HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 6, 1977

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

SENATE VACANCY

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated that the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, in accordance with section 21 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, had informed him that, in consequence of the resignation on November 16, 1977, of Senator Raymond Steele Hall, a vacancy had happened in the representation of South Australia in the Senate of the Commonwealth. The Governor had been advised that, by such vacancy having happened, the place of the Senator had become vacant before the expiration of his term within the meaning of section 15 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, and that such place must be filled by the Houses of Parliament, sitting and voting together, choosing a person to hold it in accordance with that provision of the said section.

Later:

The SPEAKER: I have received from the President of the Legislative Council an intimation that he proposes to summon a joint meeting of the two Houses on Wednesday, December 14, 1977, at 11 a.m. in the Legislative Council Chamber for the purpose of choosing a person to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Raymond Steele Hall.

PETITION: WHALES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 128 teachers, schoolchildren and residents of South Australia, praying that the House would support the opposition to the killing of whales.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CLOTHING BILL

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 315 employees of the clothing industry in South Australia, praying that the House would reject the State Clothing Corporation Bill, 1977.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by nine employees of the clothing industry in South Australia.

Petitions received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Elizabeth-Gawler Trunk Sewers Scheme (Stage 2),
O'Halloran Hill Water Supply Pumping Station and Connecting Mains.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS

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

RAIL ACCIDENT

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What was the final cost of damage to a diesel rail car in a fire on September 8, 1977?
2. Has the cause been determined and, if so, what are the details?
3. Has any person been apprehended in relation to the damage and, if so, what are the details?
4. What action, if any, has been taken against any person or persons involved in the incident, and has any compensation been paid or is any expected to be recovered?
5. What action have the appropriate authorities taken to prevent a repetition?

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

1. Approximately $200 000.
2. Evidence suggests that the fire was caused when a boy, after alighting from a train at Broadmeadows, threw a lighted portion of newspaper into the rail car.
3. A youth 16 years of age was apprehended by the police.
4. The youth was arrested and charged with malicious damage. He appeared in the Para District Juvenile Court and was placed under the care and control of the Minister for Community Welfare until 18 years of age. No compensation has been paid nor is it expected that any will be recovered.
5. It is difficult to prevent this type of vandalism, but at all times when damage is prevalent, patrols are placed on rail cars and everything possible is done to reduce the problem.

RAPE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many cases of rape have been reported in South Australia during the first 10 months of 1977, and what was the comparable figure for the same period during the two preceding years?
2. If there has been an increase in the incidence of rape this year, to what causes does the Minister attribute this increase?

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

1. The honourable member has asked a question relating to cases of rape reported in South Australia during the first 10 months of 1977 as compared with the two preceding years. This involves a highly artificial break up of the year and results in distortion of the statistics. Obviously it is more satisfactory to look at crime statistics over the period of a full year where this is possible. The following figures provide a breakdown of reported offences not only of rape, and attempted rape, but also of the related sexual crimes of indecent assault and carnal knowledge.

	Rape and Attempt	Indecent Assault (Female)	Carnal Knowledge	Combined Rape and Indecent Assault
1968-69	36	160	356	196
1969-70	24	198	395	222
1970-71	31	160	397	191
1971-72	60	167	508	227
1972-73	52	154	375	206
1973-74	100	151	251	251
1974-75	91	125	132	216
1975-76	131	128	134	259
1976-77	148	176	104	324

Source: Police statistics.

2. The Attorney-General will make a general Ministerial statement analysing these statistics later in the session.

SINGAPORE CONFERENCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What extremely important conference, in Singapore, did the Premier attend recently?
2. By whom was he invited to attend?
3. What was the purpose of his attendance?
4. Who else attended the conference?
5. What results for South Australia, if any, have come or are likely to come from it?

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

1. The Association of Asian Management Organisations.
2. The President of that association, Mr. Richard Eu.
3. To address the final session of the conference.
4. Several hundred delegates from the Asian region attended the Conference, with approximately 80 delegates from Australia, including such distinguished gentlemen as Sir John Moore and Mr. R. Gordon Jackson.
5. Apart from the fact that it gave me the opportunity of meeting top managers from countries throughout the Asian region and enabled me to impart details of the progressive participatory management styles being initiated by my Government, it also gave me the opportunity of formally inviting the association to hold its next conference in Adelaide in 1980. That invitation has been accepted and it will be a conference of great benefit to South Australia and to management thinking in Australia. It will involve the attendance of many hundreds of delegates from almost every country in the Asian region. This conference will have my Government's full support.

URANIUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government issued any licences and, if so, how many, to whom, when and with what conditions attached, to explore for uranium?
2. Has the Government issued any licences and, if so, how many, to whom, when and with what conditions attached, to mine uranium?

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

1. Since August, 1972, the Mines Department has issued 369 exploration licences to applicants to explore for all minerals except precious stones and extractive minerals. Such licences, in the event of a discovery, carry the right to peg claims and apply for mining leases. Exploration licences are not granted under the Mining Act exclusively for a particular mineral.

Conditions which apply to exploration licences, apart from the standard conditions pertaining to each licence, usually also include special conditions under schedule C of the licence which cover particular factors such as requirements for the protection of environmental or cultural features or for the prevention of contamination of underground waters. No conditions have, however, been included in an exploration licence bearing specifically on the conduct of exploration for any particular mineral.

Of the 369 exploration licences issued to date a small number could be said to be held, or have been held, by companies whose main commodity interest is uranium.

2. Two claims were pegged by Mrs. M. E. A. J. Talbot in 1959. These claims carried the right to mine for all minerals at Spring Hill on Glenorchy Station. It is understood that the area has small quantities of uranium which are certainly non-viable economically. Mrs. Talbot's claims were converted to mining leases with the approval of the then Minister under the new Mining Act on September 27, 1973. The leases expire on September 26, 1980. No special conditions are attached to these leases.

The only production from these leases to date has been a very small amount of gold. Mrs. Talbot is being advised by the Mines Department on the Government's policy preventing the mining and export of uranium.

APIARY INSPECTORS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Does the Agriculture Department propose to increase the number of apiary inspectors and, if so—

(a) by how many;
(b) when will the appointments be made; and
(c) where will the new inspectors be located?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:

(a) One. An officer seconded to Waite Agricultural Research Institute will also be transferred back to apiaries inspection duties.

(b) The new appointee commenced duties on November 28, 1977.

(c) Naracoorte.

EUROPEAN FOUL BROOD

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many reported cases of European foul brood have been discovered in South Australia during the past 12 months, at what locations, and what were the numbers of hives affected?
2. What method of control and eradication is currently being used?
3. Are hives from affected areas being transferred to the Adelaide Hills and, if so—

(a) how many have been authorised;
(b) to what specific locations?

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

1. Thirty to the 12 months ending November 22, 1977. Generally the outbreaks have been detected in that area of the State bounded by Keith in the north and Millicent in the south. The total hives owned by the 30 apiarists is 12 922, and the infection varied from 10-50 per cent of the hives in each apiary.

2. Treatment of the brood with antibiotics together with regular cleaning and disinfection of water tanks. Further treatments will be repeated early next spring and colonies which fail to respond will be burned. There is a possibility of total eradication, however.

3. Yes, but only if found "clean" after inspection by an apiary inspector.

(a) 2 380.

(b) Inspections only commenced on 14/11/77, removal is not expected to be completed before the end of the month, and apiarists have seven days from the date of removal to notify new locations. In these circumstances precise details cannot be given at present.

APIARISTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Will the Government now establish a compensation fund for apiarists and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is prepared to consider any proposal put forward by organisations representing apiarists.

RETURNING OFFICERS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Who were the returning officers for each electorate in the 1977 State election, and what is the address of each?

2. What fee was paid to each returning officer and, if there was a variation, what was the reason for such variation?

3. How many applications for postal votes were received in each electorate, and to whom was the application specifically directed for processing and dispatch?

4. If the person responsible for handling postal vote applications was not the returning officer at the returning officer's address, what was the address of the person or persons responsible for this service?

5. What was the remuneration for postal vote application duties in respect of each electorate?

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

1. Returning officers for each electorate in the 1977 State elections were as follows:

District	Name	Address
Adelaide	J. E. Martin	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Albert Park	J. M. Porter	Box 118, P.O., Henley Beach 5022
Alexandra	V. J. Coleman	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Ascot Park	E. Gudelis	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Baudin	N. K. McKinnon	Court House, Christies Beach 5165
Bragg	R. M. Dunning	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Brighton	H. Gadsby	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Chaffey	W. A. J. Jackson	Berri 5343
Coles	A. K. Becker	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Davenport	N. W. Austin	1 Gouger St., Adelaide 5001 (Department for Community Welfare)
Elizabeth	P. D. Williams	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Eyre	E. Gudelis	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Fisher	T. M. Hehir	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Flinders	M. R. Cowley	Washington St., Port Lincoln 5606
Florey	I. C. DeLongville	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Gilles	C. T. Storer	Probate Office, I.A.C. House, 345 King William St., Adelaide 5000
Glenelg	R. G. Lewis	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Goyder	T. J. Grieger	P.O. Box 36, Snowtown 5520
Hanson	H. R. Tamblyn	Adelaide Magistrates Court, Adelaide 5000
Hartley	A. K. Becker	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Henley Beach	H. R. Tamblyn	Adelaide Magistrates Court, Adelaide 5000
Kavel	R.J. Feist	Angaston 5353
Light	L. M. Hatcher	Craigmore Road, Smithfield 5114
Mallee	P. J. Howard	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Mawson	T. M. Hehir	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Mitcham	R. L. Wright	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Mitchell	B. T. Gill	Supreme Court, Adelaide 5000
Morphett	R. L. Guscott	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Mount Gambier	B. W. Johns	P.O. Box 23, Mount Gambier 5290
Murray	K. J. Coventry	P.O. Box 570, Murray Bridge 5253
Napier	L. M. Hatcher	Craigmore Road, Smithfield 5114
Newland	R. H. Wyman	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Norwood	H. G. Collins	Box 798, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001
Peake	K. R. Giddings	Adelaide Magistrates Court, Adelaide 5000
Playford	A. J. T. Parsons	Box 160, P.O., Elizabeth 5112
Price	B. S. Oates	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Rocky River	H. T. Harslett	P.O. Box 53, Gladstone 5473
Ross Smith	R. A. W. Klopp	Box 1672, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Department of Marine and Harbors)

District	Name	Address
Salisbury	J. Bormann	P.O. Box 8, Salisbury 5108
Semaphore	T. J. Collins	P.O. Box 118, Henley Beach 5022
Spence	G. A. Foote	Box 344 G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Stuart	J. D. Daniel	P.O. Box 571, Commonwealth Offices, Port Pirie 5540
Todd	A. L. Waters	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Torrens	N. Sims	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Unley	R. M. Dunning	Box 344, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001 (Electoral Department)
Victoria	R. L. Winter	Box 315, Bordertown 5268
Whyalla	J. A. L. Menard	Box 126, P.O. Whyalla 5600

2. The fee paid to each Returning Officer for the conduct of the poll was $960.

3. The number of postal vote applications received for each district was as follows:

(a)

Adelaide	565
Albert Park	543
Alexandra	502
Ascot Park	574
Baudin	426
Bragg	864
Brighton	610
Chaffey	653
Coles	600
Davenport	849
Elizabeth	305
Eyre	430
Fisher	634
Flinders	432
Florey	374
Gilles	521
Glenelg	859
Goyder	435
Hanson	646
Hartley	786
Henley Beach	441
Kavel	580
Light	415
Mallee	395
Mawson	448
Mitcham	982
Mitchell	748
Morphett	721
Mount Gambier	613
Murray	569
Napier	332
Newland	351
Norwood	738
Peake	455
Playford	288
Price	378
Rocky River	544
Ross Smith	420
Salisbury	299
Semaphore	464
Spence	416
Stuart	416
Todd	479
Torrens	776
Unley	833
Victoria	497
Whyalla	234

(b) The processing and dispatch of postal vote certificates and ballot papers was dependent upon the best arrangements that could be made by individual returning officers with facilities available, and bearing in mind the short period in which the election had to be conducted. It was necessary for a number of new Returning Officers to be appointed due to resignations and the situation created by redistribution and redrawing of electoral boundaries.

Where individual returning officers were satisfied that postal vote applications received were in order clerical assistance was arranged by the returning officer on a clerical assistance basis.

In addition, pursuant to 75 (1) of the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, the Electoral Commissioner at his office issues postal votes. This took the form of the elector completing or presenting a postal vote application at the State Electoral Department. Staff prepared the necessary material and the elector was handed the certificate envelope and ballot-paper. In certain cases the necessary material was posted to the elector from the office of the Commissioner.

Furthermore, the Assistant Returning Officer, London, appointed pursuant to Section 8 (1) *(b)* of the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, is responsible for processing all postal vote applications received by him.

The postal vote application bears a direction that the application should be forwarded to the Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Returning Officer for the Council Division or Returning Officer for the Assembly District.

No record is available to whom applications were directed and even considerable research would not give a clear indication as to the number addressed to the various officers.

4. All postal vote certificates and ballot-papers are issued on the authority of either the Electoral Commissioner or the Returning Officer of the District.

Wherever and whenever postal vote applications are handled, the responsibility for dealing with the applications was that of the Electoral Commissioner or Returning Officer of the House of Assembly District.

If the person handling postal vote applications was not the Returning Officer at the Returning Officer's address the address of the person responsible was either:

Electoral Commissioner,
State Electoral Department,
83 Currie Street,
Adelaide, or
Assistant Returning Officer outside the State,
Office of the Agent General for South Australia,
South Australia House,
50 Strand,
London, WC2N 5LW.

In the interest of service to electors a clerical facility was established and made available to Returning Officers who wished to make use of it. This facility ensured a pool of experienced and reliable clerical staff which guaranteed that all postal vote applications were processed and postal vote certificates and ballot-papers despatched by post on the day of receipt of the application.

In the case of the clerical facility established adequate arrangements were available, the responsibility for the service given was that of the Returning Officer of the House of Assembly District concerned.

5. It is not possible to give an accurate figure of the remuneration for postal vote application duties in respect of each electorate. An upper limit for each district is set in the financial forecast and can only be exceeded on specific authority. The upper limit for all pre-election clerical assistance was set as $500 for the recent election and is based on an hourly rate of clerical assistance.

MEAT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What total tonnage of meat was brought into the Adelaide metropolitan area from abattoirs outside of this area during the period 1976-77?

2. What portion of this meat was brought from abattoirs interstate, and what are the reasons for killing this meat interstate and then transporting it to Adelaide?

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

1. 30 521·6 tonnes.

2. 61·2 per cent of this meat was introduced from interstate due primarily to the poor seasonal conditions in South Australia which have influenced the quantity, quality and price of locally produced meat.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Housing Trust considered, or has it implemented, a programme of insulating trust rental homes and, if so, what are the details?

2. Does the trust provide allowance for any client who may paint the interior of a rental home and, if so, what are the details?

3. Has the trust considered a programme of cement paving, particularly of main driveways, in rental homes, or alternatively do they give any financial consideration to a client leaving the premises who has upgraded the property with paths?

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

1. All houses built by the trust since 1963-64 have been insulated. Furthermore, all pensioner flats and walk-up flats have also been insulated.

2. No allowance has been paid to tenants who have carried out their own interior repainting. The majority of tenants who redecorate themselves do so before the scheduled date for repainting by the trust. In recent months it has been agreed that the trust would be willing to provide paint to a tenant who himself wished to carry out redecoration, provided that the house was due for such redecoration.

3. As part of a general upgrading programme, the trust has for a number of years been providing cement paving with its rental properties and this programme is still continuing in the metropolitan area and in several country towns. Since 1970-71 all houses built by the trust have had cement paving laid down at the time of building.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Federal Government approached the State Government concerning proposed redevelopment of airway facilities at Adelaide Airport and, if so, when and what was the Government's reply?

2. What State Government services are affected by any such redevelopment?

3. Has an environmental impact study been undertaken and, if so—

(a) who were interviewed; and

(b) was the matter of a new access road to Tapley Hill Road and additional vehicle traffic flow at peak traffic times considered and, if so, what were the findings and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes, informally during 1974, and formally in October, 1977. In 1974, advice was given by State Government officers concerning environmental matters which should be considered in this redevelopment.

2. None.

3. No; an environmental report was prepared and assessed by the Federal Government. *(a)* I am unaware of any interviews. *(b)* Yes. Shift work will spread vehicular movements, and traffic from the complex should not coincide with peak-hour traffic.

BEEKEEPERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many beekeepers have been prosecuted since March 31 for moving bees, hives, and appliances used in apiculture into and out of all areas covered by the proclamation concerning the discovery of European foul brood?

2. What were the minimum and maximum fines imposed and—

(a) what is the total amount of penalties to date; and

(b) what is the amount of fines outstanding?

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

1. One beekeeper has been prosecuted since March 31 for moving bees out of the proclaimed area of South Australia.

2. The fine imposed was $50 plus $4 costs. As the case was heard only on November 24, 1977, it is presumed that the penalty has not yet been paid.

WINDOW FILM

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What were the findings and recommendations of the Road Traffic Board's investigations into the safety of window film for motor vehicles?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board initiated investigations into the use of tinted films on motor vehicle windows and, as a result, the matter was referred to the Advisory Committee on Vehicle Performance (ACVP) for consideration. A draft regulation has now been formulated and has been circulated to all interested parties (including manufacturers) for comment within 90 days before submission to the Australian Transport Advisory Council.

SHARK FISHING

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Will the Government review its policy in the interests of public safety to declare shark fishing out of bounds from metropolitan jetties and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There are a number of practical barriers to the control of this practice under the Fisheries Act, but other avenues are being investigated.

RAIN-WATER TANKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the study, by an officer of the Environment Department, into the implications of using rain-water tanks been completed and—

(a) if so, what were the findings; and
(b) if not, why not?

2. Will the results be published and, if so, when?

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

1. No.
(a) refer to 1.
(b) the nature of the study is long term, considering aspects associated with quantity, quality and economics. As such the results from the study will not be available for some considerable time.

2. Yes—some time in the future.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. What were the monthly average figures of staff and inmates of McNally Training Centre and Vaughan House, respectively, for each of the months from July, 1976, until November, 1977?

2. What was the average number of residential careworkers in those institutions, respectively, for the same periods?

3. Is it the intention of the Minister to transfer some staff from Vaughan House to McNally Training Centre on a temporary basis and, if not, why not?

4. What ratio of male and female residential care workers at McNally Training Centre is regarded as reasonable for security reasons, for the average number of inmates in the—

(a) first offenders unit;
(b) g.g.i. unit; and
(c) high security unit?

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

1 and 2.

	McNally Centre			Vaughan House		
	Average No. of Residents	Average No. of Staff	Average No. of R.C.W.'s & N.O.'s	Average No. of Residents	Average No. of Staff	Average No. of R.C.W.'s & N.O.'s
1976 July	54	115	74	23	41	32
August	45	112	72	26	43	33
September	47	112	71	20	41	30
October	44	112	71	17	42	30
November	48	111	71	14	42	30
December	55	108	69	16	43	27
1977 January	46	109	65	17	44	29
February	43	110	67	15	45	33
March	45	108	62	16	42	31
April	48	114	67	17	44	31
May	42	112	68	15	42	31
June	50	109	55	10	43	31
July	41	103	64	11	44	32
August	39	104	67	14	37	26
September	44	117	70	13	37	26
October	52	121	73	9	37	28
November	47	118	67	11	39	28

Note: R.C.W. = Residential Care Worker. N.O. = Night Officer.

3. No. The number of girls at Vaughan House has now increased to 19.

4. A ratio of two males to one female residential care worker is considered reasonable for McNally for security and treatment purposes. When no more than two residential care workers are in a unit, a ratio of 1:1 is considered reasonable.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. What is the total allocation to South Australia from the Federal Government for road works for the year 1977-78?

2. What specific amount for road works has been allocated to each individual council?

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

1. $40 400 000.

2. To date the following grants have been allocated to councils during 1977-78:

Local Authority	Amount
City of—	$
Adelaide	99 100
Brighton	39 000
Burnside	—
Campbelltown	98 300
Elizabeth	25 000
Enfield	92 700
Glenelg	24 500
Henley and Grange	28 130
Kensington and Norwood	20 000
Marion	141 500
Mitcham	108 700
Mount Gambier	24 500
Noarlunga	181 000
Payneham	—
Port Adelaide	86 100
Port Augusta	29 200
Port Lincoln	15 200
Port Pirie	10 000
Prospect	37 300
Salisbury	208 220
Tea Tree Gully	192 280

Local Authority	Amount
City of—	$
Unley	40 000
West Torrens	64 500
Woodville	98 440
Whyalla	30 000
Total	$1 693 670
Town of—	
Gawler	55 000
Hindmarsh	17 330
Jamestown	—
Moonta	12 100
Naracoorte	13 000
Peterborough	—
Renmark	14 000
St. Peters	—
Thebarton	24 000
Walkerville	25 000
Wallaroo	17 500
Total	$177 930
District council of—	
Angaston	25 000
Balaklava	37 000
Barmera	14 000
Barossa	27 000
Beachport	37 000
Berri	14 000
Blyth	42 000
Brown's Well	27 000
Burra Burra	46 000
Bute	17 000
Carrieton	40 000
Central Yorke Peninsula	35 000
Clare	17 000
Cleve	66 000
Clinton	17 000
Coonalpyn Downs	52 000
Crystal Brook	21 000
Dudley	27 000
East Murray	33 000
East Torrens	41 000
Elliston	89 000
Eudunda	35 000
Franklin Harbour	55 000
Georgetown	15 000
Gladstone	15 000
Gumeracha	22 000
Hallett	45 000
Hawker	33 000
Jamestown	51 000
Kadina	27 000
Kanyaka-Quorn	53 000
Kapunda	22 000
Karoonda	35 000
Kimba	77 100
Kingscote	42 500
Lacepede	37 000
Lameroo	57 000
Laura	17 000
Le Hunte	54 000
Light	57 000
Lincoln	71 000
Loxton	44 000
Lucindale	35 000
Mallala	29 800
Mannum	37 000
Meadows	75 700
Meningie	43 000

Local Authority	Amount
District Council of—	$
Millicent	35 000
Minlaton	30 600
Morgan	35 000
Mount Barker	31 250
Mount Gambier	40 000
Mount Pleasant	24 000
Munno Para	101 500
Murat Bay	56 000
Murray Bridge	59 000
Naracoorte	40 000
Onkaparinga	28 000
Orroroo	46 000
Owen	22 000
Paringa	21 000
Peake	35 000
Penola	40 000
Peterborough	80 000
Pinnaroo	41 000
Pirie	26 000
Port Broughton	14 000
Port Elliot and Goolwa	46 800
Port Germein	42 000
Port MacDonnell	30 000
Port Wakefield	15 000
Redhill	44 000
Ridley	74 000
Riverton	28 000
Robe	25 000
Robertstown	31 000
Saddleworth and Auburn	32 000
Snowtown	45 000
Spalding	15 000
Stirling	38 900
Strathalbyn	57 500
Streaky Bay	69 500
Tanunda	13 000
Tatiara	65 000
Truro	27 000
Tumby Bay	86 750
Victor Harbor	70 000
Waikerie	100 000
Warooka	33 000
Willunga	93 200
Wilmington	51 000
Yankalilla	35 000
Yorketown	27 000
Total	$3 809 100
Monarto Development Commission	$5 000
Grand total:	$5 685 700

CONTAINERS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Is the Government aware of any companies presently marketing products in ring-pull containers, either cans or bottles, and, if so—

(a) which are the companies; and

(b) what action does the Government intend taking in regard to this situation and, if no action is to be taken, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

(a) Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Ltd., and Golden Circle Products—in ring-pull cans; and Carlton United and Courage Breweries—beer in rip-cap bottles.

(b) Refillable rip-cap beer bottles are not affected by the Beverage Container Act nor is the marketing of fruit

juices; however, the Government is seeking the co-operation fo the two companies concerned by not marketing the ring-pull cans.

JUVENILE ABSCONDERS

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. What was the number of staff rostered on duty in the unit from which the recent absconding took place from the McNally Training Centre?
2. What was the proportion of male and female staff rostered in that unit?
3. Were all the staff rostered in that unit present at the time of the absconding and, if not, how many were present?
4. Had any of the three absconders any previous records of crimes of violence and/or rape or attempted rape and, if so, what was the number of offences recorded against each, respectively, and what were they?
5. Was there any assault on any of the residential care workers during this absconding and, if so, what was the sex of that residential care worker and the length of his/her service?
6. What was the type of the unit from which the absconding took place (assessment or treatment)?

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

1. Two.
2. One female and one male.
3. No. One was present at the time. The two residential care workers on duty decided to split the group into two for separate activities.
4. None of the youths had any recorded offence of rape. One youth had one previous recorded offence of assault. One youth had three previous recorded offences of assault. The third youth has no previous recorded crimes of violence.
5. One male staff member was punched. He was "winded" but not otherwise harmed. This staff member has been employed in the Community Welfare Department for a period of two months.
6. Treatment unit.

STATE ELECTION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. On what date was the poll for each of the House of Assembly electorates declared following the September 17, 1977, election?
2. Was counting complete at the time of the declaration and if not, what criteria are used to determine whether a poll may or may not be declared before counting is final?
3. How may candidates at the September 17 election failed to qualify for the return of the $100 lodged at nomination?

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

1. Dates on which the poll was declared in each House of Assembly electorate following the September 17, 1977, election are as follows:

District	Date
Adelaide	27/9/77
Albert Park	27/9/77
Alexandra	23/9/77
Ascot Park	23/9/77
Baudin	22/9/77
Bragg	27/9/77
Brighton	28/9/77
Chaffey	24/9/77
Coles	28/9/77
Davenport	23/9/77
Elizabeth	30/9/77
Eyre	3/10/77
Fisher	29/9/77
Flinders	27/9/77
Florey	29/9/77
Gilles	28/9/77
Glenelg	23/9/77
Goyder	26/9/77
Hanson	27/9/77
Hartley	28/9/77
Henley Beach	26/9/77
Kavel	29/9/77
Light	29/9/77
Mallee	30/9/77
Mawson	29/9/77
Mitcham	29/9/77
Mitchell	27/9/77
Morphett	3/10/77
Mount Gambier	22/9/77
Murray	3/10/77
Napier	27/9/77
Newland	29/9/77
Norwood	22/9/77
Peake	27/9/77
Playford	27/9/77
Price	26/9/77
Rocky River	29/9/77
Ross Smith	26/9/77
Salisbury	29/9/77
Semaphore	28/9/77
Spence	26/9/77
Stuart	23/9/77
Todd	29/9/77
Torrens	27/9/77
Unley	27/9/77
Victoria	30/9/77
Whyalla	27/9/77

2. Counting of votes cannot be completed in districts where the declaration of the poll is made during the week following polling day, as postal votes received up to seven days after close of poll have to be considered for scrutiny. It is the policy of the department that declarations may be made as soon as the outcome of the election is beyond doubt and that any small quantity of outstanding votes would not possibly affect the result.
3. Fourteen candidates failed to qualify for the return of the $100 lodged at nomination.

JUVENILE ABSCONDERS

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Is it a fact that two of the three inmates involved in the recent absconding from Grenfell g.g.i. block, McNally Training Centre, are due to appear n the Supreme Court on charges of attempted rape?
2. Were those absconders involved in a recent attack on an inmate of that institution and, if so, what was the nature of that attack?
3. Is it usual when releases to the media to alert the public to those absconders are made that only age and "some" description of clothing is given?
4. Will the Minister give an assurance that, if there are any of these types of absconders (that is, with records of violence and related crimes of rape and attempted rape), he will release and give full descriptions, photographs, etc. to the media in order to protect the public?

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

1. No. They appeared before the Adelaide Juvenile Court and the hearing was adjourned until January.

2. It is alleged that a sexual assault took place.

3. McNally give the police full information, including name, date of birth, home address, description of clothing, full description of personal appearance, including identifying marks.

4. This is a police matter.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

Was a report on the state of the dairy industry received by the Minister of Agriculture in September and, if so—

(a) what recommendations, if any, were in it;

(b) what action, if any, does the Government propose to take as a result; and

(c) what other action if any, is the Government taking to give immediate assistance to those in the dairy industry affected by the present drought or the low prices for their products or both?

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

(a) Under its terms of reference the Committee of Inquiry into the Dairy Industry in South Australia studied the implications and implementation of stage 2 of the national plan for rationalisation of the industry. There was no specific investigation of conditions within the industry. Of the 33 recommendations made by the committe, the most significant were the introduction of individual farm entitlements for whole milk production, the allocation of a share of the metropolitan whole milk market to South-Eastern dairy farmers, and the establishment of a State dairy authority.

(b) The committee's findings have been thoroughly canvassed with all sectors of the industry and appropriate legislation will be introduced in due course.

(c) Applications for drought relief and other forms of financial assistance may be lodged with the Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department.

COMPUTERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has a committee been formed to inquire into the use of computers by Government departments and, if so—

(a) when was it formed;

(b) who are its members and are such members being paid for their services as members of the committee, and, if so, how much;

(c) what are its precise terms of reference; and

(d) to whom is it to report and when?

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

(a) and *(b)* a full time working party comprising:

Mr. T. Culshaw, Chief Systems Officer, Public Service Board,

Mr. R. Rumball, ADP Controller, Highways Department,

Mr. T. Liptak, ADP Controller, Engineering and Water Supply Department,

Mr. J. Wilson, Computer Systems Officer, ADP Centre, Department of Services and Supply,

commenced investigation on 1/9/77. All members are public servants and have been seconded from their respective departments. They are not being paid any fee in addition to their normal salary as public servants.

(c) The precise terms of reference are—

(1) To establish a broad format for a co-ordinated approach to meeting the future information processing needs of S.A. Public Service departments and those statutory authorities which currently use computer facilities provided by the service.

(2) Within the scope of the above to review existing and projected information processing requirements and to estimate the nature and scale of future work over the lifetime of projected computing facilities.

(3) To review the existing computer facilities used, to consider the alternative means of providing projected information processing capacity and to make recommendations regarding these.

(d) The working party is to report to the Chairman, Public Service Board early in the second quarter of 1978.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to alter the system of licensing taxi-cab operators and, if so—

(a) why;

(b) when is it intended that alterations in the system will be made and how will they be made;

(c) is it proposed to abolish the distinction between green plates and white plates and, if so, why; and

(d) are there to be any distinctions between operators in the city and the metropolitan area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

TATTOOING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to control tattooing and, if so—

(a) when;

(b) why; and

(c) what form is it expected that such legislation will take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply is as follows:

Yes:

(a) when discussions with interested parties have concluded;

(b) in response to concern expressed in relation to risk of cross-infection, and surgery for removal of tattoos; and

(c) possibly amending legislation and regulations.

