

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 August 1978

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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice and questions on notice, except Nos. 1, 4, 9, 56, 65, 69, 73, 77, 133, 202, 217, 220 to 225, 243, 244, 251, 252, 254 to 256, 258, 260, 262, 263, 266, 267, 270 to 272, 282, 290, 292 to 296, 300, 326, 329, 331 to 334, 337, 341 to 347, 350 to 357, and 359 to 363 be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## PREMIER'S TOUR

Mr. **TONKIN** (on notice) Question No. 38:

1. How many and which officers and others accompanied the Premier on each of the Middle East, Britain-Europe and United States of America sectors of his recent overseas tour?

2. What was the cost of fares, accommodation, and incidental expenses on each of these sectors?

3. Who were the South Australian businessmen who joined the Premier in promotional activities during the U.S.A. sector of his tour, and what was the cost of their travel and other expenses to the Government?

4. What firm contracts have resulted from the party's promotional activities in the United States?

5. What are the details of firm contracts and other settled arrangements of definite advantage to South Australian industry which have resulted from the Premier's previous overseas tour in October-November 1977?

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

1. The Premier was accompanied by his wife; the Director-General of the Premier's Department, Mr. G. J. Inns; the Director-General for Trade and Development, Mr. W. L. C. Davies; the Premier's Private Secretary, Mr. S. R. Wright; and the Premier's Media Secretary, Mr. A. Hodgson. The Premier was accompanied by his Personal Secretary only on the Western Samoan and Fijian sections of the visit. Dr. B. Hughes, Economic Adviser to the Premier, who had been travelling overseas independently on other business, accompanied the Premier's delegation on the U.S.A. section of the visit.

2. The cost of fares is not divisible between each of the sectors of the visit, but overall costing is summarised as follows:

	\$
Air fares . . . . .	19 700
Accommodation and internal transport . . . . .	18 150
Incidental expenses including gifts to Heads of State, excess baggage and insurance . . . . .	4 250
Cost of holding seminars in U.S.A. (including businessmen's expenses) . . . . .	14 400

3. Mr. P. G. Pak-Poy, Mr. R. R. Cavill and Mr. V. P. Kean. Amounts totalling \$2 200 have been paid for internal travel and accommodation.

4. There was no intention or proposal to enter into firm contracts during the promotional tour of the United States of America during May of this year. At the suggestion of the Trade Commissioners in the various state capitals of the U.S.A. the promotional tour was organised to expose opportunities that exist within South Australia for trade

and investment. Excellent reports have been received from all Trade Commissioners on the presentations conducted in those capital cities and a number of inquiries are being processed.

5. There was no intention or proposal to enter into firm contracts during the trip to Malaysia in October-November 1977. The Premier went to Singapore to address the AAMO conference and the opportunity was used to visit the joint operations of South Australian ventures in North Malaysia. During the visit the Premier was able to obtain undertakings for the converted use of paddy rice straw and World Bank finances have now been obtained to proceed with the feasibility study. The visit also enabled the Premier to visit and discuss developments of Panalex housing and to promote use of South Australian consultants. South Australian consultants are now involved in a number of studies in Malaysia. The Premier also visited the North Sumatra region of Medan and held exploratory talks with development officers and these discussions are now being followed up by the Department of Economic Development. The visit was also used to initiate planning of the Adelaide Week in North Malaysia then planned for December 1978, but now deferred until December 1979.

## OLD GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. **EVANS** (on notice): When will Old Government House in the Belair Recreation Park be open to the public, and:

(a) what amount of money has been spent in the restoration of this building, and

(b) from what sources was the money made available?

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: Later this year.

(a) \$165 000.

(b) National Estate and State Government funds.

## AYERS HOUSE

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

1. What was the initial cost to the Government of renovating Ayers House, and when were these renovations completed?

2. What purpose did the Government have in mind for the building when renovations first commenced?

3. When did the two restaurants now located in Ayers House commence to function?

4. What costs to the Government were involved in the running of the building on completion of renovations and prior to commencement of operation of the two restaurants?

5. What costs to the Government are involved in the running of the building in its present form?

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

1. (a) \$361 317, (b) 31-5-73.

2. By undertaking renovations to Ayers House the Government intended that the property would function as:

(1) An historical museum operated by the National Trust of South Australia and portraying the colonial history of South Australia, presented in a building that is one of Adelaide's best remaining examples of domestic architecture of the 19th Century.

(2) A restaurant complex, complementing the museum in having a South Australian, colonial character.

3. Restaurant lease issued 2-4-73.

4. Nil.

5. \$36 500 annually.

**BARKER INLET**

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

1. What measures are being taken by the Environment Department to prevent the digging for tube-worm in the aquatic reserve known as Barker Inlet?
2. If measures are being taken to prevent this practice, are they successful?
3. Is there a proposal by any organisation to plan a boat-harbor in the general area of Barker Inlet and, if so, will it encroach upon the aquatic reserve and what type of environmental study has been done in relation to such a plan?

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

1. Inspectors of fisheries regularly check the Barker Inlet Aquatic Reserve to prevent digging for tube-worms within the boundaries of the reserve.
2. No prosecution has as yet been commenced against anyone as it has not been found necessary to do so following publicity in the media that these actions could be detrimental to the reserve and future stocks of worms. Persons digging the worms for profit are now working in areas outside the reserve.
3. Yes. A proposal is currently being studied.

**PREMIER'S OVERSEAS VISIT**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How many persons accompanied the Premier on his latest overseas trip, who were they and for what part of the trip did each accompany him?
2. What is now the total estimated cost to the Government of the trip and how is that cost made up?
3. What benefits, if any, to South Australia—  
(a) have already resulted; and  
(b) are still expected, from the trip?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** See reply to question 38.

**RURAL STUDIES**

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

1. How many studies have been instigated by the present Government to look into the needs for the preservation of horticultural, agricultural and viticultural rural areas adjacent to Adelaide?
2. When were these studies made?
3. What are the names of the personnel involved in each of these studies?
4. Were the results of all such studies reported and, if so, which, if any, were not made public and for what reason were they not made public?
5. If the results of all such studies were not reported, which were not and for what reason?

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

1, 2, 3 and 4. The preservation of land for horticultural, agricultural and viticultural purposes has been the subject of numerous on-going studies, including the:

Bolivar Effluent Irrigation Study by Kinnaird Hill de Rohan and Young Pty. Ltd., on behalf of the E. & W.S. Department; Preservation of Land for Horticultural and Viticultural Purposes; Adelaide Hills Study by the Monarto Development Commission; Supplementary Development Plan for Willunga Rural Zone authorised on 11 May 1978; and Supplementary Development Plan for Noarlunga-Meadows Rural Zone authorised on 11 May 1978.

The study of the North Adelaide Plains referred to has

been published widely as also has that of the Monarto Commission. The report of the Monarto Commission and the further work referred to above arose as a result of the recommendations of the Horticultural and Viticultural Committee which were made in 1976. The Chairman of the Committee was Mr. J. Harris, Assistant Director, Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs and its membership was:

Mr. G. Lewdowicz, Project Officer, Policy Division, Premier's Department; Mr. T. C. Miller, Chief Horticulturist, Agriculture and Fisheries Department; and Mr. K. J. Shepherd, Engineer for Water Resources, E. & W.S. Department.

Mr. Harris recently drew to my attention that, whilst the report had been widely circulated within Government departments and made available to members of the public who sought to use it in conjunction with their work, it has never been generally available.

I have now requested that copies of the report be placed in the appropriate libraries, including ones to which honourable members have convenient access.

As indicated above, the majority of the recommendations of the committee were put in hand as they were formulated, although those which are related to the long-term management of land have not been implemented because the full implications have not been evaluated.

Further recommendations refer to the need to preserve specific sites for preservation and steps are being taken to ensure this objective is achieved where and when the opportunity occurs. Because of the details associated with these particular properties, it was not appropriate to release the report at the time it was submitted.

