelling expenses, medical, dental, optical, funeral and education expenses, and sundries. I understand that formerly this provision was known as relief payment to such people as deserted wives. There has been a substantial increase in this provision. Reference has been made to the spiralling number of deserted wives who are left with the responsibility of raising a family. This ties in with broken homes and the ever-increasing delinquency problem. I completely agree with the increase in this provision.

Can the Minister give any details of the sort of assistance that the department envisages for these people? A period of some months elapses after a husband leaves his wife before a pension is paid to her. It seems that, because of shortage of funds, these women must be almost destitute before any money is available from the department. The increase in the number of deserted wives is a sorry reflection on our community. We hear talk of a conservative view, permissive changes, and freedom. Government members talk of censorship,

and people are free to exploit other citizens by hawking pornography freely.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has made comments relating to the staffing of institutions. It is usual that honourable members take their seat when the Chairman calls anyone to order.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you want me to sit down?

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member wants to disagree with anything I say, let him say so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I am merely asking for a clear direction.

The CHAIRMAN: The subject matter must be relevant to the line we are considering. There is nothing in this line about pornography or some other matters he has mentioned.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am linking my remarks up and seeking an explanation. The Minister may be able to give me some explanation for the pressures on young people which are not conducive to stable marriages, resulting in a large increase in the number of deserted wives, for whom the Government is called on to make a bigger financial provision.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I really think that an examination of the question of why marriages break up is a little beyond what I could attempt in this debate this evening. However, for the honourable member's benefit, I mention that I delivered a paper to the Australian Council of Social Service in Sydney about three months ago, and I should be pleased to give him a copy of that. The paper was not concerned exclusively with this question, but it dealt with it to some extent.

This evening I shall confine myself to saying that it is true that there has been a very sudden increase in the number of deserted wives from all States in Australia seeking the Commonwealth deserted wives' pension, and so far as I know no-one has explained that increase satisfactorily, any more than anyone has explained satisfactorily the large number of absconders from institutions in recent years. The reasons are very difficult to identify.

The member for Kavel has mentioned the waiting period that deserted wives have before they can establish their entitlement to a Commonwealth pension. They must wait six months before they are accepted for the deserted wives' pension. During that time they are the responsibility of the State, which must give them financial assistance equal to the Commonwealth pension they will ultimately get. What is remarkable is that, when they are accepted for the Commonwealth pension after the lapse

of six months, they are accepted not from the beginning but only from that period, so that the State is not reimbursed the full amount it pays but only one-half. I can understand the delay in accepting a deserted wife for a Commonwealth pension, because it is necessary to establish that it is not merely a temporary interruption in cohabitation but that there is a genuine desertion. However, what I cannot understand is that, once that is established, it is not accepted that she was a deserted wife from the beginning: obviously that is what is established. Despite the efforts of all States to persuade the Commonwealth to accept this position, it has refused to do so. The State is therefore saddled with the responsibility for one-half for the six-month period.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Whether it comes from the Commonwealth or from the State, it is the taxpayer's money. You're only quibbling.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member displays a cavalier attitude to Commonwealth-State relations, but if he had the responsibility he might think differently. The honourable member also said that people in need of financial assistance had to be almost destitute before they qualified for State assistance. He pointed out that this was due to difficulties regarding State funds. I point out to him that one reason for the increased amount on the line this year is that we are trying to tackle this problem. Hitherto, if a deserted wife, an unmarried mother or anyone else sought financial assistance, any assets they had had to be used before they were eligible for financial assistance. In the Budget, we are providing that they may have up to \$500 in assets: we do not require them to spend that last \$500 before qualifying for financial assistance. Hitherto, they have not been able to earn anything, as any income was offset against the assistance they otherwise would have received.