JUSTICES APPEAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What instructions were given to Mr. J. M. A. Cramond regarding the application on October 4, 1977, to His Honour Mr. Justice Sangster for an adjournment of the hearing of the justices appeal *Furnell v. Coleman?*

2. By whom were the instructions given, at whose direction, and why?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. J. M. A. Cramond was instructed not to oppose an application by counsel for Coleman for an adjournment of the hearing of the Justices Appeal *Furnell v. Coleman* when it came before His Honour Mr. Justice Sangster on October 4, 1977. These instructions were given to him by the Director-General of Legal Services at the direction of the Attorney-General.

Instructions were given because informations for perjury had been laid against two witnesses for the defence in the hearing before the lower court, and as some issues arising on the appeal involved evidence given by those witnesses in that hearing it was considered appropriate that these matters should be dealt with before the appeal was heard. The witnesses concerned were committed on November 29 and 30, 1977, to the Supreme Court for trial.

ELECTORS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): What were the number of electors on the roll for each of the subdivisions at the September 17, 1977, State election, and what are the numbers on the same rolls for the December 10, 1977, Federal election?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The number of electors on the House of Assembly roll for each subdivision at September 17, 1977, State election was as follows:

Adelaide	3 574
Albert Park	17 446
Alexandra	17 325
Angle Park	4 227
Ascot Park	17 041
Baudin	15 682
Bragg	17 366
Brighton	15 682
Chaffey	17 528
Coles	17 710
Davenport North	11 487
Davenport South	5 945
Elizabeth	17 513
Eyre East	6 682
Eyre West	8 983
Fisher East	5 981
Fisher North	8 897
Fisher South	1 973
Fisher West	4 057
Flagstaff Hill	2 487
Flinders	15 734
Florey East	8 724
Florey West	9 206
Gilles East	5 217
Gilles North	2 271
Gilles West	10 057
Glenelg	17 470
Goodwood	10 193
Goyder	16 798
Hanson North	11 530
Hanson South	6 256
Hartley	18 695
Henley Beach	17 756
Henley Beach North	412
Kavel	17 361
Light East	404
Light West	15 757
Mallee North	4 068
Mallee South	11 446
Marleston	4 800
Mawson	16 971
Mawson East	2 367
Mitcham	17 326
Mitchell	17 443
Moana	3 426
Morphett East	2 059
Morphett West	15 427
Mount Gambier	17 093
Murray	17 355
Napier	16 716
Newland North	13 528
Newland South	5 517
Norwood	8 844
Peake	17 132
Playford	18 134
Price	16 652
Rocky River	14 038
Rocky River West	2 748
Ross Smith	12 254
Salisbury	19 753
Semaphore	18 100
Spence North	6 673
Spence South	9 739
St. Peters	8 883
Stuart	16 813
Thebarton	9 054
Todd	17 711
Torrens	17 532
Unley	6 885
Victoria	15 482
Whyalla	16 995
Total for State	818 341

The rolls to be used for the December 10, 1977, Federal election are not the same as those used on September 17, 1977, due to:

(a) New rolls are prepared as at close of rolls on issue of writs.

(b) Certain electors on the December 10, 1977, election roll are electors for Commonwealth elections only and consequently are not eligible to vote at State elections.

(c) New subdivisions have now been proclaimed as a result of Commonwealth redistribution.

(d) The number of Commonwealth electors on the new rolls is as follows:

Adelaide	3 596
Albert Park	17 731
Alexandra North	3 990
Alexandra South	13 401
Angle Park	4 310
Ascot Park	17 144
Baudin	19 441
Bragg	17 260
Brighton	15 827
Chaffey	17 642
Clarendon	303
Coles	17 735
Davenport South	6 113
Davenport North	11 498
Elizabeth	17 782
Eyre	15 891
Fisher	19 327
Flagstaff Hill	2 579
Flinders	15 916
Florey	17 964
Gilles	17 605
Glenelg North	3 229
Glenelg South	14 389
Goodwood	10 329
Goyder	15 792
Goyder South	1 023
Hanson North	11 484
Hanson South	6 318
Hartley	18 565
Henley Beach	18 182
Kavel North	14 257
Kavel South	3 261
Light	14 871

Light South	1 450
Mallee	15 637
Marleston	4 935
Mawson	19 911
Mitcham	17 294
Mitchell	17 650
Morphett	17 624
Mount Gambier	17 433
Murray East	11 135
Murray West	6 175
Napier	16 974
Newland	19 502
Norwood	8 828
Peake	16 912
Playford East	14 198
Playford West	4 050
Price	16 671
Rocky River North	6 730
Rocky River South	10 260
Ross Smith	12 358
Salisbury	20 240
Semaphore	17 895
Spence North	12 237
Spence South	3 975
St. Peters	8 985
Stuart	16 938
Thebarton	8 980
Todd North	2 901
Todd South	15 022
Torrens	17 664
Unley	6 650
Victoria	15 633
Whyalla	17 375
Total for State	824 977

URANIUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has the Government taken, in its policy concerning the exploration and mining of uranium, of the problems of retaining civil liberties when enforcing safeguards against accident with, or theft of nuclear materials, or proliferation of Government weapons?

2. Does the Government agree with the views on this matter expressed by the Attorney-General in his speech to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science in Canberra on November 14, 1977?

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

1. The Government believes that the question of safeguarding civil liberties is of considerable significance when considering the implications of the further development of nuclear technology.

2. In the speech referred to, the Attorney-General drew attention to a number of problems that have been canvassed regarding this matter. It is appropriate that the implications of nuclear developments for civil liberties should be brought to public attention.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Was the Attorney-General enunciating Government policy on the mining and export of uranium in his speech to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science in Canberra on November 14, 1977, and, if not, in what respects was what he said not Government policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the speech referred to the Attorney-General conformed with Government policy as expressed in the resolution on uranium passed by the House of Assembly on March 30, 1977. In his remarks the Attorney-General outlined some of his own reasons for opposing the development of a uranium industry in this country and overseas and also identified a number of questions about the legal basis of proposed developments in Australia. The Government believes that the future development of policy on uranium will benefit from full and free public debate and that the Attorney-General has made an important contribution to this debate.

JUVENILES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many cases of juvenile drinking have been brought before the courts between July 16, 1975, and October, 31, 1977?

2. What was the source (that is hotels, clubs, etc.) of supply of liquor in these cases?

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

1.

	1-7-75 to 30-6-76	1-7-76 to 30-6-77	1-7-76 to 30-9-77	Total
Police Offences Act—				
Drunk and disorderly	503	497	114	1 114
Licensing Act—				
Liquor offences	483	406	88	977

Notes: *(a)* Not practicable to exclude period July 1 to July 15, 1975.

(b) Figures for period October 1 to October 31 not available.

2. Information sought is not available.

STATEHOOD

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is South Australia's particular interest in the "implications of Statehood of the Northern Territory" and what has been the extent of inquiries on the subject?

2. Who did Dr. Barry Hughes contact on this subject when in Darwin from November 3 to 5, 1977, and have his investigations in Darwin been concluded?

3. What specific action does South Australia intend to take in the matter of the Northern Territory obtaining Statehood?

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

1. Should proposals to grant Statehood to the Territories be put into effect, there is the possibility of an effect on financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the existing States. Given that the amounts of money from the Commonwealth to this State have already been squeezed severely in the interests of an outmoded ideology, it would be foolhardy not to take every precaution to safeguard South Australia's position against further erosion.

2. Frank Alcorta and Eric Anderson, both of the Winnellie Campus, Darwin Community College, and Jon Isaacs, M.L.A. Not necessarily.

3. None at this stage.

EYRE PENINSULA HOUSES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What is the South Australian Housing Trust construction programme for the next financial year at each of the following centres:

(a) Streaky Bay;
(b) Minnipa;
(c) Ceduna;
(d) Wudinna; and
(e) Elliston?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The 1978-79 construction programme is as follows:

(a) Streaky Bay:—No construction programme because trust-owned land cannot be economically serviced (water).

(b) Minnipa:—No construction programme as land has not been purchased and demand is limited.

(c) Ceduna:—15 timber-framed single units are scheduled for construction in Ceduna during 1978-79.

(d) Wudinna:—No construction programme as the trust owns no land in the town.

(e) Elliston:—No construction programme, as the trust owns no land in the town.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Has the Minister's department any plans to upgrade the water supply to the Hawker township?

2. Can the Minister give information in relation to a bore which was sunk on section 145, hundred of Wonoka, and what result has been obtained from this bore?

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

1. No.

2. The bore drilled on section 145, hundred of Wonoka, was located in the general area of Wonoka Creek, some 12 kilometres from Hawker. The salinity of the water obtained was 2 140 mg/litre, whilst the yield was in the order of 1·5 litres per second with an 8 metre draw-down. Because of its relatively high salinity, very low yield and location a considerable distance from Hawker township, a full scale pump test of the bore was not carried out.

HAWKER SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the department intend to install air-conditioners in buildings moved from the old Poochera school to Hawker and, if not, why not and is the Government aware that it would greatly improve the building if it was equipped with air-conditioning due to the fact that the temperature is extremely high for extended periods during the summer months?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Education Department does not install air-conditioning in buildings which are transferred from one school to another. In this particular instance the building transferred was a metal type and, in view of the relative ease of relocation of these buildings, they may be moved anywhere in the State and it is therefore not a practical proposition to provide them with air-conditioning.

All requests for air-conditioning of buildings in the western region are referred as a matter of course to the Regional Director. Mr. Edwards has advised that the Hawker Area Achool has applied to his office for the air-conditioning of this particular building and he has been able to have the work included in the 1978-79 minor works programme. Work cannot be done earlier due to the already fully committed current works programme.

EFFLUENT DRAINAGE

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What are the requirements before funds are made available to district councils who wish to install effluent drainage systems within townships established within their areas?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The reply is as follows:

1. Application must in the first instance be made to the Minister of Local Government when the scheme will be given a priority on the basis of need established by the Drainage Liaison Committee.

2. The Public Health Department will prepare all preliminary plans and estimates of capital and operating costs free of cost to councils in the area covered by the scheme.

3. Final plans, specifications and estimates will be prepared by the Public Health Department, or if the department indicates to the council concerned that it is not in a position to undertake the whole or any part of the work associated with the design and construction of any scheme, it will assist the council in arranging for such work to be done privately. The costs involved will be borne by the council concerned and, subject to the approval of the Minister of Local Government, will be included in the total costs for the purpose of determining the subsidy.

4. The final plans and specifications of the scheme will be examined and approved by the Central Board of Health and the Director and Engineer-in-Chief as required by the Local Government Act.

5. The proposed scheme, including the proposals for financing it, the proposed scale of annual charges, the estimated operating and maintenance cost, will be examined by the Director of Local Government and, if acceptable, the scheme may be authorised by the Minister as eligible for subsidy.

6. The Minister of Local Government must approve the acceptance of any tender for work to be carried out under a subsidised scheme.

7. The council will provide the Minister of Local Government with a revised financial statement covering the scheme based on the accepted contract prices, when the amount of subsidy to be provided will be advised.

MOUNT HOPE SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Education Department still own the school building at Mount Hope and, if so, does the department intend to move this building to another school and, if so, where and when?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Education Department still owns the building and property at the Mount Hope School. As a result of inquiries made to the Regional Director of Education, Ministerial approval was given to transfer the property to the Elliston Play Group. It later transpired that this group advised they did not have the finance necessary to maintain the facility and indicated that they were no longer interested in the property. An application was then made by the Cummins Area School Council that the property be transferred to that school for use as a camp site, and Ministerial approval was recently given for this. In summary, therefore, the situation is that the Education Department still owns the Mount Hope school but control of the property has been given to the Cummins Area School. There is no intention to move the building elsewhere.

URANIUM

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which officers of the Public Service prepared a report on uranium for the Premier?

2. What were the findings of the report described by the Premier as "chilling".

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

1. Officers of the Premier's Department.

2. The Government's findings on uranium policy were discussed in the House of Assembly debate on March 30, 1977. See *Hansard*.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What discoveries of uranium have been made in South Australia and—

(a) by whom;

(b) at what locations;

(c) what are the estimated reserves and quality;

(d) what are the estimated values of reserves based on average current market value; and

(e) what are the terms and conditions of any leases?

2. What development is proposed to operate such discoveries and what is the estimated cost?

3. When is it proposed to commence mining it?

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

1. *(a), (b)* and *(c)*. The answers to these questions are covered in tabulated form attached.

(d) On the question of the present value of reserves, the accepted practice in the mineral industry is to consider ore in the ground as of no value until it is actually mined and the product sold, as the profit to be gained depends very significantly on the costs that are involved in the mining operation. In actual fact, in the United States, reserves of unmined ore have been the subject of financial transactions. However, the price paid for ore in the ground is less than 20 per cent of the actual value when mined.

(e) There are no leases covering these discoveries. The deposits are all held under exploration licences which permit the holder to explore for all minerals except precious stones and extractive minerals. The licences do not permit mining, but are subject to standard conditions and special conditions under schedule C. The latter relates to such matters as the protection of areas of environmental sensitivity and of cultural or historic interest, but do not relate particularly to the mineral sought.

In addition to the foregoing discoveries, in 1954 the Mines Department discovered some 295 tonnes of uranium oxide (ore grade 0·25 per cent U_3O_8) at Mount Victoria, north east of Olary. This small deposit is presently held under a mineral claim by North Flinders Mines Limited. It should be noted that the claim does not permit mining.

2. None of the work programmes on these deposits has reached the stage where a final method of development has been decided upon and costed.

3. The honourable member would be aware of the Government's policy on the mining of uranium. As a consequence, no proposal for mining will be approved.

URANIUM DISCOVERIES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Company	Place	U_3O_8 Reserves and ore grade
Oilmin N.L. and Transoil N.L.	Mount Painter	3 800 tonnes U_3O_8 ore grade 0·1% U_3O_8
Oilmin, N.L., Transoil N.L., Petromin N.L., and Western Nuclear Aust. Ltd.	Beverley (west of Lake Frome)	15 800 tonnes U_3O_8 ore grade 0·24% U_3O_8
C.S.R. Mines Administration Pty. Ltd., and Teton Exploration Drilling Co. Pty. Ltd.	Goulds Dam (south of Lake Frome)	1 400 tonnes U_3O_8 ore grade 0·13% U_3O_8
Carpentaria Exploration Co. Pty. Ltd., Mines Administration Pty. Ltd. and Teton Exploration Drilling Co. Pty. Ltd.	Honeymoon Area (SE of Lake Frome)	2 500 tonnes U_3O_8 ore grade 0·21% U_3O_8
Sedimentary Uranium N.L., Mines Administration Pty. Ltd., Teton Exploration Drilling Co. Pty. Ltd. and Carpentaria Exploration Co. Pty. Ltd.	East Kalkaroo (north of Mingary)	1 100 tonnes U_3O_8 ore grade 0·15% U_3O_8
Western Mining Corporation Ltd.	Current exploration drilling at Roxby Downs has indicated a very large deposit of combined copper-uranium mineralisation. Insufficient drilling has been done to make any meaningful reserve estimates.	

DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What current housing accommodation is provided for disabled persons?

2. What alterations and provisions are made to such accommodation for persons in wheelchairs?

3. Has a standard code been recommended and adopted and, if not, why not?

4. Will such a code be adopted and who prepared it?

5. What role has the South Australian Housing Trust in relation to such a code?

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

1. For many years the South Australian Housing Trust has been providing accommodation for the handicapped and disabled persons, and some years ago built a group of dwellings at Mitchell Park to cater especially for paraplegics. Since that time it has modified several of its villa flats, and the following list shows the location of these and other rental dwellings available for handicapped persons:

Suburb	Street	No. of Units
Mitchell Park	Walter and Thirza Ave.	26
Marden	River Street	4
Oaklands	Doreen Street	2
Adelaide	Wright Street	1
Adelaide	Hocking Place	1
Norwood	Margaret Street	1
Pennington	King Street	1
Semaphore	Cave Street	1
Elizabeth Field	Peachey Road	1
Torrensville	Jervois Street	1
Hackney	Hackney Road	1
Parkside	Hone Street	1
Mitchell Park	Egan Crescent	1
Nailsworth	Newborn Street	1
Mile End	Victoria Street	1
Woodville West	Pitman Street	1
Sefton Park	First Avenue	1

Several of the above dwellings were purchased, modified and upgraded under the trust's special rental housing

scheme, and were specially selected for housing for the handicapped.

2. The trust has regularly made structural alterations to its existing rental houses to cater for the needs of the physically handicapped. This work includes the installation of such things as ramps for wheelchairs, hand and grab rails in toilets and bathrooms, the provision of sliding doors in place of the conventional opening door, and the widening of doorways to allow for wheelchairs. Special bathing and showering facilities have often been provided.

3. The new standard code AS1428 (replacing the old CA52 which has operated since 1968) covers access conditions for all classes of buildings, but mainly concentrating on public buildings. The revised code increases the scope and requirements for the various classes of building and does include some provisions for housing of various types.

4. This code has already been included in the provisions of the South Australian Building Act, and South Australia is the only State to have achieved this important breakthrough. The code was prepared by the Australian Standards Association in conjunction with A.C.R.O.D.

5. The Housing Trust has had a representative on the South Australian Committee on Access for the Disabled since 1967 and as such has contributed to the establishment of both of these codes. The trust is bound under the normal provisions of the Building Act, and naturally the inclusion of the code in this Act requires the trust to comply.

COAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What known discoveries, reserves and types of coal have been made in South Australia and—
   (a) by whom;
   (b) at what locations;
   (c) what are the estimated reserves and quality;
   (d) what are the estimated values of reserves based on average current market value; and
   (e) what are the terms and conditions of any leases?

2. What development is proposed to operate such discoveries and what is the estimated cost?

3. When is it proposed to commence mining the coal?

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

1. The coal discoveries, reserves and types of coal in South Australia are listed in table 1. The answers to *(a)*, *(b)* and *(c)* have also been included in the table.

(d) The estimated values of reserves can only be based on export values of approximately $20 per tonne to the point of dispatch for New South Wales steaming coal. As South Australia is unlikely to export coal the estimated reserve values mean very little.

(e) There are no coal leases in South Australia. Exploration licences give licence holders the right to explore for all minerals excluding petroleum and the licence holder is not obliged to disclose the mineral of major interest to his programme.

2. No development is currently proposed except for expansion and re-equipment at Leigh Creek to meet the needs of the new Port Augusta power station which is planned to be fired in the early 1980's. An active assessment programme is current for the Lock and Wakefield deposits.

3. No firm plans to mine coal other than that at Leigh Creek exist at present.

Table 1
Principal South Australian Coal Deposits

Coal Deposits	Coal rank	Location	Discoverer	Proven ($x10^6$ tonnes)	Indicated ($x10^6$ tonnes)	Inferred ($x10^6$ tonnes)
Lake Phillipson	Black coal	Arckaringa Basin 750 kms from Adelaide	Utah Development Co.	—	2 000	2 000
Leigh Creek	Sub-bituminous coal	Northern Flinders Ranges, 555 kms north of Adelaide	S.A. Mines Dept	80	150	430
Wakefield (Clinton, Inkerman and Whitwarta)	Brown coal	St. Vincent Basin, 90-100 kms north of Adelaide	S.A. Mines Dept.	786	1 200	—
Anna	Brown coal	Murray Basin, 160 kms from Adelaide	S.A. Mines Dept.	68	72	82
Moorlands	Brown coal	Murray Basin, 140 kms from Adelaide	S.A. Mines Dept.	32	—	—
Lock	Sub-bituminous coal	Central Eyre Peninsula	S.A. Mines Dept.	—	100	unknown

FAUNA

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many public auctions have now been conducted by the National Parks and Wildlife Division and—
   (a) what fauna was sold;
   (b) how many of them have been sold to date;
   (c) what was the price obtained for each item at each auction;
   (d) what were the total proceeds of each auction;
   (e) who was the auctioneer for each sale; and
   (f) what commission and costs were incurred for each auction?

2. From what parks, and from whom, did the fauna come?

3. How many confiscated birds were sold?

4. Was any fauna trapped and, if so—
   (a) by what method;
   (b) for what reason; and
   (c) is trapping currently being undertaken?

5. Why was the fauna disposed of?

6. Has any fauna been disposed of by private sale or tender and, if so—
   (a) how many;
   (b) what type of fauna; and
   (c) what are the total proceeds received to date?

7. How many persons in this State are licensed to keep Australian fauna?

8. How many persons have been prosecuted for keeping fauna without a licence, and what is the total amount of fines received?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is considered that the work required to obtain this information is beyond what would be reasonable, and it is therefore proposed not to supply an answer.

ENERGY AUTHORITY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has an energy authority been established and, if not, why not?

2. If an authority has been established—

(a) who are the members of the authority and what are their respective qualifications;

(b) what are the terms of reference of the authority; and

(c) when is it estimated the Minister will receive the first report and will the documents be made public and, if not, why not?

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

1. The proposal, announced by the Premier in his policy speech, is under active consideration.

2. See 1.

MARINE LABORATORY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action is currently being taken to establish a marine laboratory and, if no action is being taken, why not?

2. What are the estimated capital and annual operating costs?

3. What location has been selected and why?

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

1. The Fisheries Division of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries is currently examining a number of alternatives.

2. See 1 above.

3. See 1 above.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will a referendum be held concerning the removal of the power of the Legislative Council to refuse supply?

2. Has supply ever been refused by the Legislative Council and, if so, when and for what reasons?

3. Has the Legislative Council amended any Budget documents or financial proposals through error in calculations and, if so—

(a) when;

(b) what were the reasons; and

(c) what amount was involved?

4. What is the estimated cost of a referendum?

5. Are any other referenda proposed and, if so, on what matters?

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

1. When legislation has been introduced and passed in both Houses.

2. No; but, in the session 1911-12, the Legislative Council made suggested amendments in the Appropriation Bill to reduce the line Public Works by £10 000 (for purchase of brickworks including site) and the line Miscellaneous—Commissioner of Public Works by £1 000 (purchase of timber and firewood for resale) for the reason that the proposed expenditure was not previously authorised by Parliament. The suggested amendments were disagreed to by the House of Assembly, no agreement was reached at the conference of managers, and the Bill was laid aside in the Legislative Council. A general election ensued.

3. Not as far as can be ascertained.

4. Until the conditions and timing under which a referendum may be held are established, no indication of cost can be given.

5. Not at this stage.

MINERALS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What minerals have been discovered and are mined currently in South Australia?

2. How many persons are employed as a result?

3. What is the estimated value of royalties to be received this year, and how does this figure compare with each of the last three financial years?

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

1. Records show that about 450 different minerals have been identified in South Australia but commercial production has been limited to few of these. In order of value of production, the principal mineral products in 1976 were: iron ore; opal; natural gas; coal; limestone; gypsum; salt; clay; zinc ore; dolomite; silica; talc; barytes; felspar; heavy mineral concentrates; phosphate rock; damourite; lead ore; gold; magnesite; flint and jade. If construction materials are included their total value (ex-mine) was $144 000 000.

2. The number of people employed in the mining and quarrying industry is estimated to be 3 000 (not including those engaged in mining on the opal fields at Coober Pedy and Andamooka).

3. The estimated value of royalties to be received this financial year is $3 520 000. For the past three financial years the royalties were as follows:

1975	$1 998 800
1976	$2 310 400
1977	$2 863 200

SCHOOL LEAVERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many vacant positions are there in the State Public Service for school leavers and—

(a) in what categories;

(b) at what level; and

(c) in which departments?

2. How many applications have been received to date?

3. When will appointments be made?

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

1. There are currently approximately 120 vacancies for school leavers.

(a) clerical and technical grade categories.

(b) base grade.

(c) Engineering and Water Supply, Police, Agriculture and Fisheries, Public Buildings, Further Education, Labour and Industry, Transport, Economic Development, Hospitals, Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Services and Supply, Highways, Environment, Marine and Harbors, Community Welfare, Education, Electoral, Libraries, Mines, Treasury, State Taxes, Legal Services.

2. 3 500 applications, approximately.

3. Appointments are being made now with a view to school leavers commencing duty early in the new year. Current vacancies will be filled by the end of January next year. New vacancies will be filled as they occur.

TYRES

Mr. BECKER: (on notice): Did the State Transport Authority recently let a contract for the supply of tyres for

its bus fleet and, if so:

(a) when;

(b) to whom;

(c) for what type of tyre and brand name;

(d) what is the estimated value of the contract and average cost per tyre;

(e) what are the terms of the contract;

(f) what is the country of origin of the successful tenderer;

(g) where are the tyres manufactured; and

(h) what were the main criteria in choosing the successful tenderer?

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

(a) Yes. August 31, 1977.

(b) Marubeni-Bridgestone Tyres (S.A.) Pty. Ltd.

(c) Bridgestone 10.00 x 20 x 16 ply R190Z V-steel tyres.

(d) Estimated value of the contract complete with tubes and rust flaps is $108 000 (including 10 per cent contingencies). Estimated average cost per tyre complete with tube and rust flap is $180 (including 10 per cent contingencies).

(e) 600 tyres to be taken over 12 months. Rise and fall in respect of ocean freight, import duty and exchange rate to apply.

(f) The successful tenderer was Marubeni-Bridgestone Tyres (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., 1194 South Road, Clovelly Park, South Australia.

(g) Japan.

(h) Price and the tenderer's ability to meet the guarantee requirements for tyre tread and casing life as laid down in the specification. Preference was also given to an optimum width tread.

OIL AND MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the estimated total amount of money to be spent on oil and mineral exploration in South Australia this financial year?

2. How do these figures compare with each of the past three financial years?

3. What assistance, physical and monetary, is provided by the Government, and how does this assistance compare with that of the past three financial years?

4. Which companies are currently holding active exploration licences?

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

1. The estimated amount of money to be spent on mineral exploration this financial year in South Australia is approximately $5 000 000. The estimated expenditure by private companies on oil exploration during the 1977-78 financial year is approximately $7 350 000. An additional contribution will be made by the South Australian Government. (See answer to 3 below.)

2. For information on mineral exploration, see previous reports from the Director of Mines; the 1977-78 figure is significantly up on previous years. There has been a significant upward trend in expenditure on petroleum exploration over the past three years.

3. The Department of Mines provides significant assistance to encourage exploration for both oil and minerals. For example, the Fossil Fuels Division of the Department of Mines has a continuing programme of encouraging petroleum exploration through the drilling of shallow stratigraphic wells, basin studies and general advice to the public. The department expects to spend between $200 000 and $250 000 on four shallow stratigraphic wells and source rock analysis this year. In addition, during 1978, the South Australian Government will spend $5 000 000 on exploration for natural gas in the Cooper Basin. Of this $5 000 000, approximately $2 750 000 will be spent by the end of the 1977-78 financial year.

4. There is a very large number of exploration licences currently held. It is not possible to provide full details in answer to the question. The honourable member is referred to the annual reports of the Director of Mines.

RAILWAY COTTAGES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Did the Minister of Transport receive a letter dated August 31, 1977, from the then member for Heysen concerning railway cottages at Mount Barker Junction, and, if so:

(a) what are the reasons for the delay in reply; and

(b) when is it anticipated that a reply will be forthcoming?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reply is as follows:

Yes.

(a) Investigations are being carried out on the feasibility of providing a more permanent form of water supply.

(b) A reply will be forwarded as soon as investigations are completed.

NUDE BATHING

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to extend the nude bathing beach adjacent to Norah Creina Bay in the hundred of Lake George to the bay itself, and, if so, when and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I am not aware of any proposal to do so.

BISMUTH PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is it correct that Peko-Wallsend Limited was investigating the feasibility of establishing a bismuth plant in Port Pirie and, if so, was the Government involved in these negotiations?

2. What financial incentives were offered by the Government to this company to establish such a decentralised industry at Port Pirie?

3. What would have been the likely capital cost and employment created by such a plant?

4. Is it correct that the company has now announced its intention not to proceed wih such a plant?

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

1. Yes, to both questions.

2. The company was made aware of the Government's decentralisation incentives applicable to Port Pirie. These include Government loans and loan guarantees, pay-roll tax rebates, relocation grants, and the provision of factory buildings through the Housing Trust on a lease-purchase arrangement. Housing would have been made available through the Housing Trust. In addition the Port Pirie council offered to provide land at Port Pirie free of charge.

3. Estimated capital costs were about $5 000 000. The plant would have employed about 50 people.

4. The investigation by Peko-Wallsend extends to three possible sites:

1. Tennant Creek (adjacent to existing Peko plant).

2. Mount Morgan (Queensland—adjacent to existing Peko plant).

3. Port Pirie (on clear site).

In September, 1977, the company advised the South Australian Government that it appreciated the co-operation which it had received from the South Australian Government and the council of Port Pirie, but it had decided not to establish at Port Pirie. The company stated that the environmental conditions are difficult at Port Pirie for bismuth refining and would have imposed additional capital costs. In particular, large settling ponds would have been an environmental problem at Port Pirie. However, at Mount Morgan, where Peko operates a copper mine, these ponds are in existence. Mount Morgan also faces a sociological problem because the mine is nearing the end of its life, and the population will be needing alternative employment.

The South Australian Government has written again to Peko-Wallsend, suggesting that alternative sites might be possible. Peko have since advised that a feasibility study is being prepared based on Mount Morgan, and that a final review on process and site will be made in March, 1978.

CYCLE TRACKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is the Minister of Transport still persisting with his proposal that cyclists should be permitted to ride on footpaths and, if so, what action, if any, is to be taken to put the proposal into practice and, if not, why not, and what action, if any, is being taken in the current financial year to provide more tracks for cyclists?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board thoroughly investigated the proposal to allow pedal cyclists to use the footpaths, but reported against the proposal. Accordingly, it has been decided not to proceed. Instead in March, 1977, Cabinet approved the establishment of a bicycle track fund of not less than $250 000 for the construction of cycle tracks, with the Government paying two-thirds of the cost of cycle tracks following applications from local government authorities.

CIRCLELINE BUS SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What, so far, has been:
   (a) the total patronage, week by week, of the Circleline bus service;
   (b) the cost of operating the service;
   (c) the capital cost of the service; and
   (d) the revenue from it?
2. Is the Government satisfied with these results and, if not, what action, if any, does it propose to take?

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

1. *(a)* Surveys have shown that a significant number of Circleline passengers travel on pre-purchased transfer tickets, school concession tickets, or weekly tickets, and week-by-week passenger statistics are not readily obtainable. A special survey made during the first week of operation indicated that about 3 000 passengers are carried daily from Monday to Friday, and about 600 on Saturday mornings. It is estimated that about 16 000 passengers are carried each week.

(b) About $396 000 a year.