**GOVERNMENT NURSERIES**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government propose that its nurseries join the clean scheme of the S.A. Nurserymen's Association and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No, the Woods and Forests Department maintains "clean" nurseries as a matter of policy and will continue to do so.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): How many Government nurseries are there and where are they located?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Government nurseries (plant) are located at Belair, Berri, Monarto and at Black Hill Nature Flora Park.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What is the cost a unit compared to selling cost of plants at each Government nursery?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** For Woods and Forests Department nursery operations:

Cost price per plant—61 c approximately.  
Selling price per plant—Grade 1 \$0.70; Grade 2 \$2.00; Grade 3 \$4.00; Grade 4 \$2.50

Discounts offered for Grades 1-4.

Orders of value \$30-\$99—10 per cent.

Orders of value \$100 and over—20 per cent.

Plants are not being sold by the Environment Department.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What were the running costs of each Government nursery in the financial year 1977-78, and how were they made up?

2. What was the revenue from Government nurseries in the financial year 1977-78, and how was it made up?

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

1. The running costs of the Woods and Forests Department nursery operations for 1977-78 are as follows:

	\$
Insurance .....	1 910
Depreciation .....	1 379
Interest .....	11 674
Salaries .....	91 225
Operating expenses .....	246 865
	\$353 053

The running costs of the Black Hill Native Flora Park Nursery are as follows:

	\$
Wages .....	4 500
Materials .....	2 500
	\$7 000

2. The revenue from Woods and Forests Department nursery operations for 1977-78 is as follows:

	\$
Nature plant sales .....	335 116
Indoor plant service .....	18 500
	\$353 616

The revenue from the Environment Department nursery operations for 1977-78 is as follows:

Nil. No sales were made.

#### NEAPTR

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): When does the Premier propose to write to me further setting out the estimated funding programme for the NEAPTR proposals, as undertaken in his letter to me of 12 June 1978?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: As the honourable member has already made public statements on this particular matter—clearly having made up his mind on it—I saw no purpose in writing further to him.

#### IRRIGATION LAND

**Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice): Has the Government determined a policy for the future use of irrigation perpetual lease dry land in the Riverland for rural residential purposes and, if so, what will be the minimum size of each allotment to be created and when will a decision be made on the many applications being held by the Lands Department?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: Some highland districts in irrigation areas have been selected as being suitable for development for rural living purposes. At this stage, three general areas have been selected, one in each of the Waikerie, Kingston and Berri irrigation areas. No decision has yet been made as to the specific extent of the sites where development may proceed or other design details such as the minimum size of each section pending investigation of: (a) the availability or provision of water; and (b) zoning requirements.

It is anticipated that these studies will be completed shortly and that a decision could be expected by the end of September. All applications for consent to transfer land not within the three locations selected for more intensive investigation have been considered by the Minister of Lands. The parties will be advised of his decision shortly. Those applications which relate to land within the three selected areas will not be dealt with until the specific areas where urban living will be permitted have been identified.

For the reasons referred to above, a decision should not be expected before the end of October.

#### JUVENILES

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. In the years 1970 to 1977, respectively, how many offenders, whilst under the care and control of the Minister and/or his department, appeared before:

- (a) juvenile courts; and
- (b) youth aid panels,

in the following categories:

- (i) assault (other than sexual);
- (ii) rape and other sexual assaults;
- (iii) robbery;
- (iv) break and enter;
- (v) vehicle theft;
- (vi) traffic—serious and/or related to a criminal offence; and
- (vii) traffic—other than in (vi)?

2. In the same years, respectively, how many offenders, whilst not under the care and control of the Minister or his department, appeared in:

- (a) juvenile courts; and
- (b) youth aid panels,

in each of the categories listed in 1?

3. How many of these appearances were dismissed in each category or no effective order made, respectively?

4. What percentage is the number of offenders in each category a thousand of total juvenile population aged 10 years to 18 years, respectively, for the above years?

5. What percentage is the number of offenders in each category a thousand of age specific population for the above years?

6. What percentage of offenders in each category were under 16 years of age at the time of appearance?

7. How many transfers of juvenile offenders to prison were made in the years 1970 to 1977, respectively?

8. How many first recommendations were made in juvenile courts for prison transfer of an offender (by a judge or magistrate) in the years 1970 to 1977, respectively?

9. Of those offenders where first recommendation was not effected:

- (a) what were the subsequent offences until each offender ceased to be dealt with by the juvenile courts; and
- (b) how many, as juveniles, were transferred to gaol subsequently, when, in what circumstances, and with what convictions prior and subsequent to first recommendation?

10. In the years 1970 to 1977, respectively, how many juvenile traffic offences were dealt with by:

- (a) juvenile courts; and
- (b) youth aid panels,

and how many of these offences involved:

- (i) death or serious injury to third parties;
- (ii) property damage in excess of \$1 000 to third parties;
- (iii) driving under the influence; and
- (iv) a criminal offence?

11. In each category of offence listed in 10:

- (a) how many offenders were under the care and control of the Minister or his department at the time of the offences;
- (b) how many of the offenders were not under the care and control of the Minister or his department at the time of the offences;

- (c) what orders were made for offenders:
- (i) not under the care and control of the Minister or his department; and
  - (ii) under the care and control of the Minister or his department; and
- (d) how many of the appearances were dismissed or resulted in no effective order being made for offenders in each of the categories (c) (i) and (ii)?

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

1. and 2. The order "Care and Control" was introduced in 1972-73 following proclamation of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971. Since then, the numbers of children appearing before Juvenile Courts and Juvenile Aid Panels for offences have been as follows:

Year	Juvenile Court Appearances		Juvenile Aid Panel Appearances
	Under Care and Control	Not Under Care and Control	Not Under Care and Control
1972-73	634	2 383	1 961
1973-74	613	2 343	2 286
1974-75	541	2 817	3 389
1975-76	444	3 130	3 388
1976-77	367	2 929	3 503

Children under "Care and Control" orders do not appear before Juvenile Aid Panels. Numbers of appearances before the Juvenile Courts and Juvenile Aid Panels for the various categories of offences are shown in the department's annual reports (Tables 1 and 4 for 1977-78). These appearances are not separated in the detail sought between "Care and Control" children and other children. The cost to do so is not considered warranted.

3., 4., 5. and 6. Much detailed information relevant to these questions is contained in the annual reports of the department and the Adelaide Juvenile Court (see Tables 1 and 19 of the A.J.C. and 1 and 4 of the D.C.W. Annual Reports for 1977-78). The cost to obtain the remaining information sought in the questions is not considered warranted.

7. 1970—1; 1971—0; 1972—0; 1973—2; 1974—4; 1975—9; 1976—8; 1977—3; Total—27.

8. and 9. This information is not available without an extensive search of files. The time required is not considered to be warranted.

10. and 11. Numbers of appearances for traffic offences were as follows:

Year	Juvenile Courts		Juvenile Aid Panels
	Minor Traffic	Other Traffic	Traffic
1972-73	2 576	543	309
1973-74	3 081	601	412
1974-75	3 287	805	615
1975-76	3 902	815	851
1976-77	4 208	735	792

The cost to obtain the other information requested is not considered to be warranted. If any of the information not readily available now was needed for policy decisions, it could be obtained and the cost for that purpose would be warranted.

## LAND TENURE

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

1. What action has been taken to implement any of the recommendations proposed in the Else Mitchell reports of 1975-76 into land tenures?

2. Has the Government carried out any investigations supplementary to these reports and, if so, what were the results of any such investigations?