Under the proposals in this Budget, they will be allowed to have a small income without the financial assistance being affected. A woman with one child can earn \$10 a week now without affecting her title to financial assistance; a woman with two children can earn \$10 a week; a woman with three children can earn \$12 a week; a woman with four children can earn \$16 a week; and an extra \$4 a week is added for the fifth child and subsequent children. They are small amounts, but it is a significant improvement on the situation that has hitherto existed, namely, that any income was deducted \$1 for \$1 from the amount of financial assistance.

Mr. GUNN: I refer to the provision for Indulkana Reserve, which has been increased from \$33,460 last year to \$62,590 this year. Can the Minister say how these funds will be spent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This line relates to the salaries for the store and for the other facilities on the various reserves, and the sum for Indulkana also relates to those items. I am sorry that I cannot give the honourable member more specific information than that, but I will obtain it for him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister referred to new methods in the training of young people, but he did not give any details. He also referred to the retraining of staff. Can the Minister say what is involved? The Minister said that there was less group activity. On a television programme, I saw that an institution in New South Wales engaged in considerable marching in the military style, and it appeared to be reasonably successful. Can the Minister say what is involved in the new methods of handling the inmates?

The Hon. L. J. KING: When a child comes before the court he is remanded or, in some cases, the matter is adjourned to enable him to be assessed by a group of people consisting of a psychologist, a social worker, a residential care worker and, sometimes, a medical practitioner. It is their task to assess the individual, his background, and what form of treatment would be beneficial to him. If he goes to an institution, he is interviewed by a Treatment Review Board, of which the Superintendent is a member, and there are two other members. The board examines the youth's background, tries to ascertain his problems and needs, and sets a programme that will best aid his rehabilitation. This is done in consultation with the youth himself, who is involved in the problem of identifying his own needs and problems. He is involved in the task of setting a time table for the programme to which he must work and for his ultimate release from the institution. From that time, efforts are made to encourage the staff to view each inmate in the institution as an individual, to try to get to know him as an individual, and to try to understand his individual needs. This is pursued in a number of ways, and discussion is encouraged.

The honourable member said he understood that group activity was discouraged; it is discouraged only in that less emphasis is placed on marching up and down, to which he referred, but group therapy in the sense of encouraging discussion among the inmates

about their problems is very much encouraged. Indeed, it is one of the hopeful methods of trying to get juvenile delinquents to talk about their problems in their own group, because often it is found that children will talk about their problems amongst their peers. Often, their problems can be got out of them by children of their own age in a way that adults cannot ascertain them. There is nothing revolutionary in this approach: the children are still working in the workshops, learning various skills such as panelbeating, and so on. They have their sporting activities and recreation and, if they offend against discipline, they are deprived of their privileges—such as the right to watch television. Also, they could be deprived of their 40c or 50c a week pocket money. If they are insolent or cannot be handled, they can be transferred to the security section or a section in which there is more rigorous discipline.

The new methods really amount to a concentration on discussion with the youngsters in an effort to identify their problems and to find the best way of overcoming the problem that has led to their being in an institution, as well as to develop individual treatment of the inmates, rather than simply treating them as a herd and giving them all the same kind of programmes and treatment. Part and parcel of this is involving the young person in his programme and treatment, and these young people must return to the Treatment Review Board at least every three months for a review of their progress and for further discussion on a release date, according to the sense of responsibility they have developed.

Line passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$849,818.

Mrs. STEELE: I was pleased to see that the Government has increased by \$1,000 the grant to the South Australian Council of Social Service, a body that I have known extremely well, perhaps more in the past than I do at present. My association with it goes back a long time, and I was for many years Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Physically Handicapped, which was sponsored by the council. As a result of that committee's work, the Phoenix Society, which now enjoys a high reputation in the community, was formed. I received today the 25th annual report of the South Australian Council of Social Service, to one or two aspects of which I should like to refer. The report relates particularly to the council's finances, and on page 3 Mrs. Barbara Garrett, the Chairman, said:

The amount of work which S.A.C.O.S.S. is asked to undertake far exceeds the ability of the limited man hours of the executive officer and her recently appointed clerical help. We would like to be in the financial position to provide full-time executive staff. As yet this is not possible, but we must aim to achieve this. Mrs. Hutchison works far more than her paid hours and donates the excess time.