(c) The 16 buses used on the service were purchased in 1962 at a cost of $17 500 a bus. They were repainted in Circleline livery at a cost of $880 a bus. Circleline bus stops were established at a cost of about $2 000.

(d) For the reasons set out in *(a)* the actual revenue derived from Circleline operations is not readily obtainable, but it is estimated to be about $125 000 a year.

2. *(a)* Yes.

(b) Not applicable.

SAMCOR

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What action does the Government intend to take to reduce the losses continually incurred by Samcor?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Samcor has not made continual losses. The loss of $218 733 in 1975 improved to a profit of $6 624 in 1976, and has deteriorated to a loss of $1 836 531 in 1977. There are many reasons for the loss, some of which relate to poor seasonal conditions in South Australia. The Government is continuing to improve the efficiency of Samcor operations in a number of areas.

MOUNT GAMBIER FESTIVAL

Mr. ALLISON (on notice): Of the sum of $40 000 allocated in the 1977-78 Budget to South Australian festivals, how much is specifically allocated to the Mount Gambier International Festival to be held on January 28, 1978?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount to be allocated to the Mount Gambier International Festival has not been determined. An advisory committee, administered by the Ethnic Affairs Unit of the Premier's Department, is in the process of being established and will advise on the allocation of grants from the sum of $40 000 allocated in the 1977-78 Budget to South Australian ethnic festivals.

COFFIN BAY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. BLACKER (on notice): Does the Government have any plans to provide a reticulated water supply to Coffin Bay and, if so, when is it expected that work will commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There are no current plans to provide a reticulated water supply to Coffin Bay.

LANDS DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who is the Manager, Land Development, in the Lands Department?
2. Has he recently travelled overseas and, if so:
   (a) was the trip at Government expense and how much did it cost the Government;
   (b) how long was he away overseas;
   (c) what was the purpose of the trip; and
   (d) what results, if any, have come from it?

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

1. Maurice John Toohey.

2. Mr. Toohey and the Manager (Land Acquisitions and Land Management) Mr. Michael Arthur Janitz, recently travelled overseas on a joint study tour, approved in September by both the Overseas Travel Committee and by State Cabinet.

   (a) The study tour was at the expense of the South Australian Land Commission. The total cost of the study tour (return fares, accommodation and living expenses, insurances, etc.) is approximately $7 000.

   (b) The study tour comprised 31 days from October 13, 1977. Messrs. Janitz and Toohey took five

days approved recreation leave at the conclusion of the study tour.

(c) The purpose of the tour was to study management of residential land development, integrated community centre development (including commercial, educational, leisure, community services) and public/private sector joint venture investment participation in all aspects of residential and community development.

(d) It is expected that the resulting knowledge of overseas experience in related fields will prove most valuable to the commission in its future developments and operations.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (November 22).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The building to which the honourable member referred is a solid construction two-storey "A" type building comprising a library resource centre and language laboratory on the ground floor and eight general learning areas and associated activity area on the first floor. The complete building will not be available for the start of the 1978 school year, but on present planning the ground floor should be ready for occupation. It is planned that the ground floor will be available in the third week of January, but this is dependent upon the delivery of carpet from Melbourne on December 15. Full availability of the building is planned for March 15, 1978. It is expected, however, that the air-conditioning will not be operating at this time, and the work of balancing the plant will proceed after occupation.

CHRISTMAS DAY

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (November 24).

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Trading in the bars and bottle departments of hotels on Christmas Day is specifically precluded. However, liquor may be consumed in declared dining areas with or ancillary to *bona fide* meals. Clubs are prohibited from trading unless specifically authorised by the terms and conditions of their licence or permit.

VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT

In reply to **Mr. WOTTON** (November 3).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Section 106 of the Public Service Act provides that every officer who has attained the age of 55 years shall be entitled to retire from the Public Service but may, subject to the Act, continue in the Public Service until he attains the age of 65 years. The State Superannuation Office has advised that, as a result of the introduction of the new superannuation benefits from July 1, 1974, the trend is for most officers to retire at 60 or shortly thereafter. In respect of weekly paid employees, Industrial Instruction No. 474 was reissued on August 23, 1977, to provide for the following:

> Every employee who has attained the age of 55 years shall be entitled to retire from employment with the Government but may continue in the employ of the Government until he attains the age of 65 years.

BANK DRAFTS

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (October 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to your question concerning the arrangements of bank drafts prepared by the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, I would point out that the State Bank attends to this activity on behalf of the Savings Bank. The following answer therefore relates to the procedures of the State Bank. The State Bank's correspondent arrangements provide for the issue of drafts in pounds sterling on Ireland and the United Kingdom at the following points:

Ireland:
- Belfast—Ulster Bank Ltd.
- Dublin—Ulster Bank Ltd.

United Kingdom:
- Aberdeen, Scotland—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- Birmingham—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- Bradford—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- Bristol—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- Edinburgh, Scotland—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- Liverpool—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- London, 168 Fenchurch St.—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- London, Cockspur Street—Barclays Bank International Ltd.
- London, Threadneedle St.—National Westminister Bank Ltd.
- Manchester—Barclays Bank International Ltd.

All payments to Ireland are handled through the bank's correspondent in that country, Ulster Bank Ltd. To the bank's knowledge, their arrangements tie in with current clearing policy for drafts on Ireland and have not given rise to query of any nature. In the United Kingdom, draft business outside London is serviced through Barclays Bank, which has a total of over 3 000 branches and sub-branches throughout the country. Each of these outlets is attached to a Regional International Branch with the aim of providing specialist information on individual transactions should the need arise. Endeavours are made to draw drafts on the Regional International Branch located closest to the address of the favouree. In turn, if the draft is presented for payment at a branch of Barclays Bank, clearance should be effected without delay. In any event, if presentation is made other than to a branch of Barclays, clearance would be available through normal collection channels without hardship to the recipient.

In this regard, it is mentioned that the branch representation of Barclays in the United Kingdom is nearly one-third greater than that of the next largest British bank. Bearing in mind that the payment of a draft is subject to its verification and authentication, it is most unlikely that any Australian private bank has an agency arrangement of the nature claimed where "the recipients could go to any bank in any village or township in the United Kingdom or in Ireland, and cash the draft". Without knowing the background to the question, it seems that a favouree accustomed to cashing a draft drawn on a given bank and place has, on receiving a State Bank draft drawn on Barclays, presented it to his bank which has possibly not fully explained the avenues open for encashment. The point made in relation to the bank's two-point representation of Scotland is valid if personal type payments requiring cash upon presentation are sought by draft. Moves have been made to rectify the position in Scotland. Expansion of the bank's correspondent arrangements in United Kingdom and throughout the world is a continuing exercise based on demand. However, because of the greater flexibility of the inter-bank mail transfer system for effecting personal type payments, the bank recommends this facility in preference to the draft method of payment wherever practicable. Under the mail transfer system, the bank's agency network provides facilities to remit funds not only to "any bank in any village or township in the United Kingdom or in Ireland",

but to an address anywhere in the world with postal facilities.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (October 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present policy on water cartage subsidises local district councils for the supply of water at key points within council areas. However, in some parts of the State these distribution points are not convenient with the result that farmers have to cart water over longer distances than they would like. To assist in such instances the Government is allowing the expense of water carting as a valid charge against carry-on loans provided under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. This allows the farmer to consider water carting in relation to other management alternatives. Where there are particular problems in local government areas, councils concerned can approach the Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for advice and assistance on the council water distribution subsidy scheme.

CROWN LANDS

In reply to **Mr. KLUNDER** (October 18).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Both the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Forests advise that they are not aware of any vacant pastured Crown land in the higher rainfall areas which would be suitable for the agistment of stock from drought affected areas.

LOBSTERS

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (November 1).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Amalgamation of rock lobster pot allocations has previously been allowed in the situation where two vessels had unfilled quotas of pots, and a third vessel could be bought, taken out of the fishery and the pots reallocated to joint purchasers. This allowed a small decrease in total effort in the fishery, which is desirable. The recent case, referred to by the honourable member, was the first of its kind in that an authority holder sought to reduce his quota of pots, and the proposal was approved because it produced no increase in overall effort. The pots may be transferred to another fisherman with an unfilled quota, but not by way of direct purchase because in considering any application to transfer an authority no value is conceded to individual pots. This arrangement has been approved for a limited period, pending receipt and consideration of the report on rock lobster fishery by Professor P. Copes.

WATER CONSUMPTION

In reply to **Mr. WHITTEN** (November 1).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been advised by my departmental officers that the practice of leaving meter reading slips at the time meters are read, as suggested by the honourable member, has been discontinued in Sydney, Melbourne, and Hobart, and no public dissatisfaction has been encountered. The practice was also discontinued in this State many years ago, partly because of the additional cost but mainly because of certain practical difficulties in providing complete information.

The basic problem is that, compared to gas and electricity meters where meter changes are rare, water meters require much more maintenance, and usually 20 per cent are changed within a year. What therefore might quickly be considered as involving only a simple operation of subtracting a past reading from a present reading often represents an operation of doing this for two different meters and adding these two consumption figures together, with the further addition of an estimated consumption for the period during which the original meter was not recording. Although consumers are informed where such an estimate has been made, it is considered that advices giving full details of all readings where more than one meter has been involved could lead to confusion. There would certainly be more cost involved, as extra time would be taken, and this would have to be recovered in the form of higher charges.

In country districts meter reading is performed by the local representative who is also responsible for maintenance. It is considered that the time spent on preparing meter reading slips and reading meters should be kept as low as possible to ensure that all the other duties of the maintenance man are carried out as early as possible. Recent surveys by the Engineering and Water Supply Department indicate that very few ratepayers bother to take note or record in any way their meter readings or consumptions.

As part of the metric conversion programme the department is replacing all imperial meters with metric, and over 50 per cent of the meters throughout the State have been converted. The metric meter has a speedometer-type dial, which makes it very easily read by consumers. I suggest that consumers who have this type of meter should read them and maintain a continuous record of usage. By reading the meter at regular intervals they are in a better water management position than by relying upon meter reading slips. Also, they would have the added advantage of being able to detect concealed leakage at an early stage as well as being able to verify the consumption figures as advised by the department. Consumers with imperial meters who wish to keep consistent checks on their consumption of water will be readily given the registration of their meters on inquiring of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

UNDERGROUND WATER

In reply to **Mr. RODDA** (November 2).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The annual rainfall recorded in the Padthaway area was above average in 1974-75, below average in 1975-76, and has to date been below average during 1976-77. Ground water levels monitored since 1970 south-east of Padthaway township in an area of 65 square kilometres indicate average levels during 1976-77 as being lower than the average levels for the seven-year period. In addition, ground water salinity levels taken during 1976-77 indicate rising values but these are generally still significantly below the level considered to have a serious effect on crops in the region.

WEBB REPORT

In reply to **Mr. RODDA** (November 23).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The dairy industry in South Australia has been involved in discussions on changes to the marketing arrangements for dairy products more than in any other State; and there have been opportunities for the industry to put its views on both national and State plans for rationalisation of dairying.

After the Webb report was released a seminar was held to give the industry a chance to put its views. Since the views were generally favourable, the Minister of Agriculture is now preparing draft legislation, which will be discussed with the industry, but it is not possible to say at this stage when it will be introduced into Parliament.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The country prisons involved are Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. As these prisons are of much less security and contain a good number of short-term and local prisoners, they have a different staff-prisoner ratio from principal prisons and, as salaries are the main Budget component, this makes a difference. Also, the outlay of workshop materials and equipment of the larger industrial or production prisons is not apparent.

In relation to the education programme undertaken by prisoners in gaol, I advise that the Education Section of the Department of Correctional Services has attached to it two full-time teachers from the Education Department. These officers operate from Yatala Prison, but can call on resources from the Department of Further Education particularly at country prisons.

Most of the classroom work involves literacy and numeracy courses, although fortnightly tutorial classes are conducted for subject areas within correspondence courses. These cover mechanics, building, secondary-tertiary subjects, commercial, vocational and rural studies. Attendance is on a "when required" basis. There are also classes for ethnic groups, present examples being migrant English for a Greek group and Aboriginal education for Aboriginal students.

The teachers also visit all other institutions from time to time and organise various groups and classes, examples being drama and role play at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, literacy, civics and numeracy classes at Port Augusta and future vocational courses at Cadell and Port Lincoln.

YUGOSLAVIAN SOCCER TOUR

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Yugoslavian soccer tour left Adelaide on September 29, 1977, and the main group arrived back on November 3, 1977. The tour was most successful. The following persons took part: R. Jakovljevic (manager), I. Marusic (captain/coach), J. Barlo, D. Stevanovic, M. Mladenovic, R. Sisic, M. Marvsic, V. Stojanovic, E. Markov. D. Kalinovic, F. Varga, V. Bozanic, M. Matovic, G. Spasujovic, Z. Marucic, J. Jerosimic, and M. Milosevic.

The SPEAKER: Before questions without notice commence, I advise the House that the Minister of Community Welfare will take questions for the Attorney-General, and the Minister of Transport will take questions for the Minister of Labour and Industry.

URANIUM

Mr. TONKIN: I direct my question to the Premier. Why has the Government allowed exploration and drilling for uranium to take place on an Aboriginal historic and relics reserve in the North of this State, without prior consultation with the Aboriginal people, contrary to the declared policy of the Australian Labor Party, and of the Government? A report in last Friday's *News* stated that uranium ore is among tonnes of mineral samples taken in drilling exploration on the historic reserve of Plumbago Station, near Mannahill, 400 km north-east of Adelaide. Plumbago Station was, I understand, declared an Aboriginal historic and relics reserve in 1972, because of significant Aboriginal rock paintings around the station.

The Deputy Federal A.L.P. Leader, Mr. Uren, on November 14, 1977, described drilling operations, defining the ore body, as the "initial stage of mining". The Attorney-General, who I understand is now in China, in this House has recently likened the potential destruction of Aboriginal sacred sites to the bulldozing of a church. Continued drilling for uranium at Plumbago Station as confirmed by the *News* report thus violates stated Labor Party policy on both counts of uranium and Aboriginal rights.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There are several misstatements in the Leader's question. First, it is not an Aboriginal reserve—

Mr. Tonkin: I didn't say it was.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: You said it was an Aboriginal and historic reserve: it is not that, either. The area is just historic reserve, and that declaration occurs under the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act. The area that is declared such a reserve is so proclaimed to protect the relics thereon, and does not impose a ban on entry to the land by anyone, nor does it impose any restraint on activities on that land, so long as the relics are not interfered with.

Mr. Tonkin: Have the Aboriginal people been asked?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Federal Minister is reported to have referred to historic sacred sites in that area: there are historic sites but no sacred sites. Further, over many years no representations at any stage have been received from the Aboriginal people, because there are no Aboriginal people living in that area.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you ask the Aboriginal people?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No representations or objections were received at the times any exploration licences were issued. Further, there are no Aboriginal people living in that area, and there are no sacred sites. The fact of mineral exploration in that area is not new: it dates back for a long time. Mineral prospecting in the Olary province generally began many years ago about the same time as the discovery of the great Broken Hill lode of New South Wales. Geological investigations were first initiated in the region by Professor Sir Douglas Mawson about 60 years ago, and since 1945 by officers of the Mines Department. The area embraced by Plumbago Station has great mineral potential, as evidenced by the interest of fossickers, prospectors, and exploration companies, and discoveries include iron ores, fluorite, graphite, felspar, beryl, scheelite, gold, copper/cobalt/nickel ores, and uranium.

The current exploration licences over the area held by Esso Exploration, Minad/Teton and Carpentaria Exploration, and a third one by Minad/Teton. Plumbago Station, as I indicated, is a historic reserve, under the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Act, 1972. Section 23 of the Act provides:

> A person shall not wilfully or negligently deface, damage, uncover, expose, excavate or otherwise interfere with any relic in an historic reserve or carry out any act likely to

endanger relics thereon without the written consent of the Minister.

All exploration activities involving the use of declared equipment require the approval of the Director of Mines, and the Environment Department is consulted before any approval is given. Areas in which intensive drilling is currently in progress were inspected by an officer of the relics unit from the Environment Department before approval was given for this programme. To our knowledge, none of the cave paintings or other significant relics in the area have been disturbed by exploration activities, and the Environment Department has raised no objection to controlled mineral exploration in the area.

There is a case, we believe, for a proper assessment (a proper inventory, if you like) of the relics that exist in that particular area, and then, if necessary, action to preserve from the operations of the Mining Act the locations in which those relics are found. An investigation in relation to that matter will proceed.

Dr. Eastick: Before or after they're destroyed?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There have not been any destroyed and conditions have been placed on all licences in the area, ensuring that if people are involved in any way in damage to any of those relics they are in breach of their licence. I know that the Opposition is suddenly trying to give the appearance that it is against exploration.

Mr. Mathwin: We moved before—

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a peculiar stance that the Opposition has adopted.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order again.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position is, I think, quite clear. Mr. Viner was wrong in a number of respects. There are no sacred sites; it is a historic reserve. Close co-operation has taken place between the Mines Department and the Environment Department before any exploration programme is approved and conditions are attached to all exploration licences. In addition, as I have said, we are now investigating further to try to get a complete inventory of the relics there to see whether it is necessary then to take any further action, not to reserve Plumbago Station from the Mining Act but to reserve those areas where the relics are located from the operations of the Mining Act. I am not in a position now to say whether or not that will take place.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether, because of the blatant politically motivated misrepresentations of a Mr. Olson (a pharmacist of dubious address), who passes himself off as an L.C.L. spokesman regarding the sealing of the Stuart Highway, he will once again explain—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: The people in my part of the world are not sure what he is, but are sure that he does not tell the truth. Will the Minister once again explain to the House the Government's attitude towards the sealing of the Stuart Highway? In a comical political advertisement on channel 4 television, Mr. Olson stated that the Federal Government was anxious to fund money towards—

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member needs a little assistance with this matter, because he constantly refers to Mr. Olson, and I am sure that Mr. Olson is not appearing on channel 4, or any other channel, at present.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Has the honourable member for Stuart finished asking his question?

Mr. KENEALLY: No, Sir. I take the Leader's point, but he knows to whom I am referring. Because of the advertisements on channel 4, in which it was stated that the Federal Government was anxious to fund money towards the sealing of the Stuart Highway, and because of the claim that the only reason that it was not happening now was that the State Government had refused to place a proper priority on the highway, giving priority to the South-Western Freeway and the Port Pirie to Port Augusta road, and that this priority would be changed after the coming election should the L.C.L.—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now making political comment.

Mr. KENEALLY: I was repeating almost verbatim, for the benefit of the House, the political advertisement. I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and ask the Minister to explain once again what is the position with regard to this highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not seen the advertisement. I do not know the gentleman, although I understand that his name is Olson and that he is the L.C.L. candidate for the Federal Government District of Grey.

Mr. Tonkin: Wrong!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader should know the names of his Party's candidates. Whoever he is, I have been informed that some untruthful statements have been made on television, and I think that the record ought to be put straight for the benefit of the House.

Mr. Venning: You're not the one to put it straight.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Rocky River will keep quiet, he might learn something. The priorities set by the State Government for the expenditure of the depleted funds we received this financial year were approved by the Federal Minister. He has the right, under the legislation, to determine the order of priorities and either approve or amend the suggested order put up by South Australia. Mr. Nixon approved of the programme. So, for this Mr. X (whoever he may be), or Mr. Sinclair, who also finished up with an awful lot of egg on his face (and I will tell the Leader more about that in a moment), to try to blame the State Government and say that it has not set a high enough priority for the Stuart Highway is nothing more than a condemnation of the Federal Minister (Peter Nixon).

The hard cold facts of the case are that a fortnight ago the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Hon. Ian Sinclair), who is also the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, went to Alice Springs and was told in clear terms by Country Party members in that town and by other leading citizens, including the Mayor, that, unless the Commonwealth Government mended its ways and provided the State with decent finance for roads, the Country Party member for the Northern Territory would not receive any support in Alice Springs or, indeed, in the rest of the Territory. As a result of that discussion, Mr. Sinclair reacted by issuing a press statement on the air that he had consulted with Mr. Nixon and, as a result, South Australia was to receive an additional share of moneys specifically designed for the Stuart Highway.

When I was asked to comment, I said, "That's great. I'll commend Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Nixon for doing it; that's exactly what we want. But let me first check it." I rang Mr. Nixon and said, "Congratulations! It's delightful to hear

what you have had to say." He said, "I've said nothing of the kind." When I saw him last Thursday when finalising the railways agreement, I asked, "Have you reached the core of the problem?" He said, "The message came down from on high that something had to be done, and I'll be making an announcement in Alice Springs on Sunday." Having checked yesterday and today, I find that he has made no announcement. All he has done is to leave a hell of a lot of egg on the face of his Deputy Leader.

URANIUM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what were the titles of the reports which were prepared by the Premier's Public Service people and which he publicly claims led to his change of mind on uranium; who were these officers; and why has he not made these reports available? In the Labor Party's Federal election advertisement on uranium, which has now been withdrawn, the Premier says that he asked his Public Service people to check the safeguards, and that it was their reports which led him to change his mind on uranium. At no time have any reports prepared by the South Australian Mines Department, or any other person or organisation, been disclosed to this House or made public.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I thought that was a Question on Notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question asked by the honourable Deputy Leader is already on notice.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked what were the titles of the reports and why the Premier had not made them available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, the report did not have any title other than, "Report on the safety of providing uranium to a customer country", or something to that effect. I do not know that it was specifically titled. It was a very considerable report. The major officers involved in it were officers of my Policy Secretariat. Mr. Guerin and Mr. Lewkowicz were responsible for the report. After the report had been presented to the Government, a special working party on the development of material in the report was established, but it has not yet finally reported.

YOUTH SERVICE ASSISTANTS

Mr. GROOM: Has the Minister of Community Welfare yet made a decision on the request from the Marion-Brighton Community Council for Social Development to allow the two youth service assistants from his department's Brighton district office to work under that council's recently established unemployment committee? From press and other reports, it appears that the community council has been able to enlist a quite outstanding array of community representation on its unemployment committee. The calibre of the committee makes it very likely that it will be able to make a real contribution in the alleviation of unemployment in the Marion-Brighton area. A decision by the Minister to second the youth services assistants to the committee would do a great deal to help make the committee more effective.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Knowing of the honourable member's interest in this topic, I was able to come prepared, and I can inform him and the House that I have arranged to have the two youth service assistants at Brighton work at the direction of the unemployment committee. I believe that the initiative taken by the Marion-Brighton community council is most exciting and, because the membership of the committee includes people from business and industry, there should be considerable benefits to unemployed young people in the area. The placing of the youth service assistants at the disposal of the committee is subject to certain conditions. These are that the overall direction of the two youth workers will be determined by the committee; that day-to-day control will be exercised by my department's Brighton district officer (Mr. Tom Woods), who will carry out the overall directions of the committee; and that the committee will be required to provide monthly reports to my department's regional director for the southern metropolitan area on the activities of the youth service assistants and any changes proposed in their programmes.

The final point is that the salaries and expenses of the two youth service assistants are met from State unemployment relief funds provided through the Government's youth work unit. At this stage that funding is assured until the end of this financial year. Hopefully, the people of Australia will elect a Labor Government next Saturday, and then maybe we can get more finance to assist.

The SPEAKER: Order!

URANIUM

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy accept that the granting of uranium drilling and exploration licences in the Olary area, an area with significant historical Aboriginal sites, is in direct conflict with the attitude of the touring Attorney-General who, on November 15 (page 749 of *Hansard*), expressed concern about such action by saying that it was "about as bloody disgusting as I can imagine". One could conjecture that the Attorney-General has flown the coop because of the tremendous conflict occurring opposite.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One can understand why the member for Light was the previous Leader of the Opposition—there are almost as many mistakes in that question as there were in the question asked by the present Leader of the Opposition. I have little doubt that the next Leader on the Opposition side will ask questions that will contain even more mis-statements than are contained in those asked by the current Leader.

First, exploration licences for uranium are not given; an exploration licence under the Mining Act (which the member for Light, with other members who were members of the House at the time voted for) provides for a precious stones prospecting permit, or an exploration licence with respect to extractive minerals, or an exploration licence with respect to all minerals other than extractive minerals and precious stones.

Secondly, the condition of any of the licences that have been granted in the Plumbago Station area is that all relics must be cared for effectively and properly; great care must be taken. Before any drilling programme is approved or before any declared equipment can be used, the programme must be approved by the Mines Department, which consults with the relics unit of the Environment Department to ensure that no damage occurs.

Dr. Eastick: You will come back to the question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Light will get his full serve—he need not worry.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about the Attorney.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My understanding was that

the Attorney was talking about mining activity as such taking place on sacred ground so far as Aborigines were concerned. Let us be quite clear that a mining operation, involving open-cut mining in particular, will destroy a significant area of ground, whereas exploration carried out properly under close supervision will not. I do not see any inconsistency between the Attorney's statement on this matter and the Government's policy in relation to Plumbago Station.

Dr. Eastick: You can't—

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He wanted to ask the question so that he could make a point, but he does not want to hear the reply. That is the trouble with members of the Opposition—they are all like that. They never want to hear the reply.

Mr. Wotton: If you answered them, it might be different.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Murray is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: And ignorant, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I repeat what I told the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon that there are no sacred sites at Plumbago Station; there are historic relics, but no sacred sites.

Dr. Eastick: I never said "sacred".

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light is out of order. The honourable Minister is out of order in answering interjections.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the Attorney-General was commenting about mining in the Northern Territory, he was referring to mining for uranium on ground that was sacred to Aborigines. The comment that the member for Light quoted from the Attorney-General referred to that. If that is not the case, my recollection of the matter is different from that of the member for Light, and that would not surprise me. Nevertheless, I believe I have demonstrated enough to show no inconsistency as far as the Government is concerned.

For some reason unknown to me, it seems that Opposition members want to say that exploration is the same as mining. That is simply not the case. The only activity that has taken place in this area is exploration. There has been no mining, and the Attorney-General's references were to mining and not exploration.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order, as is the honourable member for Davenport.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. KENEALLY: During a question earlier today I referred to a so-called Liberal spokesman, Mr. Olson. Of course, I was wrong in referring to Mr. Olson because the gentleman to whom I meant to refer is Mr. Oswald. I would not want to be guilty of reflecting on Mr. Olson in that way. I apologise for any embarrassment, temporary though it may have been, that Mr. Olson may have suffered by being associated with the L.C.L. candidate for Grey. I regret the reference I made to Mr. Olson. The fact is that the L.C.L. candidate for Grey has made so little impact—

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

URANIUM

Mr. ALLISON: In view of the concern being expressed currently within the Aboriginal community over possible damage to Aboriginal historic relics on Plumbago Station as a result of mineral exploration, will the Minister of Mines and Energy now undertake consultation with the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust and with Aboriginal community leaders as a part of the investigations to which he referred earlier today when he told the House that he would enter into them as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would like to know specific details from the honourable member about the concern that has allegedly been expressed by Aborigines in respect of Plumbago Station. Having said that, I make clear to the member for Mount Gambier and his erstwhile colleagues that, whenever any exploration takes place on Aboriginal lands in South Australia, the company concerned, acting through people who were formerly members of the Aboriginal Affairs Department in South Australia and partly through the Community Welfare Department and Commonwealth officers, has to secure the agreement of Aborigines to the proposed programme.

A full consultation must take place under a policy that has been approved by the State Government. If any Aboriginal lands are involved in an exploration programme, no exploration takes place without the full backing of representatives of the Aborigines concerned. That process has been carried out. It is normally a difficult process and, where the Aborigines have not wanted exploration, exploration has not taken place. I wish members opposite would get their research officers, who are paid for by the taxpayers, to do their jobs properly and research questions properly before they are asked in this House.

SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education, through his department, examine the possibility of having Education Department schools fitted with burglar and fire alarm systems? In the past few months at least two schools in Whyalla have been subjected to fires and one to vandalism. I point out that, in two fires at one primary school in Whyalla, damage amounted to $75 000, and the vandalism at the high school caused damage estimated at more than this. These types of uncalled for malicious acts are becoming more prevalent in Whyalla, because of, in my opinion, the poor employment opportunity within the city, and also because schools generally are now being used more for many purposes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter is now being considered by my department. No schools at present have either burglar or fire alarms that have been installed at departmental expense but some schools have alarm systems that have been installed at the expense of the school council. As this has happened only recently, it is too soon to be able to give a proper evaluation of the success of these ventures, but we can say from information available that there have been no breakings or other significant damage at those schools that have installed this equipment.

The Minister of Works now tells me that one system has been installed at a high school in the eastern suburbs at departmental expense. He would know because the Public

Buildings Department would be involved in the matter. Therefore, I stand corrected on that point. However, we intend to install systems in certain schools on a trial basis, and at present the Security Officer of the department is negotiating with suppliers about the appropriate equipment that should be used. I cannot say at this stage whether a school or schools in Whyalla may be involved in this initial programme, but I will discuss the matter with my officers to ascertain whether that would be possible. The reason for negotiating with suppliers is that there is a doubt as to the relative merits of the various types of system on offer. The silent system is one that links with the local fire brigade headquarters and police, and that is expensive, although it maximises the opportunities of catching the people involved. The cheaper system rings a loud bell, and that can be effective in warning those involved but not in catching them, because, when they hear the noise, off they go. There can be a combination of the two systems, but that is more expensive. Mr. Simmons of the department is negotiating with suppliers, and we will install some systems in a few schools on a trial basis.

SAMCOR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government will intervene in the dispute between Samcor and independent contractors who now cart meat from Gepps Cross for butchers, in order to ensure that Samcor will withdraw its demand that independent contractors and not butchers will pay the cleaning charges on beef hooks, skids, and gambrels? As the Minister will know (and I guess all Government members will know), since the end of September butchers have had the responsibility of moving their meat out of Gepps Cross, as Samcor has gone out of the business of carting the meat.

Besides the cartage charges, there are handling and cleaning charges. The abattoirs makes those charges primarily to the butchers. At the beginning of the arrangement, the end of September, the arrangement was that the cleaning charges should be paid by the butchers and that Samcor would charge the butchers directly because, after all, the independent contractors are only carters of the meat. However, the abattoirs (for reasons best known to itself, but suspected to be administrative muddle and the desire to make some money, to rip off the independent contractors) arbitrarily and without any warning to the independent contractors changed the system.