3. If the Government has not implemented any of the recommendations, why not?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The recommendations of the Final Report of Else Mitchell Commission No. 18 with 37 subrecommendations attached. They are far reaching in character, and it would be impossible to answer the questions in the context of a Parliamentary reply. One of the major recommendations relates to obtaining for the community the capital increment resulting from permitted changes in land use. The Government is pursuing this principally through the Land Commission. Other recommendations relate to the structure of planning institutions. The Government established the Inquiry into the Control of Private Development conducted by Mr. Stuart Hart, whose report will be made to me shortly. This is expected to deal with, among other things, the desirable structure of future planning administration and the bodies involved. Mr. Hart would have been aware of the Else Mitchell recommendations in compiling his report. Further recommendations related to urban land policies, including development control systems, are also the subject of Mr. Hart's inquiry and are also currently the subject of review in the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs. The Government will be introducing legislation on these matters as soon as possible.

## ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What were the alterations carried out by the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department to the principal's residence at Roseworthy Agricultural College in 1974?

2. Why was a detailed specification of work prior to commencement not established?

3. What was the reason for the escalation of the final cost from \$30 000 to \$48 000?

4. How much was paid by the college towards the cost, and how much has been written off?

5. What was the reason for writing off such an amount?

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

1. Renovations and upgrading of buildings.

2. The method adopted is usual practice for renovations, where the final extent of the work required cannot be established before work has commenced.

3. Increases in costs of wages and materials, work difficulties not originally anticipated, and variation in the scope of work.

4. \$37 907 was paid by the college, and no amounts were written off.

5. See question 4.

## OVERSPENDING

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Which projects are referred to by the Auditor-General in his report for the year ended 30 June 1977, page 264, wherein he referred to overspending on minor and major projects?

2. How were the amounts of \$18 000 000 and \$6 000 000 referred to incurred and by whose approval?
3. What effect did these amounts have on the Budget?
4. What action has the Government taken to prevent a repetition of such overspending?

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

1. The information is not readily available and the cost of providing the same could not be justified.

2. The amounts reflect either:

Design and documentation of projects prior to a tender call and subsequent approval of funds. This was the system of accounting existing prior to July 1976.

Escalation of costs during the construction phase.

Projects being undertaken as part of a general programme approval but not yet transferred to a specific project approval.

Information with respect to individual approvals is not readily available and the cost of producing same could not be justified.

3. None.

4. A system was introduced in July 1976, to ensure that discrete approvals are obtained for all stages of design and construction.

#### UNOCCUPIED PREMISES

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What was the total amount of pre-occupational rental and cleaning for premises not occupied for the financial years 1971-72 to 1977-78, respectively?

2. Which Government departments were involved, what was the reason for the delays incurred and the time of the delay in each instance?

3. Can the Minister justify the statement he made on 1 March 1972 (page 3539 of *Hansard*) regarding future reporting of the Auditor-General on this issue when a similar report was made on page 266 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

4. What instructions have now been issued to departments to prevent a repetition?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The cost of researching this question cannot be justified. Therefore, the information sought will not be given.

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Which buildings and Government departments were involved where rental was paid for accommodation not occupied during the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

2. How did this situation arise and what was the total amount paid during the financial year ended 30 June 1977 for accommodation not occupied for various periods?

3. Was the amount charged to the various departments accrued and, if not, why not?

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

1. Department of Agriculture—Grenfell Centre, Grenfell Street; Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Wales Building, Pirie Street; Department for Community Welfare—Millicent, Salisbury, Taperoo, Woodside; Department of Labour and Industry—Clovelly Park; Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Berri, Grenfell Centre, Mount Gambier, Whyalla; Department for the Environment—Hindmarsh—Manton Street, Kent Town—Fullarton Road; Law Department—Public Trustee Building; Planning Appeal Board—Grenfell Centre, Grenfell Street; Health Commission—Salisbury, Stirling, Wales Building, Pirie Street; Police Department—Birkenhead, Mile End; Local Government Department—Public Trustee Building; Public Buildings Department—Sun

Alliance House, Grenfell Street, Public Trustee Building; Industrial Commission—IMFC House; Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs—Greenhill Road; Department of Services and Supply—Wales Building, Pirie Street; Electorate Office—Hectorville.

2. The necessity to secure accommodation when suitable premises were in short supply usually entailed the immediate commencement of rental payments. Commissioning work is required before occupation, and departments' needs cannot be defined until details of the premises to be leased are known. \$593 770.

3. No. Funds for Government office accommodation are charged against revenue funds voted to Public Buildings Department. The charges are then brought to account in the client departments operating statements.

#### INVESTIGATION COSTS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What were the projects not proceeded with which involved preliminary investigation costs of \$550 000 written off during the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

2. What decision has been made regarding a further review of investigation and design costs relating to additional projects totalling more than \$1 500 000 as reported by the Auditor-General for the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

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

1. Projects not proceeded with comprised substantially three major works proposals.

(a) Agriculture Department—office accommodation at Northfield. Cost: \$172 865.

(b) Kilkenny Technical College—major additions. Cost: \$84 132.

(c) Thebarton Community Centre—Cost: \$57 253.

The balance of funds written off comprise sundry education, health and other building proposals too numerous to list which for various reasons were not proceeded with.

2. Further investigation revealed an amount of approximately \$1 050 000 which required similar action. Of this amount \$550 000 was written off during 1977-78 and the balance is expected to be written off in 1978-79.

#### AYERS HOUSE

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice): What are the details of amounts spent at Ayers House on maintenance, minor improvements, and additions during the three financial years ended 30 June 1977, totalling \$6 000, \$25 000, and \$32 000, respectively, and what were the reasons for such expenditure?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:**

		\$
1974-75	General maintenance . . . . .	4 600.43
	Improvements and additions . . . . .	215.40
	Repairs to exterior wooden window shutters . . . . .	1 007.00
1975-76	General maintenance . . . . .	3 476.53
	Improvements and additions . . . . .	205.93
	Restoration, repairs and painting . .	20 929.93
1976-77	General maintenance . . . . .	11 627.17
	Improvements and additions . . . . .	790.18
	Restoration, repairs and painting . .	20 069.19

The work was undertaken as part of the proposal to restore Ayers House to its original state.

**WEST TERRACE CEMETERY**

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What were the two special projects costing \$27 000 undertaken for the West Terrace Cemetery during the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

2. How was the amount of \$19 000 provided by the unemployment relief scheme spent at West Terrace Cemetery during the financial year ended 30 June 1977, how much was spent on each project and what were the reasons for each project?

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

1. (i) Tree planting and associated water reticulation.

(ii) Design salaries and incidental expenses associated with planning for cemetery redevelopment.

2. The amount of \$19 000 was the approximate cost during the subject period of employment of a number of unemployment relief employees who were engaged on work associated with the amalgamation of Catholic cemetery records with those of the general cemetery; the identification of areas where short-term repairs and improvements were needed; the establishment of visual records illustrating the progressive expiry of grave site leases, and the updating of existing records. All of these actions proceeded as integral parts of the one project and were costed accordingly. The work was undertaken in the interests of effective management of the cemetery, and for planning the longer-term development of the cemetery.

**ADOPTION AGENCY**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What level of financial reserves and other resources are required before an inter-country adoption agency will be regarded as viable by the Community Welfare Department?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** No financial reserves are specified. Other requirements are specified in section 60 of the Adoption of Children Act and in Part II of the present Adoption of Children regulations.

**PUBLIC SERVANTS**

**Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. Did the Public Service Board initially advise public servants that personnel retiring after 1 July 1975, and who had served more than 15 years, would be entitled to the extra long service leave granted in the Public Service Amendment Act, 1977 and, if so, what was the text of the advice and when was it issued?

2. Did the Public Service Board subsequently issue an amended memo advising that the operative date would be from 1 January 1978 and that people who left the service before that date would not be eligible for retrospective increased leave and, if so, what was the revised text and on what date was it issued?

3. How many retired personnel have been adversely affected by this variation, if any, and what action has the Government taken or is it considering to correct the effects of the misdirection contained in the initial advice?