This is typical of many voluntary agencies in South Australia. Later, the report refers to specific areas in the council and, again referring to its financial position, states:

It was estimated that our annual operating costs would be in the vicinity of \$10,000 per annum to cope with the present demand for the services we offer. The committee accepts that the Executive Officer should be paid according to State professional award rates and additional hours worked by her should be considered as a donation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mrs. STEELE: I should like the Minister to realize that this year Mrs. Hutchison, who is the Executive Officer, donated 803 hours in extra service (for which she was not paid) to the Council of Social Service. I say that in view of the submission presented in June, 1972, to the Minister of Community Welfare for additional funds over and above the annual grant of \$1,500. The Government has seen fit to increase this grant to the Council of Social Service by \$1,000, so as a result it will now receive \$2,500. Although I am sure it will regard this as a generous contribution to the fund, it is obvious that in the years ahead the Government of the day will have to come to the rescue to a greater extent than at present it has seen fit to do.

The other reference is to the directory brought out by the Council of Social Service, which provides a wonderful reference for the people in the community who do not quite know where to go for one thing or another in the community welfare field. This report states that there has been a continuous demand for the 1970 edition. A further 1,000 copies have been printed. There is a committee that is preparing a second edition, which will be available for distribution early in 1973. Probably one of the most valuable things that the council has done in the past is in respect of this publication. Also, the Director of the Citizens Advice Bureau gives tremendous service in one way or another. The purpose of my rising to my feet was not to draw these matters to the attention of the Minister (because I know he would be aware of them) but to lay before the House itself the great services rendered by the Council of Social

Service and to express, as one who has been associated with it in the past and who knows the great work it does, the appreciation I know it would like to be expressed in the House.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Briefly, I endorse what the member for Burnside has said about the council. I add simply that it has shown great open-mindedness and co-operation in the implementation of the community welfare policies that the department has been seeking to implement in the past year. I point out that the grant was increased from \$1,000 to \$1,500 in 1970, and it was then indicated that that sum would be maintained for the next two years. None the less, in spite of that and in recognition of the excellent work done by the council, there has been an increase this year from \$1,500 to \$2,500, notwithstanding that we are still in the current period, so to speak, for which the \$1,500 was promised. There is no doubt that the council has considerable commitments and is doing excellent work.

Mr. ALLEN: I seek information on the line "United Aborigines' Mission—Nepabunna Mission", for which last year \$300 was voted and \$298 was spent. This year, \$7,200 is to be allocated. Can the Minister tell me what this allocation is for?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The \$7,200 is made up as follows: \$5,000 is to finance work on the drainage system at Nepabunna, and the remaining \$2,200 is for the purchase of a Holden station sedan.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the nature of the project to be undertaken with the \$2,000 allocated for juvenile delinquency research?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The \$2,000 will be a grant to Mr. A. W. Jamrozik of Flinders University, to assist with the cost of a research project into juvenile delinquency in South Australia. That gentleman is undertaking a survey and research to collate whatever information can be obtained on juvenile delinquency to identify its causes and determine what will reduce its incidence. He will consider all aspects including background, family circumstances, education, employment and everything else that may help determine the causes of this problem and its subsequent remedy.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the grant to the Aboriginal Lands Trust of \$279,150 or the grants to Aboriginal Reserve Councils at Gerard and Point Pearce to be recouped in the future by the Government?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. Those are outright grants and are needed to get the projects off the ground. Future financial assistance may be through advances when the projects are under way but, at this stage, these moneys would have been expended by the Government anyway, at least regarding Point Pearce. The Aboriginal Lands Trust is taking over responsibilities hitherto undertaken by the Government. These funds are allocated in order to get the project off the ground.

Line passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 27, at 2 p.m.