Samcor notified the contractors a few weeks after the arrangement had been entered into that in future it would debit the independent contractors with the cleaning charges, which are, in fact, heavy—10c for each beef hook, 5c for a mutton skid and 5c for a gambrel. Not only that, but Samcor has continued, despite the protests of the carters, to debit the contractors with this charge each week. The contractor who has been to see me has been receiving a weekly account for in excess of, on average, $1 000 just for the cleaning charges. Samcor is demanding that these amounts be paid, but it is impossible for the independent contractors now to recover charges already incurred from their customers, the butchers.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have finished the explanation, Sir. I have made that point. There have been discussions, I think through the good offices of the member for Ross Smith originally, but they have come to nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There have been discussions between Samcor and the independent contractors. Mr. Atkinson, who is liaison officer, arranged them last week, and the suggestion he made was that if the contractors would in future pay these charges Samcor would waive the back charges. Some consideration was given to that suggestion, but then apparently Samcor's board would not back up Mr. Atkinson, and the contractors have been told that they have to pay the lot. Of course, that is typical of a monopoly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in commenting. I hope he does not continue in this vein.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The whole position is unjust.

The SPEAKER: Order! Now the honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not do that, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I hope he does not, because this is the third occasion that he has.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The whole situation is unsatisfactory, and it has to be cleaned up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member mentioned, during the course of his tirade against Samcor—

Mr. Millhouse: Not a tirade; I was simply setting out the facts.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member mentioned the member for Ross Smith. I acknowledge that the member for Ross Smith has been making representations on behalf of the contractors or carters in this matter. My understanding of the position is that the matter is still subject to negotiation and that the board will meet tomorrow to consider the negotiations and representations that have been made. I will pass on the comments that have been made (those worthy of passing on)—

Mr. Millhouse: They are all worthy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —to the Minister of Agriculture, and bring down a report for the honourable member.

HOME SAVINGS GRANTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for Planning say whether funds provided by the Federal Government for home savings grants under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for 1977-78 are adequate? The question flows from a newspaper report of November 24 headed "Not much left for home aid, Government told", which states in part:

> The Federal Government has almost run out of money for its home savings grants and may delay further payments until mid-1978, the Minister for Housing (Mr. Newman) has told the Cabinet. Mr. Newman warned in a secret submission to the Cabinet last month that there would be a six-month waiting list from January unless more funds were provided . . . Applications for home savings grants are now at a rate of more than 50 000 a year, the submission says. Unless additional funds are made available, grants approved after January will not be paid this financial year, and there will be a very long waiting list by the end of the financial year. Funding difficulties will increase in future years.

In view of the seriousness of the report to which I have

referred, and the fact that, apparently, the Fraser Government undertook—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now asking his question again.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will perhaps rephrase that, with your approval, Mr. Speaker, by saying that my question has arisen because of the apparent refusal of the Commonwealth Government to listen to the Minister for Housing on making additional funds available for home building. In view of the public concern, I should appreciate any information the Minister can give me.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have no information on home savings grants other than which appeared in the press. As there has been no denial, to my knowledge, by any Federal Government Minister, I presume that there will be delays next year in the making of payments for home savings grants. Regarding money provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, I have to report that the current Federal Government has continued with its completely and utterly miserly attitude to the agreement. Over the past three years, for the first two of them the Federal Government provided no increase in funds whatsoever, and for this financial year the Federal Government has provided an increase in funds of slightly over 3 per cent. For three years, we have had a 3 per cent increase in funds, at a time during which building costs have risen by about 50 per cent. This position has applied equally to all States, with the result that the housing industry is in some difficulty in all States. I had some hopes that, with the Federal election, there would be an announcement from Mr. Newman or Mr. Fraser of additional support under the agreement, but that has not been forthcoming.

Mr. Evans: Are you saying that in three years building costs have increased by about 50 per cent in South Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: By between 40 per cent and 50 per cent.

Mr. Evans: You said by about 50 per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: About 50 per cent, if the honourable member likes it that way. Although there has been a substantial rise in building costs, the rotten Federal Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —has not matched that with increased funds.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe it that it has been ruled previously that Ministers should not debate politically when replying. I believe that the Minister has been doing that—and doing it in language that is not acceptable within the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you are ordering me to withdraw. All I said was that the Federal Government was rotten.

The SPEAKER: To which word is the honourable member objecting?

Mr. EVANS: I am not asking the Minister to withdraw anything. I am merely asking that he be not allowed to debate in the terms in which he has been doing and in the type of language he has been using.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In circumstances where younger families within the community are being penalised, not only in employment but also when they are endeavouring to own their own home, it is an absolutely appalling situation that, when building costs have risen to the extent to which they have risen, the Federal Government has refused to expand assistance under the agreement. That is an appalling attitude, because the people who are penalised are not the people sitting in big fat jobs but the younger members of the community who are penalised through having fewer employment opportunities than anyone else, who are penalised in terms of promotion, and who are now being penalised in terms of finance available for housing. That is a disgraceful situation, and I throw it squarely at the door of the Fraser Government.

CHELTENHAM MURDER

Mr. MATHWIN: In view of the shocking circumstances surrounding the death of the Cheltenham murder victim, can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government will increase the $5 000 reward offered for information leading to the arrest of the person responsible? It would appear that a $5 000 reward is considerably less than are the rewards being offered in connection with major crimes in other States. As an example, rewards of up to $50 000 are offered in Queensland for information regarding murder cases, and at present the Queensland Government is offering a reward of $20 000 in connection with a recent bank robbery.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I do not know how it is possible to set a scale for such things. I received a recommendation from the Deputy Commissioner of Police at noon on Monday that a reward of $5 000 be offered. I sat next to Assistant Commissioner Calder at a function at the Police Club about 45 minutes later and discussed the matter with him. He said that that was considered an appropriate level for the reward. An hour later, I put the matter before Cabinet and it was approved. Cabinet approved the amount the police authorities thought appropriate.

FOUNDRY NOISE

Mr. ABBOTT: What action has the Minister for Planning taken or what action does he contemplate as a consequence of his recent meeting with residents of Bowden and Brompton regarding coal dust and noise pollution emanating from Ellery's Foundry Services, in Drayton Street, Bowden? Bowden and Brompton residents claim that their lives are being adversely affected by 24-hour noise and coal dust from the foundry. Children and aged parents are most affected and are being kept awake at night.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: These residents came to see me to discover what could be done under the Planning and Development Act regarding this foundry. I explained to them that, as the foundry was an existing use when the Planning and Development Act was passed by this Parliament, its continuation as a foundry was completely protected in relation to planning decisions. Instead, under the Planning and Development Act, extensions of the foundry use within the boundaries of land held by the foundry at the time the Act was passed also were protected by the Act. Any action that could be taken would have to be under the clean air regulations or the noise legislation.

After discussing the matter with the residents, I referred the whole question to the Minister of Health and the Minister for the Environment. The residents pointed out to me that, whilst they were most concerned at the problems they were experiencing, they did not want action taken that would cause the foundry to close, throwing about 40 people out of work. I made that point, too, in the minute I have transmitted to the Minister of Health and

the Minister for the Environment. I have little doubt that, with some effective co-operation between the officers of those departments and the company concerned, some effective amelioration of the conditions of the residents of Bowden and Brompton can be achieved.

TURBO GENERATORS

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what Government assistance would be required to enable the turbo generators for the new Port Augusta power station to be built at Whyalla rather than overseas, and what studies have been made into the possible benefits that would result to Whyalla from such assistance? I understand that the Electricity Trust is in favour of importing turbo generators from Japan because of the cost advantage involved. The building of the generators by a firm such as Rayrolle Parsons, which has facilities available at Whyalla, would bring major benefits to the community, particularly in employment. Will the Government therefore give Whyalla whatever assistance possible to obtain this work for the town?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There have been some detailed investigations of this matter. Obviously, the Government has a policy of preference for local industry; indeed, preference for local industry as against interstate competition, and a further degree of preference for local industry as against overseas competition. The question that arises in relation to turbo generators is entirely a question of the degree of assistance that should be given. How much more does one pay? It now seems that, if all the work were to be done locally or if the Rayrolle Parsons equipment were to be imported from the United Kingdom, the increase in cost to the Electricity Trust and therefore to South Australia generally would be substantial. I understand that ETSA has not left the matter there but is examining the question of what part of the work could be done locally. The trust is not in a position to make any further statement on the matter. Suffice to say that I do not believe that it helps when tenders are being considered to have the nature of them the subject of public debate, particularly in Parliament.

Mr. Dean Brown: If they're going overseas it's highly important.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Turbo generators have always come from overseas. The turbo generators that have been installed at Torrens Island have come from Rayrolle Parsons and from overseas, and we have had trouble with them, too; in fact, the turbo generators at Torrens Island took about 18 months in one case to achieve the rate of capacity. We have had considerable difficulty with it. However, this is very much a technical matter. We must rely to a significant extent on the advice of the competent officers of the Electricity Trust who are concerned to see if possible that local industry is supported, but they will not be influenced by, nor will the Government be influenced by, the political prattlings of the member for Davenport. I can assure honourable members and the public generally of that.

Mr. Dean Brown: Put the money into this instead of the Government—

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

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the $1 650 000 grant for urban local roads made by the Federal Government and reported in the *News* yesterday is sufficient to expedite necessary urban road works? The report states that South Australia is to get a sum of $12 000 000 from the Federal Government and that, of that sum, $5 250 000 is for rural arterial roads, $5 025 000 is for rural local roads, and a very much reduced sum of $1 650 000 is for urban local roads. In my District of Mawson constant agitation has occurred over the past several years in relation to Flaxmill Road, about which the Minister is well aware and which he has told me cannot be upgraded until the latter part of next year. Brodie Road is also in dire need of attention.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The funds referred to in the newspaper report are the funds that have been announced, I think for the fourth time, by Mr. Nixon as being funds for South Australia. This time he has used a couple of categories and has simply said that he has now approved of the expenditure of those sums. It is the same $40 400 000 that—

Mr. Russack: Mr. Jones used to have a say.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are really concerned with the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, who it was alleged in a report made that statement. He was the man who was quoted as having approved it. We are not very concerned about what happened in Mr. Jones's period. We have suffered Mr. Nixon for about two years. Thank goodness, after Saturday, we will not have to suffer him again for a long time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: South Australia is receiving 10 per cent less this financial year in real money terms than it did in the past financial year; we have suffered a 10 per cent reduction in funds under Peter Nixon. In fact, we are promised that that reduction will continue for the next two financial years, unless the Fraser Administration is defeated on Saturday, which I am sure it will be.

HORWOOD BAGSHAW LIMITED

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Premier tell the House what investigations have been carried out by the Government following retrenchments by Horwood Bagshaw Limited in Mannum in October this year, what the results of such investigations have been so far, and whether the Government now has positive proposals regarding future permanent employment in Mannum? I seek this information in an attempt to avoid the considerable uncertainty in the future that is reflected by residents of Mannum.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a full report on the matter for the honourable member.

THORNDON PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Education ensure that the urgent needs of Thorndon Park Primary School for classroom accommodation are met by the provision of an additional two classrooms by February 2, 1978? Thorndon Park Primary School has had to use its activity room as a classroom throughout the whole of this year. A classroom, which the Minister promised for December 2, has still not been delivered. In addition to the need for this classroom another classroom will be needed as a result of new enrolments for 1978. Parents and staff are concerned that the school is operating under great difficulty, that not only the activity room but also the staff room have had to be used for teaching purposes, and that repeated requests for assistance have brought no positive response from the Minister's department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will have to get a report on the matter from my department, because I am not aware of the current situation. I do not know what was the undertaking that the honourable member says I gave. That the school has had correspondence in the past with my department or personally with me could well be the position, but I do not personally recall having written recently to the school. However, I will take up the matter with my department and ascertain what is the position.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to investigate the case of Mr. B. D. Evans, who was examined at Flinders Medical Centre in October this year, a case I raised in a grievance debate last week?

When I raised this matter in the House I said that the local general practitioner believed this person had had a heart attack and he was admitted to Flinders just before midnight on a Saturday at the end of October. He was sent home in a taxi, and arrived at his house at about 4.30 on the Sunday morning. Through one of its officers the hospital made a public statement denying that the person was sent home after a few hours, and also denying that the person had had a heart attack. This person spent a fortnight after the following Tuesday in the Stirling District Hospital convalescing from the heart attack and he is still at home convalescing. He will guarantee by way of a statutory declaration that he was sent home in a taxi, arriving home at about 4.30 a.m.

I have received representations from about nine other people who seem genuine and who make similar complaints that they have been sent home early in taxis or have not been admitted but subsequently have been admitted within a few hours to other hospitals. I believe the case I raised in this House was genuine. I believe it is possible for a hospital to make a mistake and for doctors to make mistakes, and the matter should be clarified in fairness to the person who has been hurt, because he has been virtually accused of being a liar. He objects to that, and it is causing ill feeling—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will take up the matter with my colleague. I am surprised to hear of the plurality of complaints referred to by the honourable member. I think he would agree that just as many people from my district use the Flinders Medical Centre as use it from his district. I have not had one complaint about bad treatment or service at the centre.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OIL & GAS CORPORATION PTY. LTD. (GUARANTEE) BILL

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorise the Treasurer of this State to give a guarantee in respect of certain payments and interest thereon to be made to the Government of the Commonwealth. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The need for this short Bill arises as a result of an examination by the Crown Solicitor of the provisions of subsection (1) of section 14 of the Industries Development Act, 1941-1977. This provision, in effect, authorises the Treasurer, subject to the approval of the Industries Development Committee, to guarantee repayments of certain loans made or to be made to persons. It does not, however, permit the Treasurer to guarantee the payment by one party to another party where no loan is involved, for example, in circumstances where one party is purchasing certain assets from the other party.

An application for the guarantee of such a payment will shortly be made to the committee by the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary limited, which is a company jointly owned by the South Australian Gas Company through its subsidiary Gas Investments Proprietary Limited, and the Piplines Authority of South Australia. The company has been formed to acquire an interest in petroleum production and the petroleum exploration licences in the Cooper Basin gas fields, this being the subject of an agreement with the Commonwealth.

Members may recall that, in a statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for National Resources on November 8 last, certain details of that agreement between the Commonwealth and the company were made public. In the present context the agreement provided for an initial payment of $12 450 000, together with additional payment obligations being equivalent to the Commonwealth's own obligations to Delhi International Oil Corporation. The amount to be the subject of a guarantee under this measure represents those additional payment obligations (those to the Delhi International Oil Corporation) being the equivalent of $US 8 558 000, together with interest.

I would emphasise that this measure does not, of itself, give a guarantee to the company. All it does is set up the machinery for the Treasurer to give such a guarantee if he receives the approval of the Industries Development Committee constituted under the Industries Development Act, 1941-1977. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the giving of a guarantee by the Treasurer subject to the financial limitations and in the circumstances adverted to above.

Later:

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I can reassure the House that this legislation is based on pure common sense. It is a machinery Bill empowering the Industries Development Committee to investigate and to advise the Treasurer whether or not to support a guarantee, without involving itself in any financial risk or financial payment. It takes over from the Commonwealth an obligation to Delhi International Oil Corporation. In this legislation, the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Pty. Ltd., a company jointly owned by the South Australian Gas Company, through its subsidiary Gas Investments Pty. Ltd., and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, were involved in a transaction regarding the Cooper Basin gas fields, following the State Government's involvement in those gas fields.

The obligation of the State is to guarantee to Delhi the continuity and the performance of the company. For that reason the amount involved, which has been raised outside of the Industries Development Committee and outside of State resources, is expressed in United States dollars. It

must be done that way, as it is possible to get a fluctuation in the dollar rate, especially in dealing with millions of dollars. The House has complete satisfaction that the Industries Development Committee will investigate the whole transaction. The committee has the ability and the expertise, made available to it through officers of the Treasury Department, to provide and to seek the responsible financial statements and to investigate properly the creditability of the company involved.

During the time I served on the Industries Development Committee, I was most grateful to the staff made available to the committee through the Treasury and the Economic Division. Most of the committee's decisions were certainly assisted by the staff made available to it and their help in interpreting the various documents and balance sheets that had to be considered. The Industries Development Committee has built up a good reputation in this regard. The South Australian Gas Company stands in good stead as a company that has served South Australia well; I would think its creditability would be beyond doubt. Similarly, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia is another large undertaking. There is no risk, as I see it, in the Government's giving a guarantee on behalf of those companies.

In technical terms, the Bill backs up the creditability of these companies and backs up their performance, which is so important to South Australia. It is necessary for Delhi International Oil Corporation to be assured that it will receive payment of the moneys involved in United States dollars, as was previously arranged by the Commonwealth Government. This legislation simply gives to the Industries Development Committee the machinery to make the recommendation to the Treasurer.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-76. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to effect a further minor consequential amendment to the Health Act by inserting another item in the list of amendments to that Act contained in one of the schedules to the Health Commission Act. Plans are now well under way for the amalgamation of the Public Health Department with the Health Commission. The Health Act as it now stands provides that the Chairman of the Central Board of Health shall be the permanent head of the department, and, as the department will be abolished soon, it is desirable that the Act should be amended so that in future the Chairman will simply be a person nominated by the Minister.

The schedule of amendments to the Health Act into which this amendment is to be inserted will come into operation on the day on which the department is abolished. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new item in the first schedule. The new item provides that the Chairman of the Central Board of Health shall be a person nominated by the Minister.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 1. Page 1160.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): When this matter was being considered previously, I said that the Law Society of South Australia Incorporated had expressed grave reservations about the legislation, and that legal practitioners had raised several queries needed to be considered by the Law Society. I say immediately that I am absolutely amazed that the Attorney-General, who introduced this legislation and who has other important legislation before the House (the sittings of which are to conclude, we understand, other than for the joint sitting, at the end of this week), has seen fit to go traipsing off on a private jaunt to China.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill concerning the jaunt of the Attorney-General, and I hope the honourable Leader will stick to the Bill.

Mr. TONKIN: I understood that the Attorney was in charge of this Bill and, from his second reading explanation, he was concerned about this Bill and about others that he had already introduced. I find it incredible that he should be allowed by the Premier and Cabinet to go away in this fashion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg for the second and final time. The honourable Leader is transgressing: there is nothing in the Bill concerning the Attorney-General or his jaunt away. Many times Ministers are called away and are not here when their Bill is before the House.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, you just scolded me and put me on my final points demerit in this Chamber. All I was doing was saying "Hear, hear!" in support of your ruling. I was not being nasty to you, nor was I interrupting the proceedings of the House, so I think you were a little hard on me.

The SPEAKER: I accept the honourable member's explanation, but I do not intend to be lenient. I intend to get up and call order and then warn a member; that is the discretion of the Chair. If necessary, I will name him immediately. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: Wherever the Attorney-General has gone, he is not in this House; he is not here looking after the affairs of the Government. As he is the chief law officer of this Government (such as it is), I believe this is where his place is and that he should be here. Having made that comment (and I make no reference to the fact that he has gone on a slow boat anywhere)—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader knows that he must not continue in that vein.

Mr. TONKIN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. The Law Society of South Australia Incorporated has now had an opportunity (belated) of examining this legislation. It has complained bitterly that it has not been consulted until this relatively late stage. It has now considered the Bill and the amendment contained in it. I will read now the comments that the Law Society made about the Bill:

> The Law Society is opposed to the proposed amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act affording a right of audience in all courts and tribunals to legal practitioners in the employ of the Crown in the form in which it appears in the draft Bill and makes the following contentions:
>
> 1. In the public interest, the Law Society is opposed to legal practitioners employed by Government departments (other than the Crown Solicitor) having a right of audience before courts. The basis of such opposition is that there is a relationship of master and

servant in such cases between the litigant and the employed solicitor and there is a real risk of a conflict arising between the solicitor's duty to the court and his duty to obey the directions given to him by his employer. Such a conflict is not consistent with the proper administration of justice and for this reason the Law Society is opposed to any change in the law which would bring such conflict about.

2. The society has no objection to an amendment ensuring that the Crown Solicitor and legal practitioners in his employ have access to courts and tribunals. However, where it is the policy of legislation to deny access of the legal profession to particular courts and tribunals, the Crown should be in exactly the same position as the private citizen. It is inconsistent that the Government should preserve its own access to courts and tribunals through legally qualified persons while denying a similar right to the ordinary citizen. Clearly, the proposed section 69 would override other legislation limiting the right to legal representation.

That matter is extremely clearly put. There is obviously a conflict regarding the proper administration of justice if, in fact, the solicitor's duty to the court and his duty to obey directions given to him by an employer are in opposition—there must be a conflict. It is an extremely difficult situation for a solicitor caught in that position and certainly not in the best interests of the course of justice. I have been informed that the right of the Crown Solicitor and legal practitioners in his employ to have access to courts and tribunals has never seriously been questioned, although there has been, as one legal practitioner put it to me, a sort of waffly doubt about the matter that has never really been resolved.

The Law Society is a most influential and learned body, representing as it does the bulk of legal practitioners in this State. I am amazed that the Attorney-General did not see fit to consult the Law Society before bringing this legislation forward. In case there should be any question of the Law Society's acting improperly in communicating with me, and I understand with other members in this Parliament, let me make quite clear that it took the first opportunity that it could to deliver this letter and report to the Attorney-General, who, because of his absence (we are not allowed to say where), is not in a position to receive it.

Mr. Millhouse: The society even rang his office before it was delivered.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, and it took every possible step to make sure that it was communicated to him, because the Law Society also believed that he would be sufficiently interested in the legislation to wish to hear what it had to say. Whether the Premier is privy to this communication I do not know; perhaps he will tell us. He indicates that he is not. I am amazed still further; apparently, this afternoon is my day for complete amazement. I think that it is not good enough, and I suggest that the legislation be either held over until the Attorney-General returns, when perhaps he can tell us exactly what he has in mind, or opposed outright, because I cannot see much point in it. I believe that the legislation should be thrown out. The Law Society is not in favour of it and the Attorney-General is not here to give us any opposing point of view, so I do not think we should be wasting the time of this Parliament in those circumstances

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am glad that my indication last Thursday to the Minister then in charge of the House that I proposed to say something about this Bill held it up for a sufficient period so that the Law Society could consider it at its meeting yesterday. It was even worthwhile having to sit and listen to the waffle on Thursday of the Leader about the Bill while he played out time and while a conversation was held with me as to my attitude to the Bill, because the Law Society has now been able to consider the Bill, and it has expressed its strong opposition to it.

The history of the Bill is this: it was introduced into this place, I think last Tuesday, in typescript form—it had not even been printed. If my recollection is correct, it was dated November 29. I spoke to the Attorney-General, who I understand is in China now, and asked him whether he had discussed the matter with the Law Society. He told me that he had not. I therefore made it my duty to acquaint the President of the Law Society, and Mr. O'Loughlin, the Chairman of the Committee most concerned with Bills of this nature, with the Bill, and I let Mr. O'Loughlin have a copy of it. That was on Wednesday, I think, which was the first time he had seen the Bill. The Attorney told me that the real reason for the Bill was to allow Mr. John Sulan, who has gone to a new department (whatever it is called), to practise.

However, when I looked at the Bill I could see, even at a first glance, that it was far wider than that. I was fortified in that view when I discussed it with other members of the profession who have also looked at it. This Bill is very wide indeed. Because I knew that the original intention of the Government was that the Bill should be debated last Thursday, I put on the Notice Paper an amendment to restrict the ambit of the Bill, simply to include John Sulan and anyone else in that department, as a stop-gap measure. The Law Society council has looked at the Bill and expressed the opinion that it did at the meeting yesterday, and I now propose to oppose the Bill. I almost feel sorry for the Premier at the moment, because he has been left with the Bill.

Mr. Tonkin: In the lurch.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, he has been left apparently to steer the Bill through the House, knowing nothing about it and quite obviously not knowing of the opposition of the representative body of the profession to which he belongs. That is an embarrassing position. I suppose that, as always, he will show loyalty to his Ministers and defend the Bill as best he can and use his numbers to get it through the Chamber. However, I hope that we will at least be able to put a bit of backbone into the old gentlemen in the other place not to allow it to go through in its present form. If the Bill is passed at the second reading, which I expect to happen despite my opposition, I shall move the amendment I have on file and, if the amendment is not carried (and I do not think that it will be carried), I will oppose the third reading.

The Leader of the Opposition has read out the resolution of the Law Society, and I am pleased to see that the Premier is going to have a look at the Bill. The society's resolution sums up the society's views, and I need say very little more about those views. The operative sentence and the strongest sentence is contained in paragraph 1 of the resolution, the second sentence of which states:

> The basis of such opposition is that there is a relationship of master and servant in such cases between the litigant and the employed solicitor and there is a real risk of a conflict arising between the solicitor's duty to the court and his duty to obey the directions given to him by his employer.

That is the crux of the position. The Premier should be well aware of this matter, and I am sure that he has expressed it himself in times gone by. There is a conflict of interest. If you have employed people appearing in court for clients, they are not free agents to do the best for their client. They are certainly answerable to two masters—the

courts, as officers of the courts, and to their masters. In elucidating that matter, I will quote a few extracts from a judgment of Mr. Justice Fox, about whom we hear so much in his capacity as the uranium king in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, that is correct: he is the man in the Fox Commission, and he is also a judge of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory. His judgment *in re Bannister*, reported in part 10 of volume 5 of the *Australian Law Reports*, is just on this topic. *In re Bannister* concerned the Australian Legal Aid Office. Bannister was in charge of the Canberra office, but he did not have a practising certificate: he was not a lawyer, so the facts are not precisely the same as those proposed in the Bill. A number of the things the learned judge said in hid judgment are entirely apposite to this case. At page 104, he said:

> The office of solicitor is a creation of statute. In the public interest, and for the protection of the public, the professional activities of solicitors are regulated and controlled by statute, rules of court, and the general law, probably more so than any other profession or vocation.

I am sure the Premier is with me so far. The quote continues:

> The relationship between a solicitor and his client has special features. We are here concerned with the situation between a solicitor who, like most solicitors, holds himself out as acting for members of the public, or at least a number of clients, and need not consider for the moment the somewhat different position of a Crown Solicitor or a solicitor in a similar situation. In the ordinary case, the solicitor is the fiduciary agent of his client; personal trust and confidence and individual responsibility are central to the relationship. For the task in hand the solicitor must be free from conflicting obligations and pressures. It seems to me to be of the essence of the relationship that the solicitor retain individual, personal responsibility to his client. If a solicitor is employed by another, the retainer is with the latter.

What is proposed in the Bill? Certainly, what is possible under the Bill? We will have solicitors employed by God knows what department. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Fisheries Department the other day: I do not know why everyone thinks of that one first. Solicitors will be employed by all kinds of department and, under the Bill, acting for members of the public, not necessarily for the department. The Premier might well put on his spectacles and have a look. I refer him to proposed section 69 (1) in clause 2, and ask him to look at the following phrase:

> whether or not the Crown is a party to the proceedings.

The effect of the Bill is to allow solicitors employed by any department to act for members of the public.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is. When replying, perhaps the Premier will say why it is nonsense.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you sure the Attorney-General does not intend it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course he does. There is no doubt about that, and the Law Society picked it up immediately. The Premier having said "nonsense" I will read it, as follows:

> Notwithstanding any law, practice or custom—

That wipes out everything else. Did we not pass a Legal Services Act in a previous session that contained certain safeguards? This Bill wipes those out, of course: I do not know whether the Premier realises that. The provision continues:

> but subject to this section,—

only to this section—

> a legal practitioner employed by the Crown in right of the State—

that is, someone employed in a Government department—

> and acting in the course of that employment and with the approval of the Attorney-General—
>
> *(a)* shall have a right of audience before any court or tribunal established under any law of the State—

Supreme Court, down through to the magistrates court or even to the Underground Waters Appeal Tribunal—

> and
>
> *(b)* may otherwise act as a legal practitioner in any such court or tribunal,
>
> whether or not the Crown is a party to the proceedings.

If that does not mean that he will act for people other than the Crown, why is he given a right of audience? Of course it means that he can act for private persons. There is no other implication in that subclause, and the Premier knows it. That is the position we have. I will read another extract from His Honour's judgment (still on page 104), where he refers to Ross's case by saying:

> That case, however, does establish that a person may be aptly described as practising as a barrister and solicitor although he is an employee of the Crown and does not hold himself out, and is not capable of holding himself out, as ready and willing to do legal work for the public at large. In the same way we think it is not fatal to that conception that the barrister and solicitor holds a position under the Public Service for which he is paid as such and that the only persons for whom he acts are either the Crown or State instrumentalities, or a fellow servant of the Crown.

Later, His Honour deals with the question of the Crown Solicitor, and so on. It has always been conceded by the profession everywhere that there must be a Government department that does the Government's legal work; that is, the Crown Solicitor. I am pleased to say that the Crown law office (or the Legal Services Department, or some other euphemistic title by which it is now known) has always had a high reputation in South Australia. No-one objects to the members of the Crown law office, as I will call it, appearing in the courts. It has been done for a century or more, and it is necessary and desirable that the reputation of the office, which, after all, used to be (certainly in my experience of it) run much like a large private office, be beyond dispute.

So, there is no problem there. However, it is one thing to have a Crown Law Office and allow the members of the Crown Law Office to appear; it is another thing to farm out solicitors to all sorts of department and to let them appear, apparently independently of the Crown Solicitor, for clients, whether of that department or outsiders, as must be the implication of that section and as is regarded as the implication of that section by members of the profession who have looked at the Bill. That is quite another thing.

Let us give one example, apart from the law, to the Premier and to other members and Ministers who may be interested. My view very strongly is that the legal services of the Government should be collected together, as they always have been, in the Crown Solicitor's Office. A parallel to that which may appeal to other members who are laymen is the Public Buildings Department. I remember very well that in Cabinet there were at that time (and I understood from the discusisons that there always had been and this has probably gone on since then) discussions as to whether there should be one authority for Government construction in this State, as we have in the Public Buildings Department, or whether each department which required the construction of buildings, the Education Department, and so on, should have its own little cell within that department and under its own control

for construction work. It came up in our Cabinet, as undoubtedly it had previously, and the decision then (and I think it was the right decision) was that it was far better to have one department responsible for all the construction work of the Government, responsible to its client department for the work it did. That was considered more desirable and more efficient than breaking up the Public Buildings Department and having a public buildings section in the Education Department, and so on.

That is a fairly close parallel to the situation we are looking at here. It is far better to have a Crown Law Office which is responsible for doing all the legal work of the Crown than to break it up, to take the responsibility away from the Crown Solicitor for professional discipline, and so on, and give it to goodness knows who else in other departments. I do not believe that the Crown Solicitor should be robbed of the responsibility which he now has (and which this Crown Solicitor and his predecessors have always exercised properly) of looking after all the legal work of the Crown.

That is exactly what this Bill would do. It would break up the legal services of the Crown and allow them to be disseminated amongst other departments. The Attorney-General said to me, "I have no intention of allowing the Crown Law Office to be broken up in this way," and of course the Bill is subject to the approval of the Attorney-General. That may be the intention of this Attorney-General; he may be strong enough to stand up to his Cabinet colleagues, or he may not be. One of the things we do not talk about much in this place is the relative influence of various Ministers in this Cabinet. A strong-willed Minister can get his own way often and influence Cabinet, sometimes unduly. A weak Minister is overborne by his Cabinet colleagues. I do not pretend to know (although one can surmise) who are the strong and who are the weak Ministers in the present Cabinet.