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

1. Yes: Memorandum to Permanent Heads No. 94 dated and issued on 22 December 1977. In that memorandum two, out of a number of examples used to illustrate how the calculations of new entitlements were to be made, indicated that an employee who terminated his service after 1 July 1975 after having completed more than 15 years effective service would benefit from the new provisions.

2. Yes: Memorandum to Permanent Heads No. 94 (reissued 20 January 1978). The revised text includes a

paragraph which reads: "As the Public Service Act Amendment Act operated on and from 1 January 1978, officers who terminated or had their services terminated prior to 1 January 1978 will not be affected by the new provisions."

3. The cases of two officers who retired voluntarily after 22 December 1977 and before 1 January 1978 in the belief that they would benefit under the provisions of the amendment Act were referred to the Public Service Board. Cabinet, on the recommendation of the board, approved an *ex gratia* payment, in lieu of the additional long service involved, being made to each officer.

**JAM FACTORY**

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

1. What items have been bought by the South Australian Museum from the Jam Factory during the last four years and what was the price paid for each item?

2. Has any other Government department or statutory body acquired items from the Jam Factory and, if so, what was the price and date of purchase of each item?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Detailed records containing information on items sold prior to July 1976 were not kept, therefore a complete answer cannot be given.

1. Since that date the South Australian Museum has purchased 67 items at a cost of \$4 557.06.

2. Sales to other Government departments and statutory bodies have amounted to \$5 884.62.

**CONVENTION CENTRE**

**Mr. EVANS** (on notice): Has the report on the proposed convention centre and sporting complex for the Wayville Showgrounds been completed by Cheesman, Doley, Neighbour & Raffin Pty. Ltd. and, if so:

(a) when was it made available to the Government and the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia; and

(b) when will it be made available to the public through Parliament?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The final report on the feasibility study for the development of a major convention, trade exhibition, sports and entertainment centre in Adelaide has been completed and

(a) was made available to the Government on 28 July 1978. The report has not been made available to the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia at this stage, but close liaison was maintained by the consultants with the society throughout the feasibility study;

(b) No decisions have been taken by the Government as to the release of the report.

**MODBURY HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. When was the Modbury Heights High School opened?

2. What was the total cost of building it and how is that cost made up?

3. Was the school then considered to be complete and if not, what further work was considered then necessary for its completion?

4. What alteration, either demolitions or extensions, have been made since the school was opened and in each case, why and at what cost?

5. What is the present enrolment?

6. What further changes, if any, are contemplated, why and at what cost?

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

1. February 1977.

2. Funds approval was given for \$5 047 000 for the complete project, that is, construction, site works, contingencies, design, and supervision. It is now evident that the total cost will not exceed \$4 500 000.

3. Modbury Heights High School was designed as a 1 250 enrolment secondary school and was completed for that purpose in February of 1978. However, as the school opened with only year 8 and year 9 enrolments, as is usual with new secondary schools, a decision was taken to establish a primary school in the secondary complex and so reduce pressure on neighbouring primary schools. The school therefore opened as a junior primary school, a primary school and a secondary school with enrolments from R-9. The experience gained from this grouping and use of facilities confirmed the thinking that there were many advantages to be gained from establishing an R-12 school, and planning was initiated for additions to the school in lieu of the proposed adjacent but separate primary school.

4. No alterations were made to the school until the present building programme began. These alterations, which must be regarded as part of the provisions for an R-12 school, are the extension of the staff room and canteen and the extension of one teaching block to provide a primary activity hall. The extensions are the equivalent of the normal primary school provision, and the cost is included in the total funding for the primary component of the school, on which comment will be made in reply to question 6.

5. The present enrolment is 1 137, consisting of 411 primary and 726 secondary students.

6. The present building programme will provide the equivalent of a 600-student primary school which will be available for the 1979 school year. It will consist of a two-storey block linked to the existing buildings, the extensions previously described, and associated site development. The only future addition presently planned is a permanent pre-school to replace temporary accommodation. The purpose of the complex will be to provide a continuous education from R-12, easing the problems of transition from the various levels of education and making full and effective use of all resources including teaching staff. The estimated cost of the project is \$1 850 000 (escalated).

#### HOSPITAL BOARDS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Have the boards of—(a) the Royal Adelaide Hospital and (b) the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, yet been constituted pursuant to section 29 of the South Australian Health Commission Act and, if so, who are the members of each board and, if not, why not and when is it expected that they will be constituted?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** No. While the composition of the boards is nearing finality, it is not intended to announce the membership until their appointment takes effect on incorporation.

#### HOSPITAL CONSTITUTIONS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Has the Health Commission yet approved the terms of the constitutions of—(a) the Royal Adelaide Hospital and (b) the Queen

Elizabeth Hospital, pursuant to section 27 (2) of the South Australian Health Commission Act and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Draft constitutions are currently being examined as to correctness of legal form. The commission will give further consideration to the constitutions as soon as this has been completed.

#### COUNTRY INDUSTRIES

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Has the Premier received a letter dated 17 July 1978, from Mr. Roy Underwood of Mannum, suggesting a scheme of preference for country industries and, if so:

(a) has he yet replied and to what effect; and

(b) is the suggestion considered practicable and what action, if any, is proposed to adopt it?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes.

(a) No.

(b) At present, the Government operates a scheme to assist firms in overcoming establishment costs in decentralised locations. Firms establishing or significantly expanding in growth centres or major service centres are eligible for decentralisation incentives. However, the Government is of the opinion that operational subsidies do not assist in the establishment of long-term viable industries in country locations. Since the Government already operates a general purchasing preference scheme for goods made in South Australia, no action is proposed to adopt the suggestion.

#### NATURAL PARENTS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is there a Register of Natural Parents and, if so:

(a) is this to record the natural parents of persons who are adopted;

(b) for how long has it been kept;

(c) who is responsible for keeping it;

(d) who may look at it, with whose authority and under what conditions;

(e) what information from it may be made available, by whom, on whose authority and to whom may it be made available; and

(f) what arrangements are there for the security of such register to ensure that it is not seen by unauthorised persons?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** A card index of natural parents is kept in the Community Welfare Department.

(a) Yes.

(b) Since early this century.

(c) The Adoptions Officer.

(d) Three senior officers may make information available on a confidential basis only to the four social workers in the Adoptions Branch; Director, Specialist Services; the Deputy Director-General; or the Director-General.

(e) The card has only basic information, which may be made available only to the officers mentioned in (d).

(f) The cards are locked securely and only three senior officers have a key.

#### FREE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

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

1. Does the Minister intend carrying out the request of the A.L.P. Convention held on 5 June that the State

Labor Caucus investigate extending free public transport beyond the Adelaide central business district to suburban areas and, if so, what would be the cost of implementing such a proposal?

2. Is it intended to introduce concessions on public transport for unemployed people as recommended by the Premier at the A.L.P. Convention held on 5 June, and, if so, by what method will an unemployed person be defined?

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

1. Yes.
2. The matter is currently subject to consideration.

### CAR PARKS

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

1. Is the Minister aware that in other States it is the practice to develop car parks in shopping complexes for multi-purpose use, that is, for both car parking and as a hard playing area for such local community activities as netball, basketball, skate boarding, and roller skating?

2. Will the Minister negotiate with developers in an endeavour to implement similar programmes in South Australia?

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

1. Yes. The Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department and the State Planning Authority are currently reviewing those aspects of the Metropolitan Development Plan and development control procedures, which deal with retail and centres development. One of the objectives of the review is to encourage the development of multi-purpose centres, which would include the possible use of car-parking areas for a variety of community activities. Discussions are taking place with developers.

2. Vide No. 1.

### HOUSE FENCES

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

1. Does the Housing Trust issue notice of its intention to erect fences on the common boundary between trust and privately owned property and, if not, why not?