Mr. Venning: They're all weak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I think that is not so. I do not know whether the Attorney-General, even this Attorney-General, would be strong enough to stand up to his colleagues who wanted to have legal officers in their own departments, or whether he would not be. That is the first problem. He might not want to see his authority dwindle because legal officers were farmed out to other departments or appointed to other departments, but he may have no choice if he is overborne by Cabinet. Despite what the Attorney-General may think now, he will not go on forever, and there will be other Attorneys-General in Governments in South Australia who may take a completely different view and who may be happy to do just what this Bill wants to do, contrary to the views of the present Attorney-General.

Even the present Attorney-General, I remind the Premier, said at the university (as reported in an interview in *On Dit*) that he proposes to retire from politics when he is 43. I suppose he has another 10 years or 11 years to go, other things not interfering with his plans. We do not know what successive Attorneys or successive Governments will think.

Once Parliament gives the authority to this in this Bill, it is out of our hands, and we have to accept the assurances of people who may not always or ever be able to keep up with them.

That is the situation we are faced with in this Bill. It is drawn far more widely than the Attorney-General has said he wants it drawn for the immediate purposes he has in mind; it is so wide as to be quite dangerous. It is obvious to anyone who thinks about it that that is so, and I am fortified in my opposition to it (I am not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition is supporting me in this; I was not entirely certain from the way he spoke) by the attitude expressed by the Law Society.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition has gone on at great length and assumed learning on this particular topic, saying that it is quite improper for the Attorney-General, who originally introduced this Bill, not to be here on it. I am the Acting Attorney-General in South Australia; I have been appointed Acting Minister. It is a post I have borne on numbers of previous occasions.

Mr. Venning: It's in good hands.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thank the honourable member. I think that is quite right, and I appreciate his knowledge of the matter. The objection raised at the outset to this measure I must confess I found a little difficult to follow. It was only after the member for Mitcham had dilated on that I began to get some glimmerings of the opinion being argued.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be too complimentary, will you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly did not get it from the Leader of the Opposition. The argument is that there is some interference with the office of solicitor as an officer of the court by his appearing while employed by the Crown with the approval of the Chief Law Officer of the Crown. I must confess that I do not follow that. At the outset, it is generally accepted that legal officers who are employed by Governments have a special right to appear before the court, although they are in some relationship of employ; that is, the right of appearance cannot be restricted to the Attorney-General or the Solicitor-General, who are independent authorities and not, as such, employed by the Crown. The Crown Solicitor is himself, of course, a Crown employee, as are all the persons in his employ.

It is suggested that this proposal is to alter the position of Crown employees appearing with the approval of the appropriate law officer. That is not true; the situation does not alter at all. The member for Mitcham suggests that, because officers who are employed by departments other than the Crown Law Office should appear before the court, that is somehow producing a situation entirely different from that of officers of the Crown Law Office appearing. With great respect to the honourable member, I do not follow that argument.

Mr. Millhouse: To whom are they going to be responsible professionally?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They will be responsible professionally to the Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: In what way?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can speak in Committee on the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, they are responsible, as Crown Law officers, to client departments for their briefs. Officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission, who would have the right to appear, would be responsible to that commission for their brief but they could appear only with the approval of the Attorney-General, who is the chief law officer of the Crown to whom they will be responsible. There is no more appropriate person for them to be responsible to.

Mr. Millhouse: Crown Solicitor, any way; you'd agree with that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. He has had an opportunity to speak.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does cut out the Crown Solicitor in these other cases. However, in several cases it will mean that the head of the department concerned will be the head of the Legal Services Department and, consequently, a former Crown Solicitor himself, or, in the

case of the Corporate Affairs Commission, a former senior officer of the Crown Law Department, who is now to head that commission. How that changes the basic relationship, I must confess escapes me. The Legal Services Department generally and the Corporate Affairs Commission are two cases in point where it is necessary to have solicitors who are specialising and working closely with the staff of those bodies in the preparation of matters to go before tribunals. As a former Attorney-General, I must say that I found considerable difficulty in providing staff in many difficult company cases simply because the requirements of general practice in the Crown Law Office did not allow the necessary specialisation in those areas.

Mr. Millhouse: That's only an administrative matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not. It was really quite difficult.

Mr. Tonkin: You—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would suggest that the Leader should not potter on in the way he does, because he does not know anything about this.

Mr. Venning: He ought to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not talking about the member for Mitcham; I am talking about the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second time I have told the honourable member that the Chair will make that decision. I hope he will not continue in that vein any longer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have certainly ascertained that it is desirable in corporate affairs matters to have specialists who are working quite closely with the people who are making investigations in the corporate affairs area. There is no interference with their normal responsibility as solicitors in that practice. I believe that that proposition is entirely proper. I do not believe that there is anything in what I have said to date that would in any way justify the contention of the Law Society that there is a conflict on interest.

The Leader of the Opposition did not advert to the view, but the member for Mitcham did, that the addition of the words "whether or not the Crown is a party to the proceedings" gives rise to some conflicts of interest on the view that the purpose of that phrase is that members of Government departments are going to appear for private citizens as clients while employed by the Crown.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you be happy to cut out those last words?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would be happy to make an amendment to the last words if necessary to make it clearer because I am quite sure that the last words do not encompass any such proposal, and I assume that that is the only basis on which the Law Society could have said that a conflict of interest existed. I am quite sure that those proposals refer to such cases where the Crown has a right of audience although it is not a party to the case (where it might be an intervener, although not joined as a party in the cause), or where the officer of the Crown would be heard as *amicus curiae*. I might say to the honourable member that that was not in the original draft but was added subsequently to cover those matters and to make quite certain that, where the Crown was given the right of audience without being a party, the officer concerned could be heard.

In those circumstances, clearly there is no conflict of interest. It is exactly the situation that already occurs many times when Crown Law officers appear. If that is what all the trouble is about, I am willing to let the draftsman consider preparing an amendment that will make clear the fears of the Law Society and the honourable member are groundless.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you going to seek leave to continue?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should like to hear from the honourable member whether such amendments would satisfy his position.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not know what they are yet; I don't know what you're proposing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Well, he asked me to speak. I'm quite happy to talk to him about this. Obviously, the Speaker will not let us do it across the Chamber, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to do that in the Committee stage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would suggest that possibly in Committee we will get an opportunity to do something of that kind. I do not agree with the honourable member's contention that every law officer employed by the Government must inevitably be in the Crown Law Office. Whilst it has been my own administrative practice to try to centre in specialised departments specialist work, there are in the law areas certain exceptions that I fear are quite inevitable: the Corporate Affairs Commission and the Public and Consumer Affairs Department are cases in point. It is simply vitally necessary to have officers working closely in that department with the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and taking on appropriate cases.

The honourable member may recollect a case where the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs instructed the Crown Law Office to prosecute a company in South Australia for a breach of prices orders that were delivered to that company on the advice of the Crown Solicitor. When the matter had been put before the court, it was found that there was no case to answer because the officer of the Crown Solicitor had not advised, in accordance with a High Court Decision (the leading decision on these matters), that any such prices orders must contain a specific date from which they operated, which these did not have. That is the sort of thing that can occur.

Mr. Millhouse: But a solicitor could do that work without having a right to appear in court.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If a solicitor specialised in that area, why in the world should he be prevented from appearing in court when, administratively, that is the most sensible thing to do and where, in order to get that court appearance, he must have the specific approval of the chief law officer of the Crown.

Mr. Millhouse: Not in every specific case.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He must be acting in the course of employment and he must have the approval of the Attorney-General for his appearance. In those circumstances I do not believe that any of the objections that have been raised to this Bill are valid, and I therefore ask members to support it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Chapman.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Legal practitioners employed by Crown may practise in and appear before any court."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Since the second reading debate I have discussed the words to which the honourable member referred at the end of clause 1 with the Parliamentary Draftsman and he pointed out to me another category of appearance for which this was specifically inserted and that refers to the cases which are taken under the Public and Consumer Affairs Department where the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is enabled to sue on behalf of a consumer and in the name of the consumer but at State expense. The curious objection which has now been raised to that procedure is that this creates a conflict of interest, although this Chamber has authorised this procedure for a long time and Crown Law officers have been appearing in exactly that position to date.

Mr. Millhouse: If you put everyone in the Crown Law Office, the objection of the Law Society would be overcome. I tried to make that clear.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not prepared to accede that everyone has to be in the Crown Law Office.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to break up the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am not, but quite frankly if that is the basis of the objection of the Law Society that objection is groundless. What it is doing is to insist that there is a professional difficulty where none exists at all because, if the society admits it in the Crown Law Department, it admits it for other departments. If there is no conflict of interest for an officer in the Crown Law Department, there is no conflict of interest for an officer from any other department with the permission of the Attorney-General. It is absurd to contend that there is. The Law Society of South Australia is not in a position as a professional body to tell the Government of this State what are to be the administrative arrangements within departments. If that is the basis on which its objection is levelled (and that is the only conclusion one can come to from the honourable member's statement, that if everyone is in the Crown Law Department it would have no objection to this matter at all), in that case I utterly reject the suggestions of the Law Society. I have not seen them—

Mr. Tonkin: No, because your Attorney-General is in China.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary. I have been Acting Attorney-General—

Mr. Millhouse: Your office was telephoned this morning and told that a letter was on the way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If a letter was on the way, I can only say that it had not reached me by this afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: You had better give someone a swift kick.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member cannot even say that it has been delivered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can tell the Acting Attorney-General that I have had mine, and I understand from the President of the Law Society that the Attorney-General's office was telephoned this morning to say that it was on the way and, although this is only an assumption, I am sure that even the Acting Attorney-General in the heat of debate would be prepared to concede that it is unlikely in all the circumstances that mine would be delivered and his not delivered. This is the position. If the Premier has not got it here, it is a failure to discharge a responsibility in his office, in the same way as I remember a few weeks ago it took over 24 hours of office time to get a letter from the front desk of the Premier's Department to the Premier. If the Premier allows that sort of thing to go on in departments there is nothing we can do about it. That is for him to put right, not for us. Perhaps in all the circumstances the Premier would like me to read the resolution of the Law Society. He may not have taken it in the first time when the Leader of the Opposition read it out. The letter is as follows:

> The Law Society is opposed to the proposed amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act affording a right of audience in all courts and tribunals to legal practitioners in the employ of the Crown in the form in which it appears in the draft Bill and makes the following contentions:
>
> 1. In the public interest, the Law Society is opposed to legal practitioners employed by Government departments (other than the Crown Solicitor) having a right of audience before courts. The basis of such opposition is that there is a relationship of master and servant in such cases between the litigant and the employed solicitor and there is a real risk of a conflict arising between the solicitor's duty to the court and his duty to obey the directions given to him by his employer. Such a conflict is not consistent with the proper administration of justice and for this reason the Law Society is opposed to any change in the law which would bring such conflict about.

I pause there to answer the argument put by the Premier, when he said that there was no difference between the appearance of a solicitor employed in another Government department and one employed in the Crown Law Office. There is a very great difference, because in the Crown Law Office, as he well knows, every officer of the department is subject in professional matters to the Crown Solicitor, who is the boss and head of the department in theory and in fact, and he has professional control of and discipline over officers in his charge. He is a senior legal practitioner and, as I said in my second reading speech, is a person who from time immemorial has had the respect of the profession. What is the position if we get someone not necessarily in the Corporate Affairs Commission or the Public and Consumer Affairs Department but someone in another department, say, the Fisheries Department, who does not have anyone in his department over him to whom he is answerable who is a member of the legal profession.

The Premier admitted in his reply that this cut out the responsibility of a solicitor in another department to the Crown Solicitor, and it does. So in the case of other departments (and there is no limit to the departments), we will have solicitors responsible to a layman as their employer in the department. In these instances, departmental heads and even Ministerial heads will be laymen and not lawyers. That is the distinction between having everyone under the Crown Solicitor (and that is what the profession likes and wants to retain), and having them spread about in other departments. There is no doubt of that position factually: it may be possible for the Premier to argue that it does not matter, but that is the nub of the objection.

The Premier tried to insist that it would only ever be with the authority and approval of the Attorney-General and, therefore, in some way that he did not state, those persons would be responsible directly to the Attorney-General. He knows that in practice this is nonsense, even if in theory something could be said for it, but even in theory nothing can be said for it. How often can an Attorney-General take a personal interest in a case, whether it is being conducted on his behalf by a member of his own department, or not? The answer is that it would be very seldom, as the Premier knows. The Acting Attorney-General should examine subsection (3) of the proposed

new section 69, which provides:

> The approval of the Attorney-General referred to in subsection (1) of this section may be general or limited to a particular matter or matters of a particular class.

It is obvious that people put in the Corporate Affairs Commission (or whatever it is to be called) will be given a blanket authority by the Attorney-General to appear, and that is the last the Attorney will know of it. I suppose it could be argued (and this will be *ex post facto*) that, if any solicitor did the wrong thing, approval could be revoked, but that is a different thing from saying that he is answerable for the conduct of a particular matter to the Attorney-General. It may be a right of veto in the future, as it were, but nothing more. That is the nub of the objection of the profession as expressed by the Law Society. The permanent Attorney-General well knows this, because in February, 1976, the Law Society made a submission to him as to the right of audience before courts in South Australia on the Legal Practitioners Bill, the one that did not go through. The submission stated:

> The society strongly opposes the breadth of persons entitled to practise before any court or tribunal. In the society's submission the entitlement to practice before any court or tribunal should be limited to:
>
> *(a)* the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and the Crown Solicitor of the Commonwealth;
>
> *(b)* any officer of the Commonwealth Crown Law Department so long as he holds a current practising certificate;
>
> *(c)* the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and the Crown Solicitor of the State of South Australia;
>
> *(d)* any officer of the State Crown Law Department so long as he holds a current practising certificate;
>
> *(e)* any person employed by the Law Society of South Australia so long as he holds a current practising certificate;
>
> *(f)* any solicitor in private practice and any solicitor in the full-time employ of a solicitor in private practice provided in each case that such solicitor holds a current practising certificate.

The submission then refers to articled clerks and solicitors employed by banks. The Attorney-General knew about that when he introduced this Bill, but he introduced it without consulting the profession, well knowing that it was utterly contrary to the submissions made by the society less than two years ago, and knowing that the views of the society would not have altered in that time. I continue quoting the resolution passed by the Law Society yesterday, as follows:

> 2. The society has no objection to an amendment ensuring that the Crown Solicitor and legal practitioners in his employ have access to courts and tribunals. However, where it is the policy of legislation to deny access of the legal profession to particular courts and tribunals, the Crown should be in exactly the same position as the private citizen.

One immediately thinks of the small claims court. This Bill as drawn would allow the Crown to appear, but not a private practitioner. The resolution continues:

> It is inconsistent that the Government should preserve its own access to courts and tribunals through legally qualified persons while denying a similar right to the ordinary citizen.

This is what the Government is doing. The resolution continues:

> Clearly the proposed section 69 would over-ride other legislation limiting the right to legal representation.

I do not know whether the Premier has been able to take that in any better. I did not read it all at once, but that is the nub of the objection to this Bill. I know that, however hard he may deny it out of loyalty to the Attorney-General, the Premier has been caught on the hop by this Bill. When it came before Cabinet (and I assume Bills still do), he probably accepted the explanation given and did not look at it too hard. Now he has the responsibility of it, and I hope that he, as a senior and responsible member of the profession, will be prepared to take some heed of, or at least give some thought to, what has been put to him by the Law Society through the Leader of the Opposition and me this afternoon. It is not something, as the Government thought and expected last week, to be able to push through in about 15 minutes. This is a matter of some considerable principle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before the final draft of the Bill was approved the question of the right of audience before any court or tribunal being changed was considered: that is the second point raised by the honourable member from the Law Society. The view that has been taken by the Parliamentary Counsel and by the law officers advising the Attorney-General is that the Bill does not alter the position and does not give a right to appear by a legal practitioner before tribunals before which a legal practitioner now does not have the right of appearance.

Mr. Millhouse: That cannot be right, if one looks at the proviso "Notwithstanding any law, practice or custom" at the beginning of new section 69 (1). That must over-ride everything else.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason that the view that the honourable member is not correct in this has been taken is that the words "a legal practitioner" are used. If it is a legal practitioner who has the right of appearance, the legal practitioner can appear only in circumstances where a legal practitioner may appear.

Mr. Millhouse: Is "legal practitioner" defined in the original Act as one who has a practising certificate? I do not think it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Section 69 *(a)* provides that a legal practitioner "shall have the right of audience . . ." In those circumstances, if a legal practitioner does not have the right of audience (that is a legal practitioner specifically accepted under some other legislation), being a legal practitioner, he remains barred. That was the view taken by counsel. Counsel, and the Crown law, have disagreed with the view taken by the honourable member and the society as to the meaning of the section. I am prepared to have a look at the wording to see between here and another place whether it is necessary to make clear that that exception is ensured.

Mr. Millhouse: Why can't we do it here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Simply because I want to see to it that the time arrives. I am not asking the honourable member, because of his view, to support the section if he is in doubt, but I can tell him that, the Law Society's having made that point, I am prepared to look at some means of providing it more clearly and not leaving it subject to argument. I think that will cover the difficulty. Concerning the other argument, I flatly disagree with the honourable member as to the appropriateness of the arrangements. I believe that the arrangements are quite proper, that they are essential administratively, and that the Law Society, in the submission the honourable member has read out, is taking a quite short-sighted view and one which, might I say, takes very little account of the administrative responsibility of Government today. Unfortunately, on the Law Society's council there are numbers of people who have absolutely no experience of Government administration or its responsibilities.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In answer to that last shaft of the Premier's, I point out that there is no reason why they should have had any administrative experience in Government; they are lawyers, not politicians or public

servants. It does not make their views on the law under the legal system any less valuable.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But it makes their views on administration—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but it is far better to change administrative arrangements to preserve the system than to endanger the system, as the Law Society is afraid will be done if this Bill is passed. Therefore, the ball is really in the Government's court to change its administrative system. It is not right to say that it is impossible to have cells of legal practitioners in the Legal Services Department who specialise in particular branches of the law, or fields of the law. In fact, since I went out of office, I think the present Government has done that to some extent. To come within the definition of "legal practitioner" under the Act a practitioner does not have to have a practising certificate. He is a person duly admitted and enrolled (which means he is on the court roll) "as a barrister, solicitor, attorney or proctor of the Supreme Court". It does not mean that he has to be in practice with a practising certificate. It is that definition which governs the term "legal practitioner" in the Bill, because it is an amendment to that Act. I appreciate that the Premier is prepared to go as far as he is. However, I move:

Page 1, line 13—After "the State", insert "in the Department of Legal Services or the Department for Corporate Affairs".

The effect of that amendment (and this meets the second reading explanation) would be to provide that all legal practitioners in the employ of the Government who are to have a right of audience in courts and tribunals should be either in the Department of Legal Services or in the Department for Corporate Affairs. I remind the Premier of what was said by the Attorney-General as reasons for introducing this Bill, as follows:

These doubts—

that is, the doubts as to whether a solicitor can appear if he is not in the Crown Law Office—

have been reawakened by the administrative arrangement to establishment—

that is a mistake in *Hansard*, I am afraid; it should be "establish"—

a department of corporate affairs, and the obvious need to have legal practitioners employed in that department.

The ostensible reason given (and the only reason) for this Bill is to let people from the Corporate Affairs Department appear. My amendment would be in conformity with the second reading explanation.

It goes further than I or the Law Society would like to go, but it goes as far as the Government in the speech introducing this Bill, asks us to go. The effect, therefore, would be to add a qualification in the Bill to provide that legal practitioners will have the rights set out in the Bill only if they are in the Legal Services Department or the Corporate Affairs Department, and that should be enough, on the Attorney's own speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would be inclined to accede to the amendment if it included the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. Part of the proposal for this measure generated originally with the Public and Consumer Affairs Department.

Mr. Millhouse: The draftsman did not mention it in the speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He may not have. One of the reasons specified for putting in the clause "whether or not the Crown is a party to the proceedings" is to allow legal officers employed by the Crown to represent the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs when he is suing with the consent and in the name of a consumer. That is an important part of the proposal.

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps you could frame something to cover precisely what you've said. I don't think I can.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The draftsman says that he cannot produce something.

Mr. Millhouse: I suspect that's why the Bill is as wide as it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That might be right.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Chapman. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am still not satisfied that the Premier's arguments in this matter have been sufficiently strong to overcome the Law Society's objections. I maintain that, in Committee, much discussion ensued which could more properly have been conducted before the Bill was introduced and which could have been sorted out to everyone's satisfaction. I do not like the Bill any more now than when it went into Committee, and I will not support it as it came out of Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am indebted for the words expressed by the Leader of the Opposition on this occasion. Although I accept the Premier's undertakings, whether there will be any result from them, we do not know. Despite the undertakings, I am not prepared to support the third reading. I oppose it and will divide on it, because it is a matter of great importance. This is the same Bill as the one we discussed in Committee; it is just as objectionable to me and to members of the Law Society now as it was previously, and I say with great respect to the Premier that none of the arguments he has advanced (and he did his damnedest with a dock brief) has shaken the views that I hold and have expressed about it.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Chapman.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 16 to 18 (clause 2)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 23 and 24 (clause 2)—Leave out "otherwise than" and insert "for the purpose of purchasing goods where the purchase is otherwise than for the purpose of resale or letting on hire or".

No. 3. Page 2, lines 18 to 21 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 4. Page 2, lines 25 to 43 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 3, line 8 (clause 5)—Leave out ", defend or assume the conduct of" and insert "or defend".

No. 6. Page 3, lines 12 and 13 (clause 5)—Leave out ", defending or assuming the conduct of" and insert "or defending".

No. 7. Page 3, lines 17 and 18 (clause 5)—Leave out ", defending or assuming the conduct of" and insert "or defending".

No. 8. Page 3 (clause 6)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:

Amendment of principal Act, s. 53—Cessation of effect of certain provisions—6. Section 53 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "1977" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "1978".

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

This amendment would narrow the proposed definition of "consumer" and would prevent what was intended by the Government in relation, for example, to the purchase of a house or land by a consumer. That provision would be precluded from the operations of the Commissioner, whereas the Bill as it left this Chamber gave the Commissioner jurisdiction in that class of transaction, according to the Government's intention.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment would remove the power of the Commissioner to assist consumers who had borrowed money unless they had borrowed it for the purpose of purchasing goods. The intention of this provision was to give that additional protection to the consumers of this State, whether they be borrowing money for a vacation, for repairs or whatever.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment would interfere with the proposed increase in the ability of the Commissioner to intervene in matters affecting not only a consumer or consumers who had come to the Commissioner but also in matters where the public interest indicated that some action should be taken.

Mr. BECKER: I oppose the motion. The other place has acted responsibly in reconsidering this provision, which is establishing what is in the community interest. The department, if it were to undertake investigations off its own bat, could go beyond what was originally intended by this legislation. What I fear more than anything else is that the department could be labelled "big brother", which we do not wish to happen. The department was created to serve the community, as it does well by following up complaints as they are made to it. If this amendment is not accepted, we could be establishing extremely dangerous precedent. It is not in the interests of the business community or consumers to give to the department such wide powers as were originally intended. By imposing more rules and regulations one adds costs, a situation that is becoming a joke in this State because of some of our legislation.

Business people are now getting in first and increasing their prices. I have always had doubts about whether the Prices Act really works. Its provisions do not encourage efficiency in some industries. One industry can count on regular increases in the cost of pies and pasties because it knows that as soon as it is granted a price increase it can apply for another increase. That does not provide an incentive for that industry to be efficient. The price increase can be approved in a statutory way and the profit margin is guaranteed. That is not what should be intended by this measure. I therefore oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. Chapman and Gunn.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendments Nos. 4 to 7:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 4 to 7 be disagreed to.

The provision in the original legislation dealt with the power of the Commissioner to represent a consumer in civil proceedings, and the acceptance of these amendments would stultify the intention of the legislation.

Mr. BECKER: Would these amendments allow the Commissioner to act on behalf of a person who had commenced civil proceedings on his own behalf and then decided, for various reasons, to ask the Commissioner to act for him?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As the legislation left this place, it would have assisted people in the circumstances mentioned by the member for Hanson. The acceptance of the amendments from the Legislative Council would prevent what the member is seeking.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 8:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

The intention of the legislation was to remove the requirement for an annual review of the powers of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs in relation to prices. The Government believes this is not necessary. In the past the Government has had to accept this requirement, but in hindsight it appears to have been unnecessary.

Mr. BECKER: I support the amendment. I believe we should still continue to have an annual review of the Prices Act. For the seven years I have been in this place, it has given us an opportunity to review the success of the Prices Act, and I believe Parliament should still insist on an annual review. No legislation is perfect and, whilst it is always our intention and desire that it should be perfect, there are often circumstances in which a loophole can be

found, and I believe it is necessary to have an annual review. It is not an expensive process nor is it a time-consuming process in Parliament. For this reason, I believe we should insist on an annual review.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Whitten. Noes —Messrs. Chapman and Gunn.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments adversely affect the legislation.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Allison, Groom, Klunder, Payne, and Wotton.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 7.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

REGIONAL CULTURAL CENTRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee, recommending no amendment to the Bill, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That the report be noted.

The committee held a series of meetings at which it heard the witnesses whose names are set forth in the report. The committee also had before it the preliminary report of the working party that first examined this proposition, and the feasibility study undertaken by a working party headed by Mr. Lees (Deputy Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission), and whose consultant was Mr. Conway of Conway, Connelly and Company who are clothing industry consultants.

In addition, the committee heard evidence in support of the proposals in the Bill from the Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, who appeared twice before the committee, which had received a written submission from him. It also heard evidence from a group of apparel manufacturers, two of whom were not affected by the measure and four of whom considered they would be affected in some way by it, and from those witnesses there was some criticism of the feasibility study. They had made a written submission which, frankly, on the face of it, was quite wrong in several respects, and that became apparent immediately on examination of other evidence before the committee.

The principal point made by the submission of the apparel manufacturers was that it was an expensive and unwise operation to set up a clothing factory at Whyalla, particularly because it was alleged that there were no experienced clothing operatives in Whyalla and, therefore, it was unwise to start in that city. In fact, the committee had before it the submission to the working party on the feasibility study of the Whyalla working party headed by Mr. Rainsford, and that had strongly supported the establishment of a clothing factory in Whyalla and had set out a list of about 40 operatives from Whyalla, many of them with considerable experience in the clothing industry who sought employment in a clothing factory in Whyalla.

The second contention of the apparel manufacturers was that there were some mistakes in the technical details of the feasibility study by Mr. Conway, and they questioned Mr. Conway's abilities and experience and said that his experience in the industry was confined to the manufacture of jeans, Mr. Conway was later called to give evidence.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Premier where the evidence is: it has not been tabled for members to peruse if they wish to do so. It is a report by the Select Committee and, normally, at the stage when the report is introduced, the evidence and correspondence is tabled for members to peruse and form some opinion. As the Premier has not done this, I ask him what the situation is in relation to this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I tabled the report of the Select Committee and the minutes of evidence.

Mr. Millhouse: We don't have them: they're not here.

Mr. Dean Brown: Only the minutes: where is the evidence?

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Premier that we have the report of the Select Committee, but we do not have any evidence, and I did not hear the Premier table that evidence.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Premier wish to speak?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think I can clarify the situation. As I

understand it, members of the Select Committee have not yet received the transcript of evidence given to the committee at the meetings yesterday and this morning. I had asked the Secretary of the committee to give me a copy of that transcript, and I have just received it. It may be the copy that was tabled, but I do not know. What concerns me is that we are to debate the Bill, and there has been dissension among the committee as to the recommendations to the House, and other members would like to see a copy of the transcript. Will the Premier defer proceedings until we have seen that transcript?

Mr. Millhouse: I know nothing about it at all: what chance have I to debate the matter!

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow the honourable member for Mitcham to carry on in that vein. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, the transcript was tabled. I tabled the report and minutes of evidence together with a transcript. However, if honourable members want to see the transcript and it is not available to them, I will postpone the debate until later this afternoon so that they will have the opportunity to see it as soon as we can get it. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several copies of the transcript of the Select Committee's evidence have now been provided to members, and I understand that members interested have had an opportunity to examine it. When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was adverting to the fact that members of the apparel manufacturers group of the Chamber of Commerce had criticised the qualifications in consultancy of Mr. Conway and had suggested that he had only very limited experience and qualifications in the industry. When we heard Mr. Conway and when he gave us his experience and qualifications in the industry, that objection was completely disposed of. He has had tremendous success in the industry and world-wide experience. We could have no better or more expert consultant in this area than Mr. Conway.

The third matter criticised related to some of the costings made by the feasibility study. Most of the criticism was directed to a suggestion that, in fact, the feasibility study had over-costed some of the processes; that is, that it had staffed too heavily and that its allowances in some instances were too high. When that is set against the fact that the calculations of the feasibility study showed quite real benefits as compared with current prices, one can hardly consider that that was a particularly serious criticism of the feasibility study. The criticism did not seem to be borne out subsequently by Mr. Conway's evidence.

Another ground of criticism from the manufacturers of the proposal was that certain Adelaide companies, three in particular, would be adversely affected by the establishment of a Government clothing factory. The ground for this contention was that a significant proportion of the work done by those companies at present was Government work of the kind proposed to be done by the Government clothing factory, and the firms found it difficult to move into alternative forms of production, and they consequently sought that the Government should continue its orders from those factories.

There were differences in viewpoint on the committee concerning this matter, but the viewpoint was expressed strongly by Mr. Lees, by the Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, and by Mr. Conway that it was open to those companies to diversify into other areas and that they had shown little motive to do so. Whereas one company, which has up to the present been doing a significant amount of work for the Government, has in fact got orders to such an extent that its full production will be taken up with orders from New South Wales, the other companies to which I have referred have made no moves at all. They expressed considerable reluctance to go into any areas in which they had not previously specialised.

There is considerable difference of opinion on this score, but the majority of the committee adhered to the view expressed by Mr. Lees, Mr. Conway, and Mr. Collins, that it was possible for those companies to do the normal thing that a business would do in other circumstances if it faced a loss of orders in one area—diversify and seek orders in other areas. The evidence of those who were not in the group brought forward by the apparel manufacturers was that there would be quite a small adverse effect on employment through the establishment of the Government clothing factory and that, while there might be difficulties for a period, the difficulties could be coped with.

It was clear from the evidence that the establishment in Whyalla of a Government clothing factory would provide employment in the worst area for unemployment in South Australia, particularly as regards female labour. It is a significant measure toward decentralisation, and it is a proper measure on the Government's part to establish a factory in Whyalla to manufacture non-tailored clothing for the Government. Consequently, the majority of the committee, as will be seen from the report, recommended to the House that the Bill be passed without amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is fair to point out that the Select Committee's report was not unanimous. There was dissension by two of the five committee members to certain parts of the report. The minority report supported paragraphs 1 and 2, and sought to amend paragraph 3. The amendment to paragraph 3 was to provide some balance in the report. As it stands at present, paragraph 3 states:

> On the evidence submitted to it, your committee is satisfied that the corporation will meet certain of the requirements of Government departments and agencies. The evidence of the feasibility study and its consultant would indicate that this could be at reduced cost and with greater efficiency. In addition, it will provide a considerable number of jobs in Whyalla.

I attempted to amend that by adding the following paragraph, which would provide some balance in the report, which, as it stands, betrays the feasibility study in the first report:

> The committee believes that the establishment of a clothing factory at Whyalla would be detrimental to employment by existing clothing manufacturers. Some evidence presented questioned the technical soundness of the feasibility study. In addition, the committee is concerned that the employment of handicapped persons at Bedford Industries, Phoenix Society, and Flinders Industries should not be in jeopardy.

There can be no dispute that the evidence presented to the Select Committee supports the viewpoint expressed in that amendment. It does the Government, particularly the Chairman, no credit in that the committee was not willing to give a rounded view of the evidence presented to it. My amendment was defeated because the Government had a majority on the Select Committee. I also tried to amend paragraph 4 of the report by striking out the paragraph as it stands at present and inserting in lieu thereof:

> The committee recommends that the Bill be read and discharged.

That amendment is the direct opposite of what is in the

report at present. I believed, and I was supported by the member for Mallee, that the committee, after taking evidence, should recommend that the Bill be rejected by this House. I refer to some of the evidence presented to the committee, and I start by dealing with evidence given by manufacturers who now have contracts with the Government. The pertinent point that we tried to have inserted in the recommendations of the committee was the likely effect on existing manufacturers in the clothing industry who now contract for Government work. Manufacturer A has been manufacturing for 58 years and doing Government work for more than 50 years, and now employs 50 people with 40 per cent of his business being State Government contract work. He has 45 per cent unused capacity of plant and 24 idle machines at present, but could employ another 30 people if the factory worked to full capacity. In addition, this manufacturer installed "nine to 10 months ago" a hot-head press valued at $8 000, and it was purchased "recently at Government request". On examination, it seems that an officer of the State Supply Department suggested that, if he wanted certain contract work, he should install a hot-head press.

That manufacturer pointed out that, if a Government clothing factory was established (and from evidence received it is likely to be established in an existing factory and operating within six months), and existing contracts with the State Government were cancelled in six months time, as is the likely intention if this Bill passes, all 50 people would lose their jobs. This manufacturer pointed out that half or 40 per cent of his employees would no longer be required and that, because of overhead and other expenses, his other non-State Government work would become non-competitive financially, so that he would be forced out of business. Manufacturer A was not challenged, at least before the committee when presenting that evidence. Incidentally, it is worth noting that manufacturer A said that there had been substantial changes to the industry because of imports in recent years.

Manufacturer B has 59 per cent of his business with State Government contracts, and has 55 per cent unused capacity in his plant with four machines now being idle. It is doing non-tailoring work and making made-to-measure uniforms, the work that would go to a Government factory if it were established. Three years ago, he employed 28 persons, but now employs seven, and he said that, if the Government clothing factory were established, he would have to shut his doors, causing those seven people to lose their jobs.

Manufacturer C has been doing Government work since 1930, mainly nursing sisters' uniforms, and he has 28 persons employed at present, seven people having been retrenched two weeks ago. He said that 60 per cent of his business is Government business, and he has 40 per cent unused capacity with nine machines idle. He said that 12 more employees could be taken on if the factory worked at full capacity. He has deferred spending $10 000 to upgrade his existing plant, and he said that he would have to close his doors if Government contracts were taken from him.

All three manufacturers indicated that they had been trying to get other work. They were asked whether they had adequately diversified. Manufacturer A said that, because of lack of expertise in other areas, he could not diversify. Manufacturer C said that he was trying to diversify, and manufacturer B said that he did not have the expertise to diversify. All three had been trying to get outside work. These manufacturers employ 85 people who could be out of work if the Government factory were established, and that is an astounding prospect. According to the evidence given to the committee, the new factory will create employment for 60 persons only.

Manufacturer D revealed to the committee that he represented Bedford Industries, and said that he did not intend to support or oppose the Bill. He said that 15 to 17 per cent of his factory's work was State Government work, and that all of his work was undertaken by handicapped persons. This is most significant. He said that he had come to the committee because he was concerned that the amount of Government contract work in the clothing area for handicapped persons should not be placed in jeopardy. I point out that Bedford Industries recently invested $15 000 in new sewing machines to make industrial garments, overalls, and dust-coats for the Government. The Phoenix Society and Flinders Industries also had contract work for the Government, and that is why I tried to have inserted in the report that there was a chance, if this Bill were passed, that the jobs of handicapped persons employed in Government contract work could be jeopardised. The House should consider seriously that evidence when considering this Bill. I believe that is one of the grounds for rejecting this Bill.

The industry also made the point that there were now more than 200 machines idle in South Australia. The first Government report tended to vacillate on the issues. Mr. Collins, Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, on behalf of the Executive and officers of that union, strongly put the point that he considered that the existing contractors to the Government could find work elsewhere.

Mr. Collins, on behalf of the union, made the point that he believed existing contractors with the Government would be able to get work if they went out to seek it. It was clear to me, if not to the Premier, that they had been out attempting to do so within their limited resources and had been unable to obtain the additional work to make up for the lack of Government contracts, if this Bill is proceeded with. Mr. Collins presented the following evidence:

> On the question of employment in the industry, however, it will be argued by employers that the establishment of a State clothing factory will have the effect of creating employment in that establishment at the expense of the private sector of the industry.

Later, he continued:

> They may even try to argue that the ultimate result will be a net reduction of jobs within the entire industry in South Australia. Both arguments are totally and demonstrably false.

The evidence presented to the Select Committee by individual manufacturers showed that it was not totally false and not demonstrably false; in fact, it was quite accurate. At least 88 employees in Adelaide are likely to lose jobs in place of the 60 jobs that may be provided at Whyalla. Therefore, I cannot accept that claim made by Mr. Collins.

He also said that it was the view of his organisation that it would support the Bill. He also indicated to the Select Committee that he had heard no opposition to the Bill. This afternoon in this House I tabled a petition signed by, I think, 315 persons, objecting to the Bill and asking this Parliament to reject it, yet the union Secretary says that he has heard of no opposition to the Bill. I have made a calculation and I find that that number means that about 12 or 13 per cent of the union membership in this State has openly expressed objection to this Bill, yet the Secretary says he has heard of no objection to the Bill. One cannot possibly accept that sort of evidence.

The other point that needs to be touched on is that considerable evidence was presented to the Select Committee criticising the method of tendering to the State Supply Department. Chapter 3 of the first report, of which Mr. Haslam was Chairman, said at great length that the system of tendering was unsatisfactory. The report states:

> The State Supply Department has been aware of the weakness associated with all general period supply contracts, and some time ago proposed the establishment of a computerised central contracts file which would enable quantity orders in any given period to be obtained accurately and quickly. This recommendation is still under consideration.

That is just one of the criticisms levelled at the tendering method. The Select Committee heard evidence that there are so-called open-ended tenders whereby a company is asked to tender to supply the Government with, say, nurses' uniforms, but no fixed quantity is spelled out in the tender. Therefore, that company has no idea of how many orders will be placed even though it is required, at least in the case of one manufacturer, to supply those uniforms within 14 days of receiving the order.

Another manufacturer pointed out to the committee that on one occassion it received a Government contract which stipulated that the goods had to be supplied within 24 hours. How can any manufacturer plan its long-term production, and therefore employment, on an efficient basis when it is given only 14 days, or in one case 24 hours, notice to produce the goods, especially when that work amounts to almost half of the work done by the company.

It became clear that the major reason, if not the sole reason, for the supply problem referred to by the Premier in a press statement earlier this year (if not almost the sole reason) is the tendering method and not the manufacturers in this State. Each manufacturer that came forward clearly spelt out to the committee that the Services and Supply Department should adopt the same tendering method as is adopted by the Commonwealth Government, which apparently has none of the problems experienced by the State Government.

The committee was also informed that there would be no change in the tendering method even though these deficiencies had been recognised for some time. Mr. Haslam's report, which was very critical of the tendering method, was presented to the Premier on June 9, 1976, more than 15 months ago. Despite that criticism of the tendering method, the Government has still not changed the method, according to the manufacturers: they were not aware of any change. I suggest to the House that the reason why there has been no change is that the Premier is prepared to use the deficiencies of the present tendering method for political gain and as an argument for having a Government clothing factory.

It was quite clear that one of the main reasons a number of orders went to interstate manufacturers (and I will mention quantities shortly) was that local manufacturers invariably did not know that such tenders were out and did not tender for them. Earlier this year, before the State election, the Premier issued a statement about the number of orders that were placed interstate. It was a highly political statement that indicated that considerable amounts of work were going interstate. Mr. Lees, the Chairman of the feasibility study committee, said that to his knowledge it was about (and I think I use his exact figures) five, 10 or perhaps 15 per cent. I do not believe that is considerable or substantial, which is how Mr. Collins described it.

The manufacturers also examined the feasibility study presented. That study appeared to be one of the important items of evidence presented to the Select Committee. Certain areas of that report were subject to question. The Premier did not give us the opportunity, because of the time factor (and I appreciate that he wanted the Bill to be debated today), to check with people who had given evidence to the committee as to which of the conflicting evidence was correct. For instance, it was claimed that the amount of cotton going into a sheet cost 4c. In the feasibility study the manufacturers claimed it was either 9c or 10c. That may appear to be arguing about a small amount, but when one compares that to the difference in cost between a Government produced sheet and one produced by existing manufacturers it reduces the difference significantly. If that inaccuracy is occurring in one area, one can surmise that it is occurring in other areas of the report.

There was a difference of opinion between Mr. Conway, who presented evidence this morning, and the manufacturers as to whether or not the costs shown in appendix 7, which covered the estimated annual labour costs for full production, were adequate. Certain wage rates were stated, with a loading of 5 per cent for pay-roll tax, and a loading of 5 per cent for other benefits. When I pointed out that I believed other benefits would be far more than 5 per cent, Mr. Conway indicated that he normally allowed 32 per cent, including pay-roll tax, and we were told that there had been a loading in the original wages.

Because of the way in which the matter has been rushed though Parliament, it has not been possible to check whether or not that is so, but there must be at least a grave doubt as to the accuracy of certain aspects of the feasibility study. I do not necessarily put the blame for that on Mr. Conway, who presented excellent evidence this morning, but it has been done also by other people, and I believe their evidence should be accounted for.

The next point I wish to make is that it was pointed out in the feasibility study that, if all the non-tailoring work of the Government did not go to the new factory at Whyalla, and if some or it was retained here for existing contractors, the cost advantage to the State Government would be greatly reduced. In fact, the advice of the people who carried out the feasibility study was not to proceed with the factory. This was interesting, because the question now arises of how much work the Government is prepared to allow to go to the Government factory at Whyalla. One could get the impression that some of it could be retained for Bedford Industries, the Phoenix Society, and other organisations employing handicapped persons. If that is so, according to the feasibility study the project at Whyalla would be condemned by the establishment of a Government clothing factory. That is the sort of dilemma in which the Government finds itself.

In reading the first report (the Haslam report) and then the feasibility study (the Lees report), I found tremendous conflicts, with no justification for them whatever. The Haslam report said that there should be no dressmaking in the Government clothing factory, yet the Lees report and the feasibility study are based on all the dressmaking work going to the Whyalla Government clothing factory. There was no justification in the feasibility study for changing the recommendation. If the dressmaking work did not go to Whyalla, the feasibility of the Whyalla project would come further into question.

I get the impression that the Premier is hell bent on establishing a Government clothing factory. I am not sure that his own Party did not pass a motion some years ago saying that such a factory should be investigated, if not set up. I believe the establishment of a Government clothing factory is being done for purely political purposes. There is no benefit for the clothing industry or for employees presently within the industry. There is likely to be a reduction of employment in the clothing industry in this State through the establishment of this factory greater than the employment the new factory will create. It is likely that 88 jobs will be lost. That is not an airy-fairy prediction: it is based on hard evidence presented to the Select Committee by three manufacturers. It does not

include other manufacturers who may have to put off people, and it does not include the handicapped persons organisations that may have to put people off or find work elsewhere. That figure is unknown. Employment will be created for only 60 people. Whyalla desperately needs additional work, especially for women, and I am not opposed to that. I have the greatest sympathy for the Government in trying to find that work. However, if the Government had adopted the decentralisation policies proposed by the Liberal Party, Whyalla would be far better off than it is at present. Unfortunately, the Government has failed to adopt the decentralisation initiatives proposed by the Opposition.

Mr. Allison: What about the turbines?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As my colleague says, there is a chance that they may not even make the turbines there.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about turbines.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The money that is being spent on this Government factory would be better spent elsewhere in subsidising heavy industry at Whyalla, such as the making of turbines. The reasons why I oppose the Bill are simple. I believe they cannot be questioned. Certainly, the evidence presented to the Select Committee, if taken objectively, backs that up.

The first consideration is that employment within the industry would be jeopardised. I see little point in the Government's investing money in this industry simply to transfer jobs from Adelaide to Whyalla. However, it will go beyond that. It is likely that the number of jobs lost in Adelaide will be greater than the number created in Whyalla.

Secondly, jobs for handicapped persons at Bedford Industries or the Phoenix Society could be placed in jeopardy. The Government has not stated its policy. At present, it is completely open: they are in jeopardy. The percentage is not large—perhaps 15 or 17 per cent of the 150 people employed in Bedford Industries, representing 20 to 25 people.

Thirdly, we have no guarantee (and the member for Mallee made this point well during the hearings of the Select Committee) that the costs spelt out in the feasibility study will be adhered to. If anything, the experience with Government ventures previously has been that they cannot maintain the standards laid down in feasibility studies. I am sure the member for Mallee will deal with that at greater length. Looking at other examples in this State where the Government has stepped in and tried to establish its own venture, we see that generally it has been highly unsuccessful. Therefore, we need to question the efficiency of such a factory. Unfortunately, the Government will take on a monopoly position; having done so, it automatically tends to lose its competitive edge. There is no standard by which to judge, so it tends to take on additional employees. Evidence was presented to the Select Committee that the staffing laid down in the feasibility study was top heavy; there were twice as many additional staff to machinists as should be necessary in such a venture.

Finally, the tendering system adopted by the Services and Supply Department has been questioned, apparently for 18 months. I know of a manufacturer who has had to close his doors because of the tendering methods, and I think some Government contracts have been unfair and unjust. The Government should look first at its tendering method and then reject the Bill or lay it aside. If, in 18 months or two years time, the supply of clothing is still not adequate, the Bill should be reconsidered, and I would be the first to accept it on that basis. However, I must oppose the Bill as presented to the House, especially considering the evidence presented. I resent the biased manner in which the Premier wished to report to the House. If we have a Select Committee, let us be fair about what it comes up with.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): During the recent State election campaign the member for Davenport came to Whyalla and explained at a public meeting why the people of Whyalla should vote Liberal. I wonder whether when the people of Whyalla read a copy of his speech in this debate they will believe him any more. At that time and again during this debate he declared that his Party had a proper (I think that was the word he used) policy for decentralisation of industry. I just wonder whether he is fair dinkum about that.

I wish to point out one or two important issues that came out of the Select Committee on this question, points which the member for Davenport either has forgotten conveniently or does not wish to bring to the attention of the House. One point was that no fewer than two clothing factories existed in Whyalla. It seems that the member for Davenport either glossed over that point or conveniently forgot about it. One of those factories employed about 40 skilled workers.

Mr. Tonkin: How many sheltered workshops do you have in Whyalla?

Mr. MAX BROWN: We have one, but I am not talking about sheltered workshops; I am talking about two clothing factories that were established in Whyalla, one of which employed 40 skilled workers. I believe that this legislation is simply trying to revive that industry.

The other point which came out of the committee but which does not seem to have been brought into the debate is that about 18 months to two years will elapse between the time the factory is established and when it is in full production. The Premier rightly pointed out that Whyalla as a city has the worst unemployment figures in this State. Another point that should be brought out is that this legislation emanates from an election promise that was made in the Premier's policy speech, which was supported by voters.

The member for Davenport raised the question of Bedford Industries, which undertakes contracts for the State Government. Flinders Industries in Whyalla, which is literally a sheltered workshop, also undertakes certain contracts for the State Government.

Mr. Tonkin: It didn't do well in the last lot of tenders in the last financial year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader will have a chance to speak if he so desires.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Bedford Industries is in a similar situation to Flinders Industries: it does not rely completely on Government contracts. The member for Davenport made an issue of the likely effects on the clothing industry in Adelaide. When the original clothing factory employing about 40 people closed down in Whyalla, it had an effect on that city. The honourable member's Federal colleagues' decision to close down the Whyalla shipyard had some effect, too, but he did not mention that situation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not wish to go into the manufacturers' evidence in depth but the remarks made by the member for Davenport about their evidence should be put in order. The manufacturers said that machines in this industry stand idle now. The member for Davenport implied that hundreds of machines were idle, resulting in a great loss of employment. If one cared to consider other

evidence one would ascertain that machines are idle in this industry at any time during the day. The manufacturers admitted in evidence that they had no vested interest in this project because many of them did not rely on Government contracts. That is fairly important, because only about six or seven of the 44 members of the manufacturers association had an interest in Government contracts.

The member for Davenport then complained bitterly about State Government tenders. It seems illogical to me that, upon cross-examination during the course of the committee meetings, one manufacturer admitted that he did not even bother to read the regular tender advertisements in the Monday *Advertiser*. It seemed to me that he was not interested in tendering for any contracts. Some criticism was made of the Government's setting up a factory in Whyalla, when skilled employees in the clothing manufacturing industry were not available there. The evidence revealed, however, that about 40 applicants would be interested in possible jobs if the factory were built. Those applicants have a wide scope of skills in this industry. It was not fair that the member for Davenport should suggest that skilled workers would not be available if such a factory was built.

It was also argued by members of the manufacturers association that a State Government factory would not be economical. They maintained that such a project could not specialise. That suggestion was not completely borne out in evidence. I do not believe that the member for Davenport is correct when he highlights that situation.

It would be possible in certain circumstances for a specialist field to be covered but we are looking at something that will start as an infant and possibly build up to that situation. In the evidence of manufacturer A, it was said that 40 per cent of his business was on State Government work and 60 per cent was, apparently, on Commonwealth Government work and he had concentrated on State Government work. It was obvious to the Government members of the committee anyway that this manufacturer had not endeavoured to diversify; he simply was content to rely 100 per cent on either State Government or Commonwealth Government orders. When he was questioned on whether he knew about the State Government's Small Business Advisory Unit, the gentleman said he knew nothing about it. Manufacturer B relied for 59 per cent of his business on Government work. He said he could not survive without Government business, and although he knew of the advisory committee, he found it did not work. It always amazes me when business people say they cannot survive, and the Liberal Party continues to say, "We are for private enterprise", yet we continually seem to come up with this problem of businesses going out of existence. It seems to me rather ironical that only a few weeks ago a meeting of business people was called in Whyalla to discuss this very thing. I point this out because one of these two manufacturers denied its existence, and the other said it did not work. I refer to an editorial written in the local newspaper on Friday, November 4. I will read one part of it:

> If the attendance at Wednesday night's meeting can be taken as an indication of the extent that the economic slump is worrying sections of Whyalla's community, compared with the numbers at similar meetings in centres such as Port Lincoln, then we should carry no concern about the current level of business activity in our city. Unfortunately, the opposite is probably more accurate—that those in Port Lincoln and other places are prepared to indulge in a little more self-help than we are to rescue ourselves from economic depressions.

In other words, that meeting that was called for small business people was very poorly attended, which, I suggest to this House, is the same situation as with both manufacturers A and B. Further to that, it seems ironical, too, for me personally, representing working-class people, that, when the Federal Government says, "There is no employment; you become redundant," they are the first people to say, "You must be retrained. That is the answer." Yet they have the support of small businesses and private enterprise. Candidly, I cannot understand it.

Manufacturer C said she depended for 60 per cent of her business on Government work. When asked about diversification, she would not have a bar of it. The other manufacturer I have already dealt with, in the question of Bedford Industries, but the funny part about the evidence concerning Bedford Industries is that the opposite was the case. They relied for only 15 per cent of their work on State Government work. They do mainly, on that basis, industrial clothing and, contrary to the other manufacturers, they say they have diversified very much. In fact, they took a punt and spent $15 000 on new equipment so that they could diversify. In evidence they said that that equipment was fully utilised.

The so-called existing clothing factory (supposedly still in existence in Whyalla, though I doubt very much whether it is) would not diversify, either, and currently it is coming to the State Government suggesting that it should now consider buying it out. First, that manufacturer could not diversify and, secondly, when he approached the very body we have asked these people to approach, the State Government advisory committee, he was told that there was one grave thing lacking in his enterprise—expertise. He was advised that he should get expertise and how he should go about getting it; yet nothing eventuated. I wonder, listening to the member for Davenport and knowing that that is the situation, how far any Government has to go in propping up. True, the Chairman of the working party, Mr. Haslam, said in his evidence that there would be some transfers of labour and he admitted there would be some impact on private enterprise. I do not suggest for one moment that there would not be some impact. There was a lot of impact on many major industries in Whyalla by the decisions of the Federal colleagues of the member for Davenport.

The manufacturers association condemned bitterly the State Government's consultant in this project, a Mr. W. D. Conway. Because of this attack by the manufacturers association and, to some degree, the member for Davenport, it was thought that we should call Mr. Conway and listen to his evidence. I was absolutely amazed. This young man is a business representative and an experienced manufacturer in the clothing industry. He has overseas experience—in Canada, I think, and in France, where he was connected with a $7 000 000 project—and he is now back in this country. Having sold his own business, he has been retained as advisory manager. He has travelled the world. Here is a man who the manufacturers association and the member for Davenport were implying did not know what he was talking about.

That was very ably answered by the evidence given by Mr. Conway, despite what the member for Davenport might think. The honourable member might think that he is a better representative of manufacturing industries than is Mr. Conway. We asked Mr. Collins, the union representative, to spell out any problems in connection with employment in the industry. He pointed out that, in most instances of loss of orders, the firms went interstate; it had nothing to do with the State Government's position at all. He gave numerous examples of firms diversifying

and seeking contracts interstate, thereby overcoming their difficulties. He also pointed out (and I think the Opposition members of the committee must agree) that diversification, particularly in the clothing industry, was a must.

This Bill, dealing with a $600 000 project, will bring to a decentralised community some hope of improving the employment position in the future. The employment of women has always been sadly lacking in a community like Whyalla. Where skilled labour has been recruited to a decentralised area, it soon becomes apparent that there is no employment for the wife or daughter of the skilled tradesman. I am not saying that this project will completely solve the problem, but it will go some way toward providing increased employment for women. The Government is advertising for managerial expertise. The land that will ultimately be used for the project is available, and I cannot understand why we are now having this kind of a debate. In conclusion, I point out that the local Whyalla press has played a bad role in this situation. The *Whyalla News* of Wednesday, October 26, after giving political views, makes the following statement in part of its editorial:

> There was a fanfare about a clothing factory for Whyalla, but the Premier did not know where or when, and we have not been told anything further since the election.

That editorial was written only 14 days after the declaration of the poll following the last State election. It is beyond my comprehension how the *Whyalla News* or anyone else could expect suitable legislation, a suitable examination of planning requirements, suitable land for the project, suitable expertise, the passing of this Bill, and the finding of $600 000 in only 14 days. Such editorials in times of unemployment do nothing toward getting us out of a difficult situation. I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill, and I sincerely hope that it will be passed here and in the Upper House, because it will give the people of Whyalla some hope of an improvement in the employment situation.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I do not intend to canvass any major arguments or to rebut the points made by the member for Whyalla. As a member of the Select Committee, I would like to make some observations about the evidence submitted to the committee, and to comment on the total project. The principal argument advanced in support of the establishment of a State clothing factory was that it would mean more work in South Australia; this point was made by Mr. Collins and other witnesses, who said that at this juncture South Australia was losing business to other States and that, if this business could be contained in South Australia, the total industry would benefit. However, as I see it, at present we are losing business interstate because the price in South Australia is not competitive with the price being tendered by other States.

Initially, anyway, there would be no way of preventing the present situation from continuing unless there was a clear Government direction to the State Services and Supply Department that Government tenders at present going interstate should be directed elsewhere to a State Government clothing factory. It was said in the evidence that it was expected there would be a 15 per cent saving in cost to the Government. That argument is advanced in the feasibility study. I am concerned that this need not necessarily be achieved unless there is some way of establishing a competitive situation in this industry. These figures are based on the figures of optimum productivity for units of production. The figures used are comparable with those being achieved by the industry at present, whereas my colleagues pointed out today during discussions that there is an element of piecework in the industry at present; all people concerned are not just working specifically for wages. So, there is an added inducement in the industry at present to minimise costs per unit. Without some sort of competition, these cost per unit figures need not necessarily be achieved.

There is another aspect, too; that is the point made by Mr. Collins, the Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, this morning with respect to the loss of work in the industry to interstate manufacturers. He gave the example of the Yakka enterprise, a large Victorian manufacturer of clothing. He said that that enterprise was able to come into South Australia and cut costs on some contracts to a point where it would be impossible to better the price by any means. When challenged as to how this could be done, he said that in a big firm there is such a scale of operation that there is at certain times unused capacity that one wishes to take up.

One is maximising one's capacity at all times by taking in work that may not necessarily be profitable. It may be work done on a basis of cost only in order to keep the total operation of the business working at maximum capacity. That is one of the cost savings that is available to the State Supply Department when it is tendering in the market. People can cut costs even below what is estimated to be a reasonable cost of production per unit for the various items nominated in the feasibility study. Notwithstanding the evidence, the competence of the people who did their work on the initial work study, which is known as the Haslam report, as well as the subsequent feasibility study, I am not impressed that, on the ground of cost saving, we can justify the establishment of a factory in South Australia when we already have an unused capacity here.

Unfortunately, I was not present at the committee meeting on Monday, when evidence was taken. I repeat that I regret that this morning, when the committee met to consider that evidence, we did not have the transcript before us. There was, therefore, no way in which I could read the transcript of yesterday's hearing and use it in judgment. I have not therefore in my contribution to the debate tried to raise the arguments advanced by those people. I have seen only the written submissions and not the transcript; nor did I hear the interrogation of the witnesses. I am not therefore familiar with the arguments that they advanced.

I was concerned at the statements (which were, I believe, made by Mr. Collins) which suggest that much of the lack of activity in the industry at present, and the reason for there being idle machines in South Australia, is caused by inefficiency of management and a lack of initiative on the part of owners of private firms effectively to compete in other areas.

The member for Whyalla covered this point to some extent. He said that these small factories that will be affected as a result of the project, because of the high percentage of work that they do for the Government, should diversify. However, it is possible to diversify only if one has the right equipment, people with the right skills, and a scale of operation sufficient to enable one to diversify without finding that the whole business is fragmented into so many little parts that one is not efficient in any.

Mr. Max Brown: The ones that have been successful—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is apparent to me (and the point has been made properly by the member for Whyalla) that the object of the Bill is to set up the clothing factory and that this was part of the Government's policy as expressed during the last election campaign. It was intended to provide employment in Whyalla, where, as the honour-

able member has pointed out, there is a grave unemployment problem, particularly in relation to married and single women. In this respect, I would be concerned more about the single than about the married women.

I do not dispute that it is Government policy to establish such a factory at Whyalla. However, I question how the factory will succeed financially when two private operations in Whyalla have already failed. There are three possibilities why they have failed: first, that the administration of the privately run factories in Whyalla was so bad that they could not be successful; secondly, that they were unable to get adequate contracts; or, thirdly (and this is a matter that concerns me, because we have evidence that there are skilled operatives at Whyalla; indeed, the Premier quoted a list of 40 people who had considerable experience in this field), that the failure of these businesses may in some way have been associated with the fact that some of the workmanship involved was not up to scratch. I have heard it said that there were problems with one of the factories, in that its work was sent back by the State Government because it was unsatisfactory; there seemed to be problems regarding the competence of its employees.

When setting up a factory like this, we are creating a monopoly situation. Consequently, I believe that this Government factory will succeed where private operators have failed because it will enjoy a special privilege in relation to its operation, namely, that it will have a monopoly of Government contracts. We should all be concerned that, when the factory gets these Government contracts, the price for which it is able to provide the goods is fair and reasonable. I see this as one of the weaknesses in the feasibility study; it assumes maximum productivity from each person involved in a non-competitive environment.

If this factory is to be established, I should like to see it established in the existing premises available. Before this State involves itself in a substantial capital investment in building a new factory, we should satisfy ourselves that we can produce the goods at a competitive cost per unit and at a budget figure, as suggested in the feasibility study. That will not stop the factory from being established. However, it will stop us spending a six-figure sum in building a new factory.

I express these concerns having had considerable experience in relation to such operations. The first example to which I wish to refer is the Government Group Laundry. I was a member of the Public Works Committee when this matter was investigated, and I was conscious of the Government's activities to sell the Group Laundry to all subsidised hospitals. I say unequivocally that the happiest Government subsidised hospitals were those that kept out of the Group Laundry's operations. Because of escalating costs, and the monopoly situation, some hospitals had no alternative than to pay the prices being charged, irrespective of whether they could do the work more cheaply or whether some other laundry could have provided a comparable service at a competitive price.

The other example to which I refer is the frozen food factory. The member for Stuart would know that we examined that matter in another inquiry. Indeed, we studied the proposition as it was submitted to the Public Works Committee. The scheme was examined critically to see whether the proposition as submitted to the committee was viable and whether the costs of meals, and so on, on which the factory was sold were realisable costs in the situation then obtaining. I would say that they were not, and that the costs were far greater than those for which those involved had budgeted. However, the whole proposition was sold initially because the work could be done for a certain price.

That is what worries me regarding this project. It is being sold on a feasibility study which states that, if it can be done for a certain price, there will be an economic advantage. However, I dispute that this can be achieved. I will not dispute, however, that this is a Government project that is being put at Whyalla for a specific purpose; I hope it achieves that purpose. However, I suggest caution regarding the development of this project until it has been proven. It can be proven because there are unused resources that can be used to test the capacity of the people involved and the economics of the operation, to ascertain whether the figures that have been presented to us are achievable in reality.