2. Does the trust give an indication of the type of fence and cost before erecting fences between trust and private property?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

### BAROSSA TOURISM

**Mr. EVANS** (on notice): Is the Chief Secretary aware of a report in the local press on 31 May 1978, that the Barossa Valley Tourist Association office may be forced to close if greater financial assistance is not received from the Government and, if so, what action will the Government take to further help the effective regionalisation of the South Australian tourist industry?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I am aware that a report appeared in the *Barossa Herald* on 1 June 1978 quoting from the annual report by the Chairman of the Barossa Valley Tourist Association. The principal activity of that association is the operation of a tourist inquiry office at Nuriootpa. The Chairman's report indicated that, for the year to 31 March 1978, the accounts of the association revealed an excess of expenditure over income of \$711. It

also stated that, unless the association receives greater monetary assistance from local government and from the State Government, the tourist office may be forced to close or, at least, to drastically scale down its operations.

I can advise that the association's income for the year to 31 March 1978 included a \$2 000 grant by the State Government. A further grant of \$2 200 was paid on 24 May towards the cost of operating the tourist office during the current year. I also advise that contributions by local government to the association for the year to 31 March 1978 totalled \$1 371, and were \$960 less than for the preceding year. Total contributions from local organisations and membership fees also declined from \$5 318 in the year to 31 March 1977 to 4 751 for the year to 31 March 1978. It seems clear that whatever financial stringency the association is experiencing ought to be attributed to declining support from local organisations generally, rather than from the Government, which has actually increased its contributions from year to year. Travel agency trading is the largest generator of income for the Barossa Valley Tourist Office. The annual State Government grant, which is similar to that paid to comparable country tourist offices elsewhere in South Australia, is intended to assist the association to provide advisory and guidance services to visitors to the Barossa Valley. The Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department maintains close liaison with about 30 country tourist offices throughout South Australia, providing financial and advisory assistance, also assistance in kind related to the provisions of advisory and guidance services to visitors to the various regions of the State. The scale of this assistance has been increased recently and will continue to be given considerable priority in the use of resources available to the department.

### FOOD FACTORY

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

1. How many cooks and chefs are being trained at the School of Food and Catering?

2. What job opportunities exist for them upon completion of their course?

3. Is the Minister aware that many cooks and chefs formerly employed by hospitals have been unable to find work since their dismissal as a result of the establishment of the Government's food factory?

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

1. Chefs: There are no chefs being trained yet.

Cooks: The present enrolments indicate that cooks are educated in three ways:

(1) Apprentice Cooks			
Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Total
75	70	62	207

(2) Commercial Cookery Certificate—part-time 36

(3) Commercial Cookery Certificate—full-time:

13 enrolled
5 pass
5 still to complete work
3 withdrawn

2. There are more job opportunities in the hospitality industry than any other field taught at Regency Park College. The School of Food and Catering is constantly being requested assistance to fill vacancies. There has been no time since last December, when a highly-paid job has not been displayed on the school notice board. There are, without doubt, jobs for all successful graduates. In the last five weeks the school has been contacted with respect to 15 vacancies. Employers are continuously in contact



with the college offering positions for good cooks, paying from \$180 to \$300 clear.

3. To my knowledge there have not been any chefs employed in hospital kitchens. The cooks who work in the highly specialised areas of food preparation in large institutions have not been trained to be the versatile people that are required in hotels/motels/restaurants. It could be conceived that there are two different industries. The methods of food preparation for a known number of captive clients on set diets with financial constraints is totally different from the situation obtaining in the hospitality industry.

In a hotel/motel/restaurant situation the clients come in when they like and they expect to order from a wide ranging menu what they like. They have personal tastes which differ, and they expect to get what they want, and they pay for the individual attention and satisfaction of personal desires. I believe that people made redundant by technical changes in food preparation in institutions are certainly retrainable and that, because of the high employment potential in the industry, arrangements could be made for retraining those people who wish to change from institutional cookery to hospitality cookery. Not all of those who have been employed in hospitals may wish to enter an industry, which has its busy times when most people are off duty relaxing. It is emphasised that some hospitals (e.g. Queen Elizabeth) encourage their apprentice cooks to gain a wider experience than that specifically necessary for their industry. Many of these apprentices, if released, would be highly valued in the hospitality industry.

#### HOUSING INDEMNITY

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

1. Is the Minister aware of the voluntary housing indemnity scheme set up by the Housing Industry Association?

2. Does the Government support the scheme and, if so, what action is it going to take?

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

1. Yes.

2. In a letter on 13 February to the Chairman of the Housing Industry Association, I said:

This Government has been concerned with the protection of the home purchaser, and you can be assured of my support and assistance in future. I will be advising Cabinet of your scheme's significant contribution in this matter.

I think that this is a useful scheme and I congratulate the association for taking the initiative to organise it. Discussions are taking place on the further development of the scheme.

#### LOTTERIES

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

1. Is it proposed to modify the regulations in relation to lotteries to enable voluntary organisations to pay only on the number of tickets sold in lieu of the present system of being required to pay, in advance, a licence fee for the number of anticipated sales?

2. How many lottery operators during the last three years have asked for an extension of the time necessary to conduct their lottery?

3. On how many occasions has it been necessary to cancel a lottery with the result that the operators were required to refund any moneys that had been paid and—

(a) what were the names of the operators; and

(b) what was the size of each such lottery?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The replies are as follows:

1. Lottery regulations were amended on 3 April 1978, which now enable associations conducting general lotteries to pay licence fees on actual gross proceeds derived instead of anticipated gross proceeds, as was the case prior to the amendments.

2. In the last three years, out of a total of 3 015 general lottery licences issued, 375 requests have been made for extensions of the period of ticket sales. Of this number, 95 requests were approved, and these were granted only after ensuring that the lotteries would not have realised sufficient proceeds to cover the cost of prizes and administrative expenses and the time of extension was reasonably within or near the permissible maximum three month selling period.

3. Of a total of 5 400 general lottery licences issued since the introduction of the lottery regulations in 1971, 10 lotteries have been cancelled and moneys refunded to the ticket buyers. The names of the associations concerned and the size of the lotteries are:

	Prize-money	Anticipated gross proceeds
	\$	\$
1. Whyalla Model Railway . . . . .	400	1 000
2. Morphett Vale Kindergarten . .	2 000	4 800
3. S.A. Amateur Judo Assoc. . . .	1 300	4 000
4. Tanunda Amateur Basketball Club . . . . .	700	2 000
5. Mintaro-Manoora Football Club . . . . .	445	1 000
6. Athelstone Guides and Brownies . . . . .	900	2 000
7. Whyalla Rugby League . . . . .	2 180	5 000
8. Supporting Fathers Assoc. . . .	8 000	30 000
9. Far West Aboriginal Progress Assoc. . . . .	800	5 000
10. Lions Soccer Club—Whyalla . .	300	1 000

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

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

1. Will the Government insert a clause in Government contract conditions so as to provide a preference to a tender from an approved decentralised manufacturing industry and, if not, why not?

2. Is the Premier aware that a preference scheme for decentralised industry applies in Victoria?

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

1. No. A Government purchasing preference scheme already exists for all goods made in South Australia. The Government feels no justification exists for an extension of the present scheme.

2. Yes. Literature indicates that the South Australian scheme allocates a higher preference to local producers.

#### SCHOOL NURSES

**Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. What are the criteria for the provision of a trained nurse within schools?

2. Which are the schools in South Australia currently employing a trained nurse?

3. Is the Minister aware that at one suburban high school which has approximately 1 500 students and 120 staff, and contains physics and chemistry laboratories,

workshops, craftrooms and a home economics section, 613 students were treated by the Deputy Principal and school counsellors during the first term, 1978?

4. What relationship, if any, does the Minister see between the needs of industrial premises which are met under the first-aid and health facilities provisions of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and the needs of schools?

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

1. There is no deliberate programme of employing trained nurses in departmental schools. There would be a number of departmental schools employing teachers and ancillary staff who, coincidentally, hold current trained nurse qualifications or who have at earlier stages of their careers been trained nurses. However, this is not to say that schools have no capacity to cater for situations requiring first-aid. Indeed, a large number of schools have ancillary staff members who hold current first-aid certificates or equivalent qualifications, enabling them to provide a high level of first-aid attention. At least 100 are nominated to be primarily responsible in schools (and are paid an allowance) for high level first-aid duties. In addition, all school assistants employed in schools may be required to undertake elementary first-aid duties, including responsibility for sick rooms and matters of simple hygiene.

2. There are 10 secondary schools with nurses.

3. Yes, with the majority of the cases being very minor cuts, bruises, headaches, etc., some of which were contracted outside the school.

4. The Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and the regulations made pursuant to the Act are adjuncts to other legislation concerning the employment of workers in all forms of industry. As clause 6 of this Act binds the Crown, the Education Department accepts the obligation to observe any relevant requirements in schools. To this end, workshops, craftrooms, laboratories and offices are expected to meet the first-aid and health standards required under the Act and regulations.

#### SEMP KITS

**Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. How many schools in South Australia are using resources from the Social Education Materials Project?

2. What is the cost of each SEMP kit?

3. How many kits have been purchased for use in South Australian schools?

4. What opportunities, if any, have there been for parents to examine the material prior to its introduction in schools?

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

1. It is difficult to be precise about this. Dissemination has been going on for some 18 months, and any school could be purchasing materials over that time. In that time some 80 secondary schools have sent representatives to a number of three-day conferences or have been visited by its project team in the school situation. Continuing inservice is occurring at this time and will go on through term 3. It is very likely that many of the 80-plus schools have purchased or will purchase some of the SEMP materials for use in their school curriculum. It is not possible to state precisely how many are actually using SEMP materials or to what degree they may be using it.

2. SEMP has so many components that it is not possible to put a general cost overall. Not all sections are yet available nor are all the materials for the various topics yet published. A very general figure for the section "Urbanism" which is complete is \$226.

3. Figures are difficult to obtain but it is estimated at around 300.

4. In the "Development Stage", at the outset invitations were sent out to over 140 community organisations to meet with the project team to discuss and, if necessary, modify the brief of the South Australian team. In addition, the Education Department encourages full parental involvement at the local level, and it is hoped that this will enable parents to carry out rational assessment without the emotive problems that have been fostered elsewhere. A "SEMP for Parents" handbook will be available in three to four weeks from the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra.

#### FRASER PARK SCHOOL

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is a new activity room to be built at Fraser Park Primary School, Murray Bridge, and, if so, when and what are the reasons for any delay and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** A new activity hall is planned for Fraser Park Primary School. It is anticipated that this facility will be available for occupation by December 1980. There have not been any delays experienced in either the programming or design schedules.

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is the multi-purpose room at Fraser Park Primary School to be converted into a four teacher unit and, if so, when and what are the reasons for any delay and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The temporary demac activity hall is to be converted to a four teacher flexible open plan unit. It is anticipated that this facility will be available for occupation by December 1980. There have not been any delays experienced in either the programming or design schedules.

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is a double unit, currently placed at Murray Bridge South Primary School, to be moved to Fraser Park Primary School and, if so, when and what are the reasons for any delay and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The dual demac classroom will be relocated at Fraser Park Primary School. It is anticipated that the relocation will occur as programmed in October 1978. As there are some external and internal modifications to be carried out on site, the building will not be available for occupation until January 1980. There have been no delays.

#### HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Does the Government have an education policy relating to students who are handicapped and, if so, what is that policy and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The Education Department policy on "students handicapped" rests on three broad bases. They are: (i) appropriate education should be available for "all"; (ii) the form of "special education" should permit the maximum useful association between handicapped children and others, consistent with the interests of both; (iii) parents should be involved in the process of education.

Appropriate education for all: the South Australian Education Department accepts responsibility for providing for a more substantial part of the child population than most other States. The latest available comparative data (late 1976) shows that 96.1 per cent of children receiving special educational assistance in South Australia are

receiving it in departmental schools. Other States' comparable figures are: Tasmania, 100 per cent; New South Wales, 93 per cent; Western Australia, 90.6 per cent; Queensland, 89.4 per cent; Victoria, 79.3 per cent. Some States have private organisations or other departments (for example, health) providing "educational" services for considerable numbers of moderately and severely handicapped youngsters who, in this State, would be attending regular or special schools. For example, the department provides a school within the Strathmont centre for any child who can take any self-initiated action whatever—a level of acceptance which is rare elsewhere. Even at Ru Rua, where "totally dependent" children are provided with medical nursing and basic training care, departmental teachers have an advisory and co-ordinating role.

The department accepts all children except the very small numbers of totally dependent ones, no matter what their level of handicap. Physically handicapped, mentally retarded children are accepted within the school at the Woodville Spastic Centre. Totally blind or totally deaf students are accepted into appropriate special schools or centres. Special schools have been set up at Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Berri, Murray Bridge, and Port Pirie where hostels are provided by organisations such as the Mentally Retarded Children's Society to permit children in more isolated settings to board in order to attend school. Some peripatetic support services are available to help teachers retain more handicapped children within their neighbourhood schools.

The level of services described has been made available in South Australia despite the fact that the Handicapped Persons Assistance Act, operated by the Australian Department of Social Security, provides staff (50 per cent of salaries) and capital (4:1) subsidy to private organisations providing special educational services for handicapped children, but not to Government's doing likewise. The effect of the legislation is that States like South Australia, which have accepted greater responsibility for the education of handicapped children, receive proportionately less Commonwealth support because of that acceptance. Representations have been made on this matter both by the State Government and by the Schools Commission for a number of years, without any obvious outcome.

Maximum useful association between handicapped children and others: The Education Department works on the premise that meeting the wide variety of handicapped children's needs requires a wide variety of services, flexibly organised. A general summary of these services includes: the provision of facilities within special schools which are of specific value to groups of children and adults within the community (to attract the general population into settings which would otherwise be exclusively for the handicapped); the provision of special school resources, wherever possible, on the same site as regular schools, the combining of special classes, students and teachers, with regular classes in a single unit; the provision of an additional teacher within an open space unit which includes a group of handicapped children; the provision of support teachers to regular schools with small numbers of handicapped children; the setting up of full-time special classes and of special classes to which children are withdrawn for limited periods.

Examples of these policies in specific areas of handicap include the fact that hearing-impaired children, for example, are educated in special units attached to regular primary or secondary schools, or in regular classes supported by visiting specialist teachers. The School for Visually Impaired Children (Townsend School), provides

on-site education for approximately 50 blind and partially sighted children, but additionally, supports nearly twice that number in regular schools by advice, counselling and the provision of specialist materials.

Involvement of parents: With very rare exceptions, parents have the option of acceptance or rejection of recommendations concerning the provision of special education for their children. In the case of hearing-impaired children, they are given the option of choosing between three modes of instruction—cued speech, oral and total communication. This sometimes means that the department must accept greater cost to transport children to the centre of their parents' "choice". In a variety of ways, special education settings are seeking to involve parents in the actual process of education of their children and have been invited to a number of seminars aimed at promoting their capacity to do so. A number of parents' organisations communicate with the department and its officers on matters concerning their particular interests—hearing-impaired children, mentally retarded children, hyperactive children, autistic children, and so on.

Resources in support of handicapped children: The Guidance and Special Services Branch employs 63 psychologists (known as guidance officers and including senior officers), 11 social workers and 11 speech therapists in support of teachers and parents of students including handicapped children in departmental schools. Not all officers work full-time. The Special Education Section of the department is responsible for a little under 500 teachers (including principals and deputies) in one form or another of special education throughout the State. Of that number, rather less than half are employed in special schools with some degree of separation from regular schools, although often on a common campus, or co-operating across a range of activities. The remainder are employed in regular primary and secondary schools as teachers of full-time special classes, withdrawal classes, special centres, or as support teachers within single schools or groups of schools. In addition to teachers employed in these areas of work, nearly 150 school assistants, or teachers' aides, are also employed in support of handicapped children in our schools.