I had reservations about this, and one of the amendments made to the report that came into the House (and the Premier agreed to alter the original proposal to conform to my view) was that from information given to us, it could be possible to achieve these economies. I should like to see them achieved before the State commits itself to the total expenditure envisaged in the feasibility study for the establishment of a big factory in Whyalla. I support the Bill.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): As a member of the Select Committee, I support the report. The feasibility study and the evidence before the committee seems to me strongly in favour of establishing a State clothing factory in Whyalla. The only persons who gave evidence to the contrary were a group of people representing clothing manufacturers. They submitted that establishing a clothing factory in Whyalla would have varying deterrent effects on their industry in the metropolitan area, although many of their statements were not supportable, and I believe that they painted a far gloomier picture than is expected to occur should the factory be established at Whyalla. In his evidence, the Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, Mr. Collins, argued that the most compelling argument in favour of establishing the factory stemmed from the fact that for some years it had been found most difficult to avoid a substantial amount of work going to manufacturers in other States. I point out, and I think the member for Whyalla has already done so, that of the 44 manufacturers in the Federation only eight are working on State Government contracts to varying degrees.

The evidence presented to the committee by the manufacturers categorised individual manufacturers into groups A, B, C and D. They contended that establishing a factory at Whyalla would have an adverse effect on employment in the industry and in their factories. The member for Davenport has said that he believes that 85 persons now employed in the metropolitan area would lose their jobs if the factory were established. The evidence did not prove that: it proved that establishing a clothing factory in Whyalla would assist persons there who already had skills, as they had worked in this trade previously.

It was not established that there would be any adverse effects in the metropolitan area; the clothing industry has always had fluctuations, and it is up to individual manufacturers to make alternative arrangements and to anticipate the market. This has happened successfully among some manufacturers in South Australia. I understand from the evidence given and from a statement by Mr. Collins that about 2 200 persons are now employed in the industry in South Australia, and I assume that most of those people are employed in the metropolitan area. However, that is a minor percentage only of the people employed in this industry throughout Australia.

The member for Davenport made play about the petition presented to the House today containing 318 signatures. I believe that this was a contrived petition which was probably sent around factories on the instigation of employers and which was signed by various employees in the industry on the premise that they may be adversely affected in their employment. The petition does not indicate to me that the 318 people were fully aware of the position when they signed the petition; all these people will not be affected in the metropolitan area if the State Government establishes a clothing factory at Whyalla.

Mr. Collins, Secretary of the Clothing Trades Union, who has a wider interest in the industry than have individual manufacturers, said that he did not think it would affect employment at all. One factor that affects employment in the clothing industry, as it affects other industries, is overseas imports. At present all manufacturers are in competition in order to grab as much of the market as they can. There are too many in the game in South Australia, and some of them rely basically on Government contracts to see them through, and this practice will not work. In the long term, they cannot exist solely on having one egg in the basket, and they need to diversify.

I support the report of the Select Committee, because I think it is in the best interests of the State to establish a clothing factory at Whyalla, and it will probably prove in the long term to be in the best interests of the clothing industry of this State.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It is clear from the report of the Select Committee that this legislation has been railroaded through that committee, and has come out exactly as it was when it went in. Opposition members on the committee made several suggestions at all times throughout the meetings of that committee. I am certain that they did their duty as members of the committee, and did it well, indeed. Also, I am certain that they were conscious of their responsibility, and I know that they were hampered particularly in the past 24 hours by not being in possession of the transcripts of evidence that they should have had if they were to make a reasoned and rational assessment of the situation before the report was introduced in the House. Therefore, I repeat that this has been railroaded through the Select Committee, and it has been pushed through the meetings.

Mr. Nankivell: It is the first time I have seen a transcript of these proceedings.

Mr. TONKIN: True. How can anyone say that the Select Committee has done the job that such committees are traditionally set up to do in the Parliamentary process? The answer is that no-one can say that. The committee has reported today but, obviously, members have not given the report the full consideration they should have given it or needed to give it, and both Opposition members of the committee have said that they have not been given sufficient time to consider the evidence that was given to the committee. All I can say is that this makes an absolute mockery of the process of the Select Committee system. It is clear that this was an exercise only, and paying lip service to Parliament by going through the motions. It would have been more honest if the Government had said that it did not intend to budge one inch on the matter but that, if it were able to give the impression that it was going to be reasonable, it would agree to have a Select Committee for that purpose.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Leader will get back to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: We are talking about the motion that the report of the Select Committee be noted, and I have not strayed from the point one little bit: I think I have been right on the point. The legislation is exactly the same as it was before it went to the Select Committee, and its effect will be the same. Businesses are going out of existence. Whyalla is in serious trouble and needs jobs. That is what this has been all about. We have heard from the member for Whyalla that this was an election promise. During that election we heard much vilification of the Federal Government's failure to keep the shipyards going and that is why jobs are scarce in Whyalla. We heard much vilification of the Federal Government because it did not maintain shipbuilding subsidies at the level that the Labor Party thought it should.

Now we find that, when the possibility of another industry coming to Whyalla is ventilated, the Minister of Mines and Energy says in this House today, "You have to balance how much it will cost against the benefit to the town." That is nothing more nor less than a sham. The Government clothing factory at Whyalla will be likely to put other people out of work, and no-one, not even the Premier, apparently has disputed this.

From evidence given, we see that at least 85 people are likely to be put out of work in three different factories in Adelaide, not to mention the effect that this will have on Bedford, Flinders, and Phoenix. However, that does not matter, because the Government has referred the matter to a Select Committee! The member for Whyalla has been able to stand up tonight and justify the establishment of a Government clothing factory in Whyalla and to justify the fact that jobs will be lost elsewhere, simply because the matter has been referred to a Select Committee. In other words, the Government can wash its hands of the whole affair! This has been a cynical exercise in political expediency. I think it is sickening, and I cannot support even the motion to note the report. It is an exercise to grant Parliamentary respectability to a political sham.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In the short time that I have had to see the evidence, it is difficult to sift through the transcript of three or four meetings. Indeed, when I found out that there were two meetings today, it made the task much more difficult. I have no doubt, from going through the evidence, that the cost of setting up this industry will cause much unemployment in Adelaide. One firm has stated that it will be laying off 50 people.

Mr. Max Brown: Which firm is that?

Mr. MATHWIN: Mrs. S. M. McGee said that, and I will read her evidence to refresh the honourable member's memory, if he has forgotten what she said. Obviously, the honourable member has not had time to read the evidence, as I have not had. Mrs. McGee says that her company will have to close down if this factory is established in Whyalla and that will cause 50 people to lose work in her factory alone.

The cost of setting up the factory will be about $720 000. It will cost about that sum a year to run the factory. I understand that there is a clothing factory in Whyalla now which is used for a storage area or something of that kind and which was built by the Housing Trust. The first investigations carried out by the Government ought to have been to find out the term of the lease. If the Government intends to take over or build a factory in Whyalla, that factory is already established and therefore would be well on the way to being equipped. I refer now to the evidence given by Mrs. McGee, as reported at pages 44 and 45 of the transcript, as follows:

> Mr. DEAN BROWN: What would be the effect on your company if in six months all the Government contracts were taken from you?—I would close up.
>
> And all 50 would lose their jobs if you did not find other

alternative work?—But where would it come from?

I do not know but, if you could find alternative work, there could be some hope of retaining them?—But if we cannot find any alternative work now how would we do so in six months?

The Premier has offered some assistance through the small business unit, although that would be of a more general nature. You are sceptical about getting any other work?—That is right.

Earlier this evening, the member for Whyalla said that one of these persons did not know that advice and assistance could be provided in situations like this. The other person stated that he did know that such existed. The whole point is that the work is not available, and people need not advice but work and orders to keep the workers employed in their factories. Mrs. McGee's evidence continues:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: You say in your prepared submission that you have recently installed a hot-head press, valued at $8 000, at Government request. Could you tell us when that request was made and when you installed the machinery?—We were doing many trousers, and we did uniforms for Flinders Medical Centre, all of which had to be hot-head pressed. We had to cost that in. It was more expensive because we were having it done outside. They said, "You will never win a contract. You will not do anything unless you cut costs by installing your own press." I said, "Right, we will install the press."

When did you install it?—About nine or 10 months ago. Since then, the press has had no work.

Do you see the future of the clothing industry in your sort of area continuing to remain depressed? Also, do you see any of your area being threatened by further imports?—Yes.

Do you see it depressed for the foreseeable future?—If we lose our Government contracts, yes. I do not know what the other manufacturers will do. However, I know that my own factory might just as well close its doors. That business has been running for 58 years, and it would be a pity for it to go out like that.

I understand the situation that the member for Whyalla is in, and I do not blame him. He is fighting for his area and his constituents, and that is his job. However, I do blame him and his colleague the member for Gilles for saying that the factory will not create unemployment in the metropolitan area, when they know that it will. They cannot deny it.

Another matter that was brought up in evidence was that of tendering and how it is done. I refer to the evidence of Mr. Travers, President of the relevant association, in replying to the Chairman. As reported at page 24 of the transcript, his evidence is:

You have made your written submission and it has been circulated to members of the committee?—Yes. We would like to elaborate on it a little. As regards page 3, the survey just conducted by our members in Adelaide indicates that over 200 machines are idle in members' factories which, with support people, means an unemployment level of at least 275. With the factory going up to Whyalla, it means that more people will be unemployed and more machines will be vacant in Adelaide. Also, this is not just a replacement. If you put 36 machinists up there and take away 36 machinists down here, some of the factories are heavily committed to Government contracts. If their members are unemployed, it brings the percentage of workers in those factories down to a small number, but their overheads are the same, and we see some of those places that might eventually close up—not many of them but, as the Government makes a point of looking after small businesses, in this instance we do not think it is.

Mr. Thomas then went on to talk about the methods of tendering in the clothing trade, particularly for the Government. He stated:

For a long time, I have always felt that the State Government's system of tendering was wrong. In March, 1975, I wrote a letter suggesting the method that should be used. The method I am suggesting is the method used by the Commonwealth Government for many years, with much success. It does not advertise in the paper; it actually goes around the factories and makes a list of all the factories and the types of work they do. It inspects the factories to see whether they are capable of doing that kind of work. It then asks the factory whether it is prepared to accept Commonwealth Government contracts. In this way, it finds out the specialists in shirts, socks, uniforms, whatever it wants, and a tender is sent out to all those firms making that particular type of goods. When it gets the tenders in it knows then whether those factories are capable of doing the type of work. Everyone is circularised.

The way it is done at the moment, I feel the tendering is left to a few, which does not give the State Government the benefit of all the factories in South Australia. A sealed sample is always supplied and, before the work is made by a factory, it has got to be made up to that sealed sample. It is inspected by inspectors and then, if the sample is accepted, it is put in a sealed bag and that becomes the standard of the work to be done. In this way, it gives the Government the lowest price for the highest standard, and it states that in the tendering the lowest price will not necessarily get the contract. Inspectors go through the factory regularly and inspect the work. They generally pick up one out of a batch. If one of that batch is wrong, the whole lot goes back. This has operated for many years and has been successful, and this is the system, without elaborating on it more, which, if the State Government used it, would cut out many of its problems.

He then stated the advantages of the Commonwealth Government system of tendering, which incidentally is the same as the system presently used by the New South Wales Government. The system being used by the South Australian Government, of placing an advertisement in the newspapers, is one of catch as catch can as to whether a particular manufacturer sees the advertisement or not. Needless to say, many opportunities are lost by these experts in this industry. At page 26 of the evidence, Mr. Thomas said:

We have had up to 150 machinists, although at present we have only 100. We would be interested in quoting for, say, uniforms. We used to quote for the Commonwealth Government, so I see no reason why we should not do so for the State if we had the opportunity. The President has a factory, and he would be interested in quoting for uniforms, although not for, say, sheets, for which he may not be set up. We have all specialised in certain aspects of the industry and we would quote for them.

So he was saying these firms would be quite interested in quoting for the South Australian Government if they were given the opportunity to do so. Mr. Travers supported Mr. Thomas in his remarks about tendering. The following question was asked by the Chairman:

And you have not since then tendered?

Mr. Travers stated:

I make ladies' uniforms, and I would be pleased to work with the State Government in making uniforms if I was given an opportunity to do so. In any business, one must be able to plan one's production. I telephoned the Supply Department to ascertain when they called for tenders for uniforms, etc., and I was told to read the papers. You can imagine, my being a red-blooded Australian, what I thought about that reply.

At page 26 the Chairman asked the following question:

We have had submitted to us by Mr. Rainsford, the

Chairman of the Whyalla working party for getting industry for Whyalla, a list of experienced clothing factory operatives as at April 18 this year in Whyalla. It comprises 40 people, many of whom have considerable experience. I assume that you were not aware of that when you made this statement?

Mr. Travers answered:

Yes, I was aware that they had factories there. I was also aware of the fact that they could not have been going too well. I believe that the Government was railing stuff up to them and bringing it back to try to get them going.

So the situation even then was quite difficult. The Chairman then asked a question relating to the number of trained people in Whyalla and about how many were trained members of the clothing industry (and he listed a number of people and the years of their experience in the industry). Mr. Thomas, in reply to that, said:

I would answer that by saying that if there are 40 unemployed clothing machinists in Whyalla, there would be 300 or 400 of them unemployed in Adelaide at present. As you know, there have been quite a few factories that have run into trouble. Many were put off in one factory; I was told that it involved 300 people. Others have run into trouble since and closed down. The need to use these girls is greater in Adelaide than it is in Whyalla.

That is followed by further evidence of tendering and other matters relating to Whyalla. Mr. Max Brown then asked the following question:

Two clothing factories were established in Whyalla, one being reasonably large. This type of skilled labour is available in Whyalla, because some of these people would obviously have worked in those factories. The heavy industrial clothing factory closed down because its major contract came from Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. I draw your attention to the question of places such as retarded people's workshops tendering for State Government clothing?

In reply, Mr. Thomas stated:

I believe that they are probably on the mailing list and are contacted. This is where the system is wrong. If this number of women is unemployed in a small place like Whyalla, the number must be multiplied 10 times for a place like Adelaide. Many clothing factories have closed down in South Australia, even in the past few months.

And so the matter goes on. Mr. Travers also made clear that the method of tendering in New South Wales was similar to the system used by the Commonwealth. There are areas there where the Government could have done something for this trade had it seen fit to do so.

The matter of the feasibility study was mentioned on page 33 of the evidence, where Mr. Travers was asked whether he could comment on that study, and he replied as follows:

Yes. At page 22, you get down to a rate of $11·85 an hour, which is a rate of 19·75c a minute. There is no manufacturer in Australia who could afford the luxury of manufacturing at 19·75c a minute. That is a ridiculous figure. Costing today would be between 12c and 14c a minute.

Mr. Travers was then asked:

Is that 19c a minute before the 50 per cent efficiency, or after?

He replied:

That is providing every operator is getting 100 per cent efficiency. If, as it says here, they are working at only 50 per cent efficiency, that must double, must it not? . . . Another thing that worries Mr. Thomas and me is the consultants to this feasibility study, Conway, Connelly Associates.

He then stated that he doubted Mr. Conway's experience in this industry and said that he had been in the industry for only about 12 years.

At page 34 of the evidence, Mr. Travers made the following statement:

Another thing in the report is that I do not think anybody could afford the luxury of having 36 machinists and 24 non-productives. One pattern cutter, two stencillers, two layers' up and two cutters—a total of seven to feed 36 girls. To give you an example of that, in my place I have about 35 or 36 girls. I have one pattern cutter and two cutters and they keep the 36 girls going with a variety of work. So in their estimates there, there are four people more than I would employ.

He was talking, of course, about the feasibility study. He continued:

He went to a lot of pains to work out his different costs of making different articles, like sheets; they were going to save X amount of money on making sheets. With their time at 19.75c a minute to lay up, he has got 4c for cotton sheets. The sheets would be of polyester cotton and therefore they would have to use a polyester cotton thread. At 4c, I say it would be more like 9c to 10c.

So, the people who came to give evidence took to task certain aspects of the feasibility study. At page 39 of the evidence, still dealing with the feasibility study, Mr. Travers made the following comment:

I think the costs are very high: 24 non-productive people to look after 36 machinists. It is a luxury no-one in private enterprise could afford. That is absolutely ridiculous. I think the consultants are fooling themselves in connection with the question of working at 50 per cent efficiency. It will be a while before they get that high. They reckon that every other factory works at only 50 per cent efficiency, but that is hard to swallow. Some of our manufacturers are competing favourably with big-name manufacturers in the Eastern States. The report needs to be straightened out.

The Chairman asked Mr. Thomas the following question:

Your analysis shows that, if anything, the consultants' costing has been too high?

Mr. Thomas replied as follows:

We are referring to the making of sheets in 1¾ minutes, and we are saying it would be impossible to do it in the time. I therefore wonder whether all the other times are accurate.

So much for the feasibility study produced as evidence.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You should look at the consultants' evidence in reply.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is most difficult. I have been through the three transcripts. They total many pages, and it is difficult to read every one, and to quote from it. I am sure the Premier would support me on that.

I can understand the situation of the member for Whyalla. He represents an area which has problems, and obviously he will support the establishment of this factory. He said there had been no evidence on costing comparisons, but what I have just read shows that his remarks were quite wrong. I have dealt with his remarks about one of the members not knowing about the advisory service. In passing, he mentioned the unemployment problems in Whyalla, and of course he was referring to the shipyards. We know the reason for that: it was the Federal Government, but the Whitlam Federal Government.

The member for Gilles admitted that unemployment would occur in the metropolitan area, but he shrugged it off. The union representative, Mr. Collins, said there would be no effect in the metropolitan area. The two opinions differ. As the member for Gilles said, Mr. Collins should know. Be it on his head; he said there would be no effect in the metropolitan area.

The worst thing the member for Gilles said was that the petition submitted to this House by the member for Davenport was a farce, and he suggested that workers had been coerced into signing it. I utterly reject that suggestion, as I am sure does my colleague the member for Davenport. No-one was made to sign that petition. It was signed by more than 300 Adelaide workers who were

offered no bribe to do it, and who were not forced to sign. If that is how the member for Gilles deals with petitions and people who sign them, it is a sad story for people in his district who wish to show their opposition to what goes on in this place and elsewhere and to show their feelings on any matter. It is to his shame to suggest in some way that people were forced to sign a petition and that a petition signed by more than 300 people was not worth worrying about.

I shall delay the House no longer, except to register these objections. The situation has been rushed. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, and I suppose we should be thankful for that. A Select Committee collects evidence and allows people to submit their views about certain legislation coming before the House. Certainly, people should be given every opportunity to put their views. I understand that two meetings were held today. The report came to this House and the Premier moved that it be accepted, and wished to get the Bill right through the House at this stage. The evidence had not been tabled, and no member of this House had been able to peruse the transcript. Members of the committee had not been able to read the evidence, and in fact the member for Mallee was able to read the evidence of the previous committee meeting only half an hour ago. That is not good enough. The Premier should have given more time for the matter to be considered and for members to gauge its value and the damage this project could do to the State of South Australia.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In the main, I shall refer to only one aspect. I support most of what my colleagues have said. I am not keen on public enterprise moving into a field where private enterprise, and in particular a form of rehabilitation enterprise, is operating. I wish to talk about the aspect of rehabilitation in relation to Bedford Industries and as it relates to the Flinders operation at Whyalla and to the Phoenix Society and I shall read the brief evidence given in relation to Bedford Industries. At page 57 of the transcript the following appears:

> The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fraser, you said that your had 30 percent to 35 per cent of your work coming from Government contracts. Is that State Government work?—It is State and Federal Government work.
>
> How much of it would be State Government Work? —About half.
>
> What actual work are you doing for the State Government?—Mainly industrial garments—overalls, including the bib-and-brace type.
>
> Mr. DEAN BROWN: Dust coats?—Yes.

The transcript then states:

> The CHAIRMAN: What workshop is this?—Bedford Industries. We have not come to object to the Whyalla concept, but we have come to state the case that, if the Whyalla factory goes ahead, the handicapped community will suffer. If the Whyalla factory is only minor, we would not worry about it, but, if it will be enormous, we will be in trouble.
>
> At the outset it would not be able to cover all State Government work.

That was at the outset. Let us accept that. The Chairman then asked:

> What would happen thereafter would depend on the results. Because of our attitude, Bedford Industries, Phoenix, and Heritage would always be allocated by the Government a part of our work, to provide employment for disabled people.

How can any Premier or any member of this Parliament guarantee in future that, once a clothing corporation has been set up, a future Government would give any work to Bedford Industries, Phoenix, Heritage or Flinders? The Premier's word means something only as long as he is willing to uphold it or as long as he is Premier of the State. He will not be here forever—that could happen because of the action of voters or some other action he may take in society.

Mr. Dean Brown: It's an open-ended guarantee.

Mr. EVANS: I agree. To some extent we are agreeing to export jobs from the handicapped to Whyalla. In the case of Bedford Industries, I ask what group of workers in our society is more dedicated to trying to achieve its full capacity? They have been handicapped because of accident or illness or from birth, and are doing their utmost to become fully efficient to the point where they can move from Bedford Industries into another venture. If the other venture happens to be at Whyalla, because that is the only place that offers secure employment for making Government garments, what employment prospects would these people have?

Many private enterprise operations within Adelaide say straight out that this measure will affect them. They admit openly that high costs in this State are pricing them out of the Australian market. No other market is available to Australian manufacturers, because we cannot compete on the world market. We in South Australia are an island that cannot compete on the Australian market. The area that should be available in the long term with any sort of guarantee is Government projects and Government contracts.

In the long term we would be taking that work away from the disabled at Bedford Industries and Phoenix and send it to Whyalla. I am sympathetic to Whyalla's problems, but we have created that situation in this country because we have exported jobs overseas through our high cost structure. It is not our fault that we do not have the necessary expertise for this work. This measure will export jobs that are held by handicapped people in the metropolitan area.

Bedford Industries employs about 100 people, and 150 handicapped people are waiting to get jobs in Bedford Industries so that they can be rehabilitated, trained and given the opportunity to work, to earn and to hold up their head in society so that they can say that they are carrying out a duty and are earning money just like any other respectable worker is doing. Through this measure we are saying to them, "We will give you some work in future on the Premier's word, but no-one can give you a guarantee about what the corporation or the Government will do in future."

If the Whyalla project proceeds, a large plant is built, money is borrowed and the corporation runs short of work and some work is going to Bedford Industries or to other rehabilitation centres, union pressure will be such that all that work will be exported to Whyalla. I make the plea, regardless of the overall concept of the clothing corporation, that nothing be taken away from people who are suffering or who have suffered, who are handicapped and are trying to be rehabilitated in our society, and who are trying to make a full effort and to use this opportunity in our society.

At page 58 the transcript states:

> Mr. MAX BROWN: Have you diversified very much? . . . Certainly. We do not try to undercut outside bodies. We are not profiteering. We have gone in for rather involved garments; for example, the battle dress for the Army. Beyond March, the outlook is pretty bleak for us.

Mr. Fraser also said that, regardless of the clothing corporation's being set up, the outlook was bleak for handicapped people he was trying to help and to make effective in our society. The transcript continues:

> Mr. DEAN BROWN: The feasibility study suggests that overalls and dustcoats could eventually be transferred to the new factory. If you lost between 15 per cent and 17 per cent of your work in 12 to 18 months, would that affect your employment? . . . Certainly.

What we are voting on this evening if we vote for this measure is that some people at Bedford Industries will be retrenched. That is what we are admitting this evening if we pass this measure. These people will not be able to get a job anywhere else in the workforce even if a job was available. This is one of the few institutions that can train these people. Their job opportunities are being taken away by this Parliament if we vote for this measure this evening. That was admitted by Mr. Fraser to members of the Select Committee. The transcript continues:

> Mr. DEAN BROWN: How many people would be involved in those figures of 15 per cent to 17 per cent?---We have just spent $25 000 on new equipment. We have an endless list of people needing employment. Today the equipment is almost used. This is based on getting a fair share of State Government contracts. If they are not open to us because they are allocated to Whyalla, we would have to cut back or diversify.

The opportunities to diversify are not great. If there is an opportunity to diversify, let us use it for the type of employment that is needed at Whyalla; do not let us take away from an existing establishment work that is catering for those who have suffered in our society and are handicapped. I make the plea that we should consider these people strongly when we consider this project. If any group in our society needs to be helped it is the group that is willing to help itself to its fullest capacity.

I have a fairly close association with that group at Bedford Industries. I admire them for their courage and dedication, to give a 100 per cent effort to their work. If every South Australian gave the same effort we would not be considering the sort of project we are considering for Whyalla, because we could compete throughout our industry with overseas as well as Australian organisations. The very people who are giving 100 per cent effort we are setting out to damage because the rest of us have not given a 100 per cent effort.

I do not necessarily support the report; I believe it will be damaging to the group to which I have referred. I do not believe that the Premier's word in the long term will mean anything. I do not believe that any of us can give a guarantee in the long term once the clothing corporation is set up. I object to that principle.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I was quite puzzled that the Government in the present economic climate, and having regard to the state of the clothing industry in South Australia, should proceed with this measure. I do not in any way wish to speak against the problem, which I admit exists in Whyalla, but let us not fool ourselves; an almost indentical situation exists in many other country towns that have relied on a clothing industry for a long time to provide employment for female labour in those areas. I refer for that purpose to Gawler.

I do not want to be parochial in this. I could easily refer to Kapunda, because there were clothing facilities there; but I make the point that the clothing industry throughout South Australia has had a major downturn as a result of the drop in tariffs foisted upon Australians by the Whitlam regime. The industry has not recovered and shows no signs of recovering. Some of the organisations are proceeding with a very much reduced staff, still providing employment for a few but, in the action that the Government now contemplates, I suggest seriously that the majority of those smaller companies will go to the wall and no doubt some of those in the Adelaide area will also find themselves in great difficulty. We are simply moving the jobs from point A to point B, point B on this occasion being Whyalla. Whilst the promotion of the whole project may be on the premise that combining all the activities in one area will improve the economics of supplying uniforms, pillowcases, sheets, etc., for the Government, where there will be in the future no competition, I suggest to the Premier that shortly there will be a marked escalation in costs because, where the Government-sponsored facility does not have to measure itself against other competitors, as has always happened in the past, it will cease to be an economic and viable proposition. The cost will escalate.

No matter which area we refer to, this situation has arisen and will arise, and there is already evidence of it in so far as the central food provision of the hospital system is concerned. It is certainly a major feature of the laundry system which applies to hospitals and similar organisations in Adelaide at present. We are simply shifting jobs from one point to another. We shall disturb a number of existing organisations and will create a problem in several communities that are currently gaining some benefit from the activities of their clothing factories; because, when we take these contracts away from the existing larger organisations in Adelaide, they in turn will compete against the country factories for the work that those factories are currently undertaking, and the whole process will be like the dog chasing its tail: there will be a shift of responsibility and effect from one place to another.

Another point is South Australia's peculiar geographical position compared with the Eastern States, in respect of the white goods market and the motor industry. The problems that face our industry today are associated with the cost of transportation of the finished product to the market. Where we have to import the raw products to the manufacturing site, the problem is even graver. If we are to take the raw products to Whyalla, there will be a cost factor; if we are required to bring back the finished product from Whyalla, there will be another cost factor, associated purely and simply with transportation. I question seriously whether the advantages of providing additional employment at Whyalla will outweigh the transport costs. I question seriously also whether the socio-economic difficulties encountered by some smaller country towns with their clothing factories will be in any way lessened.

I find the creation of a Government monopoly of this nature abhorrent to the best interests of the South Australian public. I cannot accept that the matter has been thoroughly tested or considered, notwithstanding that it has been to a Select Committee which was forced to consider it hastily. The House this evening is being asked to pass legislation that it will soon regret.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I propose only to deal briefly with matters raised by two members. The member for Fisher has suggested that the result of passing this Bill will inevitably be to take work away from the sheltered workshops in South Australia; that is not the case. The sheltered workshops presently get a proportion of Government business. That is as a result of Government policy, and the passing of this Bill would not alter that policy. The fact that the Bill is passed and there is a Government clothing factory will not alter the situation in relation to the Government's provisions for assisting people who need assistance and rehabilitation of the kind involved. The member said, "Well, the Government may not remain; another Government may have a different policy." That will be so whether or not this Bill passes. So, when the honourable member goes

into a grand diatribe that we are exporting jobs from Bedford Industries to Whyalla, he is talking without basis. The Government in relation to rehabilitation work provides a certain amount of its contracts and assistance to areas like this, and it also provides by direction to the Government departments a proportion of employment to disabled people. That remains a Government policy and I anticipate the electors of South Australia will see to it that Governments that support that point of view remain in office whatever may be their political complexion.

Mr. Dean Brown: I accept that undertaking but it alters the validity of the feasibility study.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry, but I had this argument with the honourable member in the Select Committee. I do not accept that; I do not believe that is correct.

Mr. Dean Brown: The feasibility study—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member went on with this business in the Select Committee and was disagreed with by me and other members of the committee on this score. He made it quite clear that from the outset he was going to find everything possible wrong with the total proposition and he approached the whole matter in a completely biased fashion; and he would see something wrong even if it there was nothing wrong.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's an unfair accusation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is an accurate one. The member for Light suggests that the amount of work in South Australia in the clothing industry is finite and therefore, by providing an additional outlet in South Australia, we are altering the situation for other companies, which will then face competition from those which no longer have Government contracts. That is not a valid contention. It has not come out in the evidence before the Select Committee. In fact, South Australia has only 3·5 per cent (my figure says 3 per cent; the manufacturers say 3·5 per cent) of the total clothing industry in Australia although it has nearly 10 per cent of the work force in Australia; we have less than our proportion of the clothing industry, by a long way.

Dr. Eastick: You are not suggesting that 10 per cent is producing only 3·5 per cent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The total employment in the South Australian clothing industry is about 3·5 per cent of the national total. It has been possible to change the basis of some clothing firms in South Australia so that they work within a larger market in Australia. An instance of what can happen was given by Mr. Collins before the Select Committee when he pointed out that Glenside Clothing, which had previously been doing considerable work on Government contracts, after the announcement of the Government's decision to set up a Government clothing factory diversified and got considerable subcontracts from the King Gee enterprise. The firm has been so successful in this that its total production will be taken up with that subcontract work; that was not work that it took from other clothing manufacturers in South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: This time!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is true, but this is only one instance. As Mr. Conway pointed out, successful people in the industry have diversified and gone into merchandising and marketing in a way that has led a number of businesses to start up and grow considerably without affecting other people in the market place in South Australia. The total clothing market in Australia is such that that is possible. It is not correct to say that we are looking at the clothing market in Australia simply within the confines of this State; manufacturers in this State are involved in the total clothing market, and there is considerable flexibility of effort in that area.