It should be noted that our general policy is to assume that most individual differences of children can and should be managed within regular classes by regular classroom teachers. There are many children with physical difficulties, or with less severe learning problems, who are dealt with adequately without special education resources as such being required in their support. All have access—if their teachers or parents wish it—to have the advisory service of psychologists in the Guidance and Special Services Branch. Handicapped children unable to attend a special educational or regular school facility by use of public or privately arranged transport are provided with taxi or small bus transport without cost to parents. In the 1977-78 financial year, this cost the department a little over \$500 000.

#### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What is the Department for Community Welfare policy regarding the future employment of community development officers in this State?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The policy regarding the future employment of community development officers in this State will be determined in the light of decisions made on the recommendations contained in the report of the Corbett Committee on Community Development and Assistance.

### LAND TRANSFER

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Who are the members of the Pitjantjatjara working party which is investigating the possibility of transferring land in the north-west of South Australia to the local Aboriginal communities?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The members are: Mr. C. H. Cocks, S.M. (Chairman); Mr. H. J. Copley, Regional Director, Northern Country Region, Department for Community Welfare; Mr. D. Hope, Senior Lecturer, Aboriginal Task Force, S.A. Institute of Technology; Mr. R. Howie, Solicitor, Central Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service, representing the Pitjantjatjara Council. The working party was assisted by: Mrs. E. Johnston, Law Department, as a legal consultant; Mr. A. Minutjukur, as an Aboriginal observer for the Pitjantjatjara Council; and Mr. B. C. Headland, Aboriginal Advancement Committee, as secretary.

### SCHOOL DEPUTY PRINCIPALS

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

1. Is it present Education Department policy not to appoint a secondary deputy to an area school when the present secondary deputy is promoted or transferred and, if so, what are the reasons for such policy?

2. Will the Minister take the necessary steps to change this policy to allow at least one secondary deputy principal to be appointed at the Oakbank Area School?

3. Is the Minister aware, in relation to Oakbank Area School, that:

- (a) enrolment in years 8 to 12 is likely to be in excess of 450 students in 1979, with many high schools having a much smaller enrolment;
- (b) the school has eight senior staff, including one special senior, all of whom have had extensive experience in secondary administration experience; and
- (c) unlike other area schools, it has a primary section which is much smaller than the secondary section and also has 14 other contributing primary schools?

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

1. The Education Department is not able to appoint secondary deputy principals to area schools, under advice from the Auditor-General who rules that it is in contravention of the Teachers Salaries Board Award.

2. The Education Department's industrial officer advises that the Minister does not have the power under the Act to change this policy.

3. Departmental officers are fully aware of all the statistics in relation to Oakbank Area School. Indeed, discussions have been held with the principal of the school informing him why it is not possible to replace the current secondary deputy with another secondary deputy, should he be transferred or promoted. Already the principal has been advised that he is able to seek an area deputy with a significant secondary background should the present secondary deputy leave the school at the end of this year. If after consultation with the Regional Director, Central Eastern Region, the principal wishes to fill the vacancy with a second area deputy for the school, it would be possible, with the concurrence of the Institute of Teachers, to declare this position as an open position. This would allow teachers who had been assessed eligible for area deputy to apply for the position irrespective of their standing on the promotion list. The only other possibility allowed for under the Teachers Salaries Board Award is

that the principal ask for a secondary senior to be appointed.

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Which high schools in South Australia with an enrolment in years 8 to 12 of over 450 students have—

- (a) no secondary deputy principal;
- (b) one secondary deputy principal; or
- (c) two secondary deputy principals?

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

- (a) None.
- (b) Port Adelaide and Waikerie High Schools.
- (c) All other high schools have two or more secondary deputies.

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

1. How many submissions were received by the Department for Community Welfare on the Corbett Report on Community Development and Assistance prior to the granting of extension of time and since the extension of time?

2. When is it intended that this report will go before Cabinet?

3. Have any people been allocated the responsibility of studying the submissions prior to the report going to Cabinet and, if so, who are they and why were they selected?

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

- 1. 39 and 47 respectively.
- 2. Late August or early September.

3. Yes: officers of Community Development Branch (Community Welfare Department), and Policy Division, Premier's Department. They were selected because of their knowledge of community development and Government policy parameters.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Has the new intensive neighbourhood care system for young offenders up to the age of 18 years being put into operation and, if so, when did the scheme start and, if not, when is it expected to commence?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** No. The scheme is expected to commence early in 1979.

### CARE GIVERS

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Question No. 287:

1. With the selection of community care givers (as outlined in the Department of Community Welfare document entitled Development of Services for Young Offenders), what criteria are to be used for the selection of these people with regard to: (a) experience and (b) environment?

2. Are these people to be advised regarding the record of the child they are expected to foster?

3. Will these people be given full access to all information?

4. If these people are not given full access to all information, will they be informed of the more serious offences such as arson, assault, rape, and other sexual assaults?

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

- 1. (a) Assessed maturity in life experiences, a balanced approach to living and the ability to understand, relate to,

assist and supervise young people so that the purposes of the scheme are achieved.

(b) Adequate accommodation in an accepting and helpful environment close to the address where the young person belongs.

2. This programme is not foster care. Records of children will be disclosed to caregivers, but having regard to confidentiality and treatment requirements.

3. Yes, to all relevant information but some information about the young person's parents or relatives may need to be restricted.

4. The more serious offenders in these categories will not be placed in the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme. See 2 above.

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Has the Department for Community Welfare recently advertised for people to be involved as care givers under the new scheme for young offenders up to the age of 18 years and, if so, how many applications have been received and, if not, when is it expected that applications will be received?

2. When the selection of community care givers is embarked upon, what method of selection will be used?

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

1. No.

2. Selection will be preceded by a training programme which will include information giving and discussion, thus enabling matching of the abilities and circumstances of the caregivers with the individual needs of the young people. (See answer to Question on Notice 287).

#### LOCKLEYS LIGHTS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice): Are plans proceeding for traffic lights to be installed at the intersection of Rowells Road and Henley Beach Road, Lockleys, and, if so, in what month, approximately, will the lights be installed?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Yes. January 1979, subject to council agreement and completion of the necessary roadworks.

#### TRANSPORT CONCESSIONS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice): When does the Government propose to introduce free or concessional transport to unemployed persons and, if this is not proposed, why not?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The matter is currently subject to consideration.

#### LOCAL HOSPITAL BOARDS

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

1. What criteria are used by the South Australian Health Commission when determining the composition of local hospital boards?

2. Is it intended to enforce worker participation policies on country and city hospitals under the control of the commission and, if so, why?

3. Have any country hospitals objected to employee representatives being on the board?

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

1. In considering the composition of hospital boards, due regard is given to achieving a balance of expertise, experience and backgrounds (e.g., finance, business, medical, education, legal, community, consumer).

2. Some hospitals have already freely accepted the concept of worker participation, and discussions are still

taking place with others.

3. See 2 above.

#### HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT LAND

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): When does the Highways Department intend to use the property on Burbridge Road which they acquired from Mr. and Mrs. Elston?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** This property was acquired for the widening of Burbridge Road. The Highways Department has no immediate plans to put this work in hand.

#### STONE RESERVE

**Mr. EVANS** (on notice): Will the Minister take steps to have set aside for recreational and sporting pursuits and conservation, at least portion of the land known as the Stone Reserve which has a frontage of 2 km to the Iron Knob Road and a total area of 193 hectares, much of which is high land overlooking Whyalla, and, if so:

(a) will the land be dedicated to the City of Whyalla to be held in trust with the possibility of development for tourism to parts of the area; and

(b) will planning controls to those sections which could be considered be hills face in relation to the City of Whyalla?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Section 374 north out of hundreds, known as the Mt. Laura Stone Reserve, was placed under the care, control and management of the Minister of Mines and Energy on 1 July 1978. On 17 July 1978 discussions were held between officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Whyalla City Council concerning this area. A formal submission has since been received from the council concerning management of the area and this is currently being examined.