Another example is the Levi Strauss enterprise which, having been very successful in the jeans market, decided to diversify into shirt manufacturing at a time when most shirt manufacturing in Australia was conducted in Victoria and when shirt manufacturers in Victoria were complaining bitterly that they were badly hit by imports and that they could not get into the Australian market. However, Levi Strauss was extraordinarily successful in getting into the market with an entirely new product, in respect of which the firm was able to be completely competitive with imports. This sort of thing can happen in South Australia, and it is not possible to say that, by creating an additional outlet to do Government work, we are diminishing the total work available to the South Australian clothing industry. It is quite possible to get into other areas if one proceeds in the normal way in which Opposition members have previously advocated private enterprise should operate.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 11 (clause 2)—Leave out "This" and insert "(1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, this".

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 11 insert "(2) If a proclamation referred to in subsection (1) of this section has not been made before the thirty-first day of December, 1978, this Act shall expire on that day.".

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

I oppose the Legislative Council's amendments. The substantive amendment is the same as that moved and defeated in this place as an unnecessary addendum to the Bill. The principal Act provides for the continuation of the principles of indexation within the State jurisdiction; to place any limitation upon it presupposes that indexation will not continue. The Government does not have that view; indeed, the Government has meticulously followed the principles of indexation, and has reflected that through the State Industrial Commission. We intend that that principle should continue in the future. To place a limitation on the life of this Bill by a date predetermines that the indexation principles will not continue. The Government believes that those principles should continue in the State sphere so long as they operate in the Commonwealth sphere. As there is no termination date in that area, it is inappropriate to have a termination date in the State sphere. For those reasons, the Government rejected an identical amendment moved in this place, and it now rejects the amendment moved by the Legislative Council.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. As the Minister said, it is the same amendment as that moved in this place. It restricts the extension of this Bill to another 12 months. The Government has already done this kind of thing twice. It had no objection to such a proposal in 1975, when this legislation was first introduced, and it had no objection to such a proposal in 1976, but now, when the same amendment is moved in 1977, the Government has changed its mind. It wants to give power to the Minister to terminate wage indexation at his discretion. The Minister

has shown that he is incapable of using that sort of power with discretion. The Minister said in the press that he was prepared to go outside indexation for the purpose of achieving a 37½ hour week for workers in the power industry. While the Minister is prepared to make threats like that in the press, we are not willing to give him the opportunity to withdraw the power given under this legislation at any stage at his discretion. We therefore support the Legislative Council's amendment, which provides that wage indexation will apply for the next 12 months, and the position can be reviewed then.

Mr. BECKER: I, too, support the Legislative Council's amendment. Parliament should have the right to review the legislation and to examine the performance of the State Industrial Commission on a year-by-year basis. This would be achieved by accepting the amendment.

I am surprised that the Government will not accept the amendment. When it was first debated in this place, I thought, "Fair enough. The Government has its point of view; let the matter be tested in another place." That happened, and the amendment was carried in another place. We therefore now find ourselves in conflict with the Legislative Council. I see no danger in having a terminating date. It does not mean the end to wage indexation, as long as it is perpetuated in the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. I hope that to some extent it will be. At the same time, I hope that the workers of this State get the full benefit of wage indexation, and not just a part of it, as has happened to date. Parliament has the right to review legislation such as this, which, by its very name, is temporary legislation. However, sometimes temporary legislation becomes permanent, and Parliament should have the right to review it annually.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Noes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Whitten. Noes —Messrs. Chapman and Gunn.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments are in opposition to the principles of the Bill.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 1133.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It seems to Opposition members that this Bill has been introduced somewhat hastily and, indeed, that it has been rather hastily drafted. I have already expressed my concern that the Minister in charge of the legislation, who has been promoting it assiduously in public, is no longer in the State. Indeed, he has travelled to China. I can only say that, in view of his haste—

Mr. Venning: On a slow boat, I hope.

Mr. TONKIN: Unfortunately, he has not gone on a slow boat.

Mr. Becker: I bet he's a guest of the Chinese Government.

Mr. TONKIN: The Attorney says that it is a private visit, which makes it even more reprehensible. There are a number of matters that ought to be canvassed. However, to put the record straight at the outset, I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to amend the motion by deleting all words after "That" and inserting the following:

the Bill be withdrawn and that such legislation and changes to the Standing Orders of both Houses as are necessary to achieve the effect contemplated in the recommendations of the Commonwealth Parliament's Joint Committee on Pecuniary Interests of Members of Parliament be prepared and presented to this Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Several honourable members: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: I will not take up unduly the time of the House on this matter. I have moved for the susupension of Standing Orders to enable me to move my amendment for the simple reason that the Bill, as it has been introduced, does not give appropriate scope for the full consideration and amendment of matters relating to it. I repeat that there are obviously many areas to be canvassed in the Bill, and they must be canvassed and considered carefully.

At present the Bill is drafted in such a way that only one course of action is possible at the end. Having investigated the matter thoroughly, I find that it is virtually impossible to amend the Bill in order to achieve the results which should be achieved and which most nearly approximate the findings of various committees of inquiry into this matter, particularly those of the Commonwealth Parliament joint committee of inquiry into pecuniary interests of members of Parliament which was held in 1974 and 1975 and the report of which very adequately deals with the situation. That report has been praised by Federal members of the Labor Party and supported by many members of Parliament. For that reason, I wish to suspend Standing Orders in order to allow a wider debate which, in the long term, will result in much better legislation and procedures for the disclosure of members' pecuniary interests as they may apply to their duties in this House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Chapman and Gunn. Noes —Messrs. Corcoran and Whitten.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank Opposition members who supported the motion. One thing that comes out of it, and comes out clearly now, is that the Government's refusal to suspend Standing Orders in order to widen the scope of this debate and make it possible to consider all the various methods of organising the disclosure of members' pecuniary interests shows that it was very much a cynical political move to introduce the legislation when it was introduced and in the form that it was introduced. If the Government was concerned about the protection of the interests of members of the public and of members of Parliament, as we on this side are, it would have agreed to such a suspension and agreed that such matters should

have been included in the debate, and be considered by this House. I indict the Attorney-General in his absence for this cold-blooded cynical politicking.

Be that as it may, now we have demonstrated clearly by a vote in this House that this is the Government's attitude to this exercise, let me say that the Opposition is not opposed to the principle of the disclosure of the pecuniary interests of members of Parliament. What we are concerned about is to find the best way of achieving this end, a way that will serve the best interests of the public and of all members of Parliament, whether of this House or of another place. It is absolutely essential that we acknowledge the right of the public to know that their members of Parliament are free of pecuniary pressures, but we have to balance that against the undoubted right of privacy of members and of their families.

When we refer to the right of the public to know, this does not mean that any member of the public has the right to know the exact details of every member's financial affairs, and certainly not such details as they relate to member's families. In my opinion, such a proposition goes far beyond the requirements of the public to know that members of Parliament are free of pecuniary pressures. There is an appropriate mechanism for achieving this reassurance for members of the public and for achieving a means whereby members' pecuniary pressures and interests can be disclosed to properly concerned members of the public. Those methods must be found and implemented.

I repeat that it is quite apparent from the attitude adopted by Government members in this place that that is not their primary concern. This is a matter that always concerns people, and it should concern all members of Parliament, because it is inherent in the selection and election of members of Parliament that they should behave honourably at all times. Basically, the ultimate solution to dishonourable conduct lies in the hands of the people, where it should lie. The question is: what mechanism if any should be set up to provide further reassurance to members of the public so that they will be more satisfied than some are now? I emphasise again that this dissatisfaction that has been expressed by a few is politically motivated more than it is adopted for any other reason. The whole question has been probed by various legislative bodies. The Attorney-General, when explaining the Bill, said that there was no suggestion that any member of this Parliament had in any way behaved dishonourably, or that the behaviour of any member of this Parliament had led to the introduction of this legislation.

I should hope that such legislation should not be necessary, but in this age it seems to me that the actions of members of Parliament, in particular (and this to some extent seems to reflect a measure of the standards of politics today), are such that we must be prepared to be more open than we have been and be prepared to be picked up on various actions and attitudes. A background paper has been prepared by the Parliamentary Library on this subject. It is an excellent paper and I pay a tribute to the officer or officers who prepared it. It will bear close and careful scrutiny by all members and it is a great credit to those who prepared it. Accordingly, I intend to put on record considerable portions of it, particularly the recommendations of the various committees of inquiry in various countries. I hope that members will bear with me when I read the document. It is most important, and sums up the situation extremely well. It would be a big loss if it were not recorded permanently in the papers of this House. The document states:

> The debate on members' interests stems from two premises which are so widely agreed as to be considered axiomatic. They are:
>
> 1. Public office confers upon an individual responsibilities for his conduct which he did not have as a private citizen.
> 2. Legislators should place the public interest before private advantage.

Generally, members of Parliament are simply trusted to comply with these moral values. To this extent the relationship which exists between M.P.'s and the public is fiduciary. The M.P. becomes a trustee of public confidence. This trustee relationship will be severed if a "conflict of interest" occurs, that is, if a member's private interests are given precedence over public interests, or if such precedence appears to be given.

Even though most people would agree with this opinion, fewer people would always agree on what constitutes a "private interest" and a "public interest". It is necessary for legislative purposes, therefore, to define the term "conflict of interest". One definition, suggested by the Canadian Government, is:

> A conflict of interest denotes a situation in which a member of Parliament has a personal or a private pecuniary interest sufficient to influence, or appear to influence, the exercise of his public duties and responsibilities.

It is not always easy, however, to identify a conflict of interest or to ascribe blame once it is identified. Some conflicts of interests are inherent in a representative democracy. In a word, some conflicts are unavoidable.

For example, it may be argued that to perform a representative function properly a member must demonstrate that his personal interests coincide with those of his constituents. Thus, farmers may be chosen to represent farming communities, businessmen may be chosen to represent predominantly commercial communities and trade unionists may be chosen to represent predominantly industrial communities. It may happen that such a member, working on behalf of his constituents, is accused of working on his own behalf, that is, of placing private advantage before public interest. It should be recognised, therefore, that an apparent conflict of interest may be unavoidable.

Another problem may arise in relation to a member's right to privacy. On the one hand it is often argued that avoidance of conflicts of interest may be assured by open disclosure, but on the other hand a member may resent an invasion of his privacy. The Canadian attempt to strike a balance between these competing principles is expressed in these terms:

> The public has an undisputed right to know certain factors which may influence a representative's behaviour, but that right to information does not extend to features of his private life which are irrelevant to the performance of his public duty.

Obviously, this type of compromise does not settle the conflict of principles. On the contrary, it highlights the very difficult problems that need to be resolved. What, for instance, may influence one representative's behaviour may not influence another. Who can say with certainty what features of a member's private life are irrelevant to the performance of his public duty? These questions are as vexed as the earlier questions "What is a 'private interest' and what is 'a public interest' "?

It may also be argued that obligatory declaration of interests will influence the calibre of representation in Parliament. "Successful" people will be less likely to seek election if they must sever business arrangements and liquidate investments. This is especially so of members of Parliament, because they have no guarantee of tenure and must therefore make provision for future means of livelihood.

Solutions:

The foregoing remarks give some indication of the complexity of the conflict of interest problem. Two basic approaches may be adopted toward a solution. They may be referred to as the principle of avoidance and the principle of disclosure. In essence the principle of avoidance declares that a fiduciary relationship is best preserved when a Member of Parliament divests himself of all holdings or in some other way avoids those interests which may conceivably prejudice his public duties. The principle of disclosure expresses a different attitude toward the conflict of interest question. It holds that a member need not divest himself of interests so long as he is prepared to admit his interests and abstain from voting on related issues. Supporters of this view often point to the fine record of frankness and propriety exhibited by members of the British House of Commons.

The paper goes on to summarise the recommendations of the Canadian Government and the British and Australian Parliamentary committees that have considered the problem on conflicts of interest, and it adds some observations from the United States and New South Wales. The document continues:

Summary of "Members of Parliament and conflict of interest"—a Green Paper prepared by the Canadian Government, July, 1973.

The paper contends that neither the principle of avoidance nor the principle of disclosure is "totally and absolutely defensible". Accordingly its recommendations are developed from a qualified acceptance of both principles.

Recommendations:

1. The Green Paper recommends the adoption of a code of ethics, or theoretical guidelines, and also makes specific proposals for changes in law.

The guidelines are as follows:

1. A member of Parliament is a trustee of public confidence and must perform and appear to perform his duties in a manner reflecting the highest degree of concern for the public interest. Moreover, a member of Parliament must at all times ensure that his actions do not detract from the dignity of Parliament, and the respect and confidence which society places in it.
2. Members of Parliament should make every reasonable effort to avoid even the appearance of those conflicts of interest that are not inherent in a representative democracy.
3. Where possible, the rules on conflict of interest should be formulated so as not to restrict unduly candidacy for the Canadian House of Commons or unnecessarily prevent any group in society from holding membership in the House of Commons or Senate.

Obviously, that same principle applies in South Australia and, indeed, in any system where Parliamentary democracy applies. The document continues:

4. The rules on conflict of interest should attempt to provide the public with that information which is relevant to the question of conflict of interest while safeguarding the individual member's right to privacy regarding information which the public does not require.

5. The right of members of the public to equal access and impartial treatment by Government officials should be respected at all times.

6. The rules on conflict of interest of members of Parliament should assume the form most appropriate to their application and to the general problem area. Those rules which are capable of precise definition and which can, therefore, be objectively tested should usually be set out in legislation. Those rules which can only be stated in subjective language, and must rely for their application on the individual circumstances of each situation, should be set out in a less formal manner.

The present legislation in the form it has been introduced is far too narrow and limiting, and it is not in the form most appropriate to the application of those rules on conflict of interest. The document continues:

7. The public should be granted a limited avenue to initiate investigations into apparent violations of the statutory provisions regarding conflicts of interest.

8. Through a process of continuing review Parliament should ensure that the legislation and the rules governing conflict of interest are relevant to changing situations.

Those were the guidelines. The proposals are as follows:

(a) That legislative provisions pertaining to conflicts of interest, with the exception of bribery, should be contained in a separate Act.

(b) That any member be automatically disqualified from membership of the House upon conviction for treason, bribery or any indictable offence for which he is sentenced to imprisonment for a term exceeding five years.

Our own provisions in South Australia are considerably stricter. The proposals continue:

(c) That the following provision be incorporated in the Standing Orders of both Houses of Parliament:

A member shall not advocate any matter or cause related to his personal, private or professional interests among members, or among public servants, or before any Government boards or tribunals, for a fee or reward, direct or indirect.

I repeat my emphasis that the Standing Orders will come into these recommendations and summaries time and time again—and so they should, because these are matters on which Parliament should be its own master. Parliament is well qualified to judge this whole situation and it is quite wrong that the responsibility and the right to judge such situations should be taken away from it. The proposals continue:

(d) That certain offices should not be held by members of Parliament, either because they constitute a conflict of interest (as defined on page 3 of this paper), violate the principle of the supremacy of Parliament—

the supremacy of Parliament is a proper principle indeed—

or violate the concept of the division of powers between Federal and State jurisdictions. (Service in the Federal armed forces, or employment in an office expressly permitted by Act of Parliament, are considered legitimate exceptions to the separation of Federal and State jurisdictions).

(e) That, generally, participation in a Government contract by a member of Parliament constitutes a conflict of interest.

A member should be prohibited from participating in, or deriving any benefit directly or indirectly from Government contracts, except those for which there is explicit provision. No member should be permitted to participate in the management or direction of a company having a Government contract.

Members should be required to register annually with the Clerk of the House a list of those companies in which they are officers, directors or managers.

A list of exemptions follows. I ask leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): The matter I wish to raise this evening is relevant to the Federal election on December 10. Members may recall that two years ago the then Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser (although he was not Prime Minister in the sense normally understood in democratic countries, because at that time he did not have all the attributes of a democratically elected Prime Minister, but nevertheless he was the appointed Prime Minister), said that if the Liberal Party was elected on December 13 he would need some three years to carry out its programme, as he said, to get Australia back on its feet.

After two years we find that we are going to a Federal election at a time when the Liberal Party has a record majority in both Houses of Federal Parliament. We are told that next year things will be brighter, that the economy is on the mend and that unemployment will decrease shortly after February, 1978. There is no real need for the Prime Minister to go to an election on December 10, especially before—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GROOM: I know that members opposite do not like facing the reality of the Federal situation but—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Opposition members should stop interjecting and allow the honourable member for Morphett to continue his speech.

Mr. GROOM: Thank you, Sir. Nevertheless, the Prime Minister said that he needed three years to carry out his programme, yet we find that after two years we are facing a Federal election. If things will be so much brighter next year, why does the Prime Minister not wait until May of 1978 so that he can have concrete facts and figures and a record to prove that things will be better? Instead, we are left to rely on his word. What did he say, as reported in today's *News*?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members can quite easily be named in an adjournment debate, as in other debates in the House.

Mr. GROOM: The Prime Minister was reported in today's *News* as saying that forecasts of an unemployment peak of 420 000 were outdated and misleading. He said that a report predicts that unemployment will begin falling after February and would reach a peak of 420 000 this summer. I remember the member for Fisher, only a few nights ago in this House, suggesting that unemployment would not exceed 400 000 people, but here is a direct concession from the Prime Minister that it will reach over 400 000. If things are to be so good, he could have waited until May, when he would have had the statistical, factual matters to back up his proposition.

In the *News* on December 6, 1975, he was reported as saying (while he was still the appointed Prime Minister, not the democratically elected Prime Minister) that the Liberals would cut jobless by 200 000. He said this when speaking in Cairns when the unemployment figure was about 300 000, so here we had the non-democratically elected Prime Minister making an election promise to slash unemployment, he said, by 200 000 people.

So, in December, 1975, the Prime Minister said that Australia's unemployment figures could be slashed by up to 200 000 under a Liberal and National Country Party Government. What is happening to unemployment today? Some slashing of unemployment! According to today's *News*, some two years later, he is telling us that unemployment has doubled, and that it is going to be about 420 000.

Mr. Abbott: Another broken promise.

Mr. GROOM: I am pleased that the member for Spence has mentioned that. It is another promise broken by the Prime Minister. I shall enumerate some of his broken promises. He has chosen the election date of December 10 because he knows that the number of unemployed will increase during 1978.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Evans: It is going—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Fisher that he should not try the patience of the Deputy Speaker. I intend to hear the contribution of the honourable member, even though other members may not wish to do so.

Mr. GROOM: Members opposite do not like listening to facts and having pointed out to them the unreliability of their Prime Minister. Just as his statements in December, 1975, proved false and baseless in that the number of unemployed was not cut by 200 000, so will his statement in today's *News* in time prove equally baseless.

Mr. Becker: The Murdoch press—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson may think he can speak without the Deputy Speaker's seeing him, but the Deputy Speaker can hear him.

Mr. GROOM: On December 6, 1975, the Prime Minister said he would cut inflation by 11 per cent, which meant that he was hoping to cut it to less than 4 per cent. In the same article, he conceded that inflation at that time was about 15 per cent, yet Liberal Party advertisements supposedly put inflation at about 19 per cent. Two years later, inflation is still running at about 13 per cent, only 2 per cent less than under the Federal Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GROOM: I know honourable members opposite have put out newspaper material which is misleading in the extreme. They have taken the worst figures during the last few months of the Labor Government's term of office in 1975 and the best figures for the last two months of the Liberal Government, and spread them over the whole year. That is typical of Liberal honesty and what members opposite do with figures. What about Medibank? On November 19, 1975, the following report appeared in the *Advertiser:*

> Medibank would stay if a Liberal Government was returned to office, the Minister for Social Services, Mr. Chipp, said yesterday.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GROOM: Mr. Chipp left the Liberal Party, for obvious reasons, because he could not rely on the word of his Prime Minister, and that is why he is leading a separate Party today. He knew that the Party of which he was a member at that time was not being honest with the Australian electorate. He was the Liberal spokesman at the time, and he made the following statement:

> Essentially, the features of Medibank now existing would remain, but the Government would have a look at abuses and ways in which the same sort of first-class health service could be provided for people at a cost that could be controlled.

Senator Wheeldon, the Labor Party spokesman on social security, warned that Medibank would be the first victim of a Liberal and National Country Party Government. Where does the truth lie? Obviously, it was not with the then Liberal Minister, because Medibank was attacked. No wonder Mr. Chipp got out. In fact, it was the first victim of the Liberal and National Country Party Government. It introduced proposals to force 50 per cent of the public out of Medibank and into the private funds.

What about education? We had a grand statement by the Federal Liberal Education Minister, Senator Margaret Guilfoyle. She did not last long in that job after the election: she was soon moved. Her comments were quoted in the *News* on December 3, 1975, as follows:

> A Liberal Government would not cut back on education

spending next year, the Federal Education Minister, Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, said in Adelaide today.

That was another broken promise, because we know exactly what happened to education. In the Liberals' first Budget there was a reduction in funding to education.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about uranium.

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

Mr. GROOM: In conclusion, because of the length of time that has been wasted with interjections from the Opposition, I point out that the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In June this year I brought to the notice of the Minister of Education what I believe to be a serious problem for many teachers in South Australia. I refer to those teachers who are prepared to participate in their profession in country areas of South Australia. On that occasion I pointed out to the Minister the problem that country teachers experienced once they accepted country service, and how extremely difficult it was for them in years to come to transfer back to the metropolitan area. It was a matter of looking at the reasons why there were no vacancies occurring in the metropolitan area for these teachers (for whom I have much admiration) who were prepared to put in part of their time, in many instances in quite remote areas of South Australia, in the interests of their profession. However, the Minister has not been willing to tackle this problem and meet it head on. On August 29 the Minister wrote the following letter to me:

> Thank you for raising this issue. The problems that are looming in staffing movements are probably more a question of the overall reduction in the teacher vacancies rather than a lack of recognition of country service.
>
> Some country teachers currently holding promotion positions have positively advantaged themselves by accepting these positions while more highly placed teachers on promotion lists have declined, because it would mean moving from the metropolitan area.

We should consider why teachers who could advantage themselves by moving to country areas are not willing to do so. There are many reasons for it. The first and foremost reason is probably the conditions that are provided in many country schools. Many of them are substandard. Many young teachers appointed to metropolitan schools at the beginning of their teaching careers are in the process of buying a new house and, consequently, in many instances the other partner (the wife or husband) is not employed by the Education Department but is employed in the metropolitan area. They therefore have the advantage of two incomes coming into the family. If they were to move to a country area the likelihood would be that it would be difficult for the other person to gain suitable employment. In many instances they are not both schoolteachers, and this is partly where the problem arises.

In the past many young teachers who have been looking for promotions have accepted positions in country schools. However, it is now extremely difficult to get many young qualified teachers to leave the metropolitan area and to go to country schools, because they are primarily unwilling to leave a relatively new home and have no guarantee of being able to return to the metropolitan area. Acceptance of promotion or transfer from the metropolitan area to the country really means that a teacher can become virtually trapped in the country area once he has transferred there. The openings are just not occurring, for many reasons: the fact that the employment opportunities do not exist in the country for the other party concerned; the conditions are not there; and housing is another problem. Many teachers at present occupying Teacher Housing Authority houses are disenchanted with the present maintenance provisions, and many feel that the present situation is much worse than when the Public Buildings Department was maintaining and in full control of teacher housing maintenance. Those attitudes are obviously well-known to metropolitan teachers, and that is another reason why many of the teachers think twice before they are prepared to move to the country.

As I said at the beginning, the Minister is obviously not prepared to grapple with this problem. There must be a greater incentive for teachers to move into country areas, and somehow the Minister has to provide the opportunity for those teachers who have served 10 years to 20 years in country areas and desire to do so to move back to the city, particularly if their children have reached the tertiary education stage and they wish to be with them while they are undertaking their tertiary education studies; but, as things stand, the opportunites do not exist.

The Minister could give added incentives; he could say that, with seven years of city service, it is mandatory that there should be some three years of country service so that it is fair to all members of the teaching profession. I do not say that they all want to come back to the city, but many of them do after 10 years to 20 years service in the country, and at the moment there is no way in which they can get back, because the vacancies are not there. Teachers who have positions in the metropolitan area are prepared in many instances not to accept promotion since both husband and wife are working and consequently, if they move to the country areas, even though it meant promotion, if the wife could not get work it would mean a reduction in the overall pay packet in the household.

Mr. Klunder: You realise that that speech is about three years out of date, don't you—restrictions on teaching posts available?

Mr. ARNOLD: No, it is not three years out of date. Obviously, the member for Newland has lost contact with the teaching profession quickly, because this problem has been raised with me many times by teachers in the past week or two—in fact, it was raised as late as yesterday.

Mr. Klunder: With 20 years service in the country? He has wanted for 17 years to transfer, has he?

Mr. ARNOLD: I would be interested to know as a matter of curiosity how many years service the member for Newland had in the country.

Mr. Klunder: None at all.

Mr. ARNOLD: Precisely. I think that explains the very real problem. Teachers in the metropolitan area are not prepared to give up their positions so that their colleagues in the country can have a share of city service. At least the member for Newland is aware of the situation even if he was not prepared to share his service.

It is not sour grapes on my part. I am not a member of the teaching profession. I am merely trying to represent members of the honourable member's profession who have been prepared to spend much of their teaching lives in the country. Obviously, the member for Newland is not willing to consider those teachers who have been willing to go out into the country. It is a sorry state of affairs that the Minister will have to grapple with if he is to see that justice is done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): I wish to refer to the preoccupation of the member for Glenelg with the operation of McNally Training Centre. It is a preoccupation so deep that it has earned him the honorary title of

"member for McNally". I hope the member for Coles is aware of this carving out of a piece of her territory. Members have become accustomed to the constant stream of questions with or without notice from the member for Glenelg on the subject of McNally Training Centre and other juvenile training centres. The honourable member is entitled to his interest, although in this case the word "fixation" might be more appropriate than "interest".

The honourable member seems to think that there is a conspiracy of silence to deny him information about the operations of training centres. As a result, he gathers odds and ends of information from his sources (and thoroughly unreliable sources they are at times) and then hops on his band waggon and badgers the Minister of Community Welfare for an explanation of his latest scandal.

If the honourable member was as conscientious about his concern for juvenile training centres as he would have the House believe, he would learn a lot more about the legal processes that surround them. As an example, on November 23 he asked the Minister whether two of the three McNally inmates who had absconded from the centre on the evening of November 20 had been awaiting a High Court appearance on charges of attempted rape. The honourable member was stunned when the Minister replied that no High Court appearance was scheduled. Eventually, the penny dropped, and the honourable member took the opportunity during the adjournment debate to plead that he had been unjustly rebuffed by the Minister for a slip of the tongue.

He said that, instead of "High Court", he should have said "Supreme Court", and claimed the Minister had seized on this slip and taken cover in his foxhole. I trust the honourable member has learned from the answer supplied to him by the Minister that he made yet another slip of the tongue, and should have said "Juvenile Court", not "Supreme Court".

The member for Glenelg has also launched a veritable barrage of questions about staffing levels at the various training centres as though there was yet another deliberate conspiracy to keep staff-inmate ratios high at Vaughan House and low at McNally. He seized on a most unusual situation at Vaughan House at a time when that centre had only six inmates and 28 residential care workers, compared with 51 inmates and 79 residential care workers at McNally.

He ignored the fact that these were figures for a particular day and that the number of inmates could have been considerably higher the day before or the day after. The honourable member suggested that staff should be transferred from Vaughan House to McNally, failing to take into account the fact that juvenile populations in centres fluctuate at short notice and that staffing must be based on average numbers and not the lowest number in any month.

He also ignores the fact that Vaughan House is the only secure training centre for girls and, as such, accommodates a greater age range of inmates than either McNally or Brookway Park. This of course means that a wide range of programmes must continue to be maintained, even when inmate numbers are below average.

In one of the answers provided for the honourable member, it was pointed out that the number of inmates at Vaughan House had recently climbed to 19—a three-fold increase on the low point of six, about which the member for Glenelg made such a song and dance. Assuming that the residential care staff numbers remained at 28, it means a staff ratio at Vaughan House of less than 1½ to one.

If the Minister had taken the honourable member's advice and transferred Vaughan House staff holus-bolus to McNally, what suggestion would the honourable member have come up with when the number of inmates at Vaughan House rose to unmanageable levels for the staff that remained? The honourable member takes a much too simplistic view of staffing at training centres.

Residential care workers and their seniors work in a team situation in both assessment and treatment units. Those responsible for running these institutions plan staffing on the basis of maintaining as much stability as possible, for the sake of the staff and the young people involved in programmes. Frequent and sudden changes from institution to institution would create much dissatisfaction among staff because of the effect this would have on their ability to do an effective job.

The member for Glenelg has on occasion held himself out as putting forward the staff point of view in matters concerning training centres, but I doubt whether they would thank him for the views he has expressed on wholesale transfers of staff between centres. The honourable member does not seem to realise that transfers between training centres already occur, to cover staff on annual or sick leave and during other emergency circumstances. However, these are minimal, and every effort is made to prevent disruption of programmes and the ability of staff to carry them out. Each training centre has an individually tailored staff structure to carry out the programmes that operate within it, and this staff structure takes account of the high and low points in inmate population.

In his contribution to the grievance debate on November 23, the member for Glenelg also implied another conspiracy, namely, that the Minister allowed only scanty descriptions of three absconders from Grenfell Treatment Unit on November 20 to be given to the police. He did not provide any sort of sensible reason why the Minister would want to withhold information of this kind. I trust that the honourable member has taken careful note of the answer provided to his Question on Notice—that full descriptions of all three youths were provided to the police by McNally staff and that the release of this information to the media or the public is a matter for the police, not the Minister.

The member for Glenelg said that it appeared that the three absconders had records of violence, rape and attempted rape. This is another of the honourable member's dangerous generalisations in which he tars everyone with the same brush, turns allegations into matters of fact and generally misrepresents the situation. I trust that he has absorbed the answer to another of his Questions on Notice that none of the three absconders concerned had any recorded offence of rape against him.

It should be stressed (and this is something that the member for Glenelg rarely does) that the two absconders facing charges concerning an alleged sexual assault on another McNally inmate have not yet been found guilty. The court will decide on their guilt or otherwise in January. The member for Glenelg would do himself much credit by rethinking his attitude of recent times instead of constantly criticising the work of the department and its staff in the juvenile training field. He has visited McNally and should know the difficulties of the work undertaken there. I do not believe anything that the honourable member has done in this regard has made the job easier for anyone. The next time that the honourable member spouts off about the morale of the staff at training centres, he should consider whether his comments have made a positive or a negative contribution to that morale.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 7, at 2 p.m.