#### VAUGHAN HOUSE

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Has any costing been done in relation to the upgrading of Vaughan House and, if so, what are the details of:

(a) capital costs;

(b) salaries;

(c) running expenses; and

(d) any other costs?

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

(a) \$150 000.

(b) \$694 600 per annum total for the centre.

(c) \$64 000 per annum total for the centre.

(d) Public Buildings Department costs \$86 000 per annum.

#### McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Has any costing been done in relation to the upgrading of McNally Training Centre and, if so, what are the details of:

(a) capital costs;

(b) salaries;

(c) running expenses; and

(d) any other costs?

2. Is it the intention to upgrade the security block of McNally Training Centre and, if so, what is the expected cost and what are the details of that cost?

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

1. Yes.
  - (a) \$550 000.
  - (b) \$755 000 per annum total for the centre.
  - (c) \$209 000 per annum total for the centre.
  - (d) Public Buildings Department costs \$376 000 per annum.
2. Yes. \$50 000 (included in the \$550 000 above).

	\$
Upgrading security .....	10 000
Individual toilets in sleeping area .....	15 000
Air-conditioning of administration, sleeping and dining areas .....	8 000
Floor coverings .....	10 000
Room for education programmes .....	3 000
Repainting .....	4 000
	50 000

**NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE**

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. When the newly developed services for young people are introduced by the Department for Community Welfare, what will be the remuneration, daily and weekly, for people who are involved in the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Programme for each type of young person, respectively?
2. Is any part of that allowance taxable?
3. Will the department provide pocket money for these young people and, if so, how much?
4. If these young people are receiving unemployment relief, will they also receive pocket money?
5. If they are receiving unemployment relief, is any of it to be paid as board to the care givers?
6. Will the care givers receive any compensation for loss or damage to person or property which may occur whilst fostering these young people?
7. Will the care givers be responsible for all or part of any medical, dental and optical expenses of these young people and, if not, what arrangements will be made?
8. What back-up staff will be available to the care givers?
9. Will there be a community welfare worker allotted to each care giver?

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

1. Payments will be by way of allowances, not remuneration.
  - (a) For young persons on remand for alleged offences—\$12 per day.
  - (b) For young persons placed for care and treatment under contractual arrangements—\$15 per day.
2. Initial inquiries with the Commissioner of Taxation indicate that the allowances will not be classed as taxable income.
3. Yes, at standard rates which currently are:

	Per week
	\$
10-11 years .....	1.05
12-14 years .....	2.10
15-18 years .....	2.85

4. No.
5. To be determined on an individual basis according to an approved scale.
6. Yes, outside that which is covered by normal insurances. It is intended that this will be written into the

contract with the care giver. The scheme is not foster care.

7. The department will pay necessary medical, dental and optical expenses which are not covered by approved medical or hospital benefit funds.
8. District office and other professional consultant staff.
9. Yes, while they have a child in their care.

**FOSTERING RATES**

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. What are the current rates set down by the Department for Community Welfare in relation to the fostering of children under:
  - (a) care and control orders;
  - (b) guardianship; and
  - (c) private fostering?
2. What basis is set down for pocket money for those children, respectively?
3. Who is responsible for the medical, dental, and optical expenses of those foster children?

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

1. (a) \$22.70 per week, plus wear and tear clothing allowance of \$3.20 per week for children under 12 years and \$4.50 per week for children 12 years and over. Family allowance applies and is kept by the foster parents.
  - (b) \$22.70 per week.
  - (c) As arranged between the parent or guardian and the foster parent.
2. Pocket money is paid for care and control children only.

	Per week
	\$
9 years and under .....	0.70
10 to 11 years inclusive .....	1.05
12 to 14 years inclusive .....	2.10
15 to 18 years inclusive .....	2.85

Parents, guardians or custodians provide any pocket money for other children.

3. For care and control children the department will pay necessary medical, dental and optical expenses which are not covered by approved medical or hospital benefit funds. For other children, parents, guardians or custodians are responsible.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE**

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Has any costing been done in relation to the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Programme and, if so, what are those costs and the details and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Yes. The estimated cost of \$150 000 for 1978-79 is based on an estimated number of 20 youths in the second quarter of the year, rising to 50 in the fourth quarter.

	\$
Youths on remand (\$12 per day) .....	64 800
Youths placed for care and treatment under contractual arrangements (\$15 per day) ..	60 750
Other costs .....	24 450
	150 000

**CONSULTANT FEES**

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice)—Question No. 321:

1. What was the total expenditure by the Premier's Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The cost of researching this and other related questions is very large and completely unjustified. The Leader talks constantly of saving moneys and is guilty of promoting gross waste.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the State Transport Authority for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Hospitals Department, now the Health Commission, for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the South Australian Land Commission for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the State Planning Authority for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Public Buildings Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Attorney-General's Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Department for Community Welfare for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Education Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Environment Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Labour and

Industry Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Local Government Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Public Service Board Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Auditor-General's Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What is the total expenditure by the Consumer Affairs Department for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What is the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were

expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** See answer to question 321.

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. What was the total expenditure by the Treasury for consultant fees for each of the financial years, respectively, from July 1974 to June 1978?

2. What was the specific task or study performed by the consultants on each occasion?

3. What were the individual amounts paid in respect of each project and to what firms were they paid?

4. What benefit in cost savings and efficiency were expected to result from the adoption of recommendations made in each case?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** See answer to question 321.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE PROGRAMME

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): With the introduction of the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Programme, is it the intention of the Community Welfare Department to include care givers on its review board, either as members of the board or to sit in when their charges are due for release or readmittance?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Yes, whenever possible.

### JUVENILES

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Were the advertisements in the *Advertiser* of:

(a) 1/7/78: page 6. "Volunteers Wanted",

(b) 22/7/78: "Families Wanted"; and

(c) 29/7/78: page 8. "Family Required",

in any way connected with the Government's new programme for development of services for young offenders and, if so, what are the details and, if not, to what did they relate?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** No.

(a) use of volunteer aides in assisting young offenders has been a consistent programme of the department.

(b) and (c) relate to the need to find homes for young people with specific needs.

### TEACHER HOUSES

**Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): What is the programme for the provision of homes by the Teacher Housing Authority in Port Lincoln, Tumby Bay, Cummins, Cleve, Cowell and Lock, respectively?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The approved 1978-79 programme for provision of teachers' accommodation includes a house for teachers with dependants at Tumby Bay and Cleve. This programme also includes provision of accommodation for four teachers without dependants at Cummins and two teachers without dependants at Port Lincoln. The Manager of the Teacher Housing Authority has indicated that funds likely to be available to the authority in 1978-79 should permit provision of the abovementioned accommodation. No firm programme has yet been established for the ensuing financial years. Preliminary planning and consultation with the Regional Director have indicated, however, that it is likely that the 1979-80 housing programme will include Lock, Cowell, Cummins and Cleve.



## DAYLIGHT SAVING

**Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce amending legislation to provide for an extension of daylight saving in South Australia and, if so, what will be the new commencement date and finishing date?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No.

## TRAFFIC LIGHTS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to alter the traffic lights at Anzac Highway and South Road intersection to provide turn-right arrows from Anzac Highway to South Road and, if not, why not?

2. How many accidents have occurred at this intersection in each year for the past three years, and what is the number of injuries and fatalities?

3. How many accidents during the past three years involved vehicles turning right from Anzac Highway to South Road?

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

1. No. If right-turn arrows were provided, the resulting delays to the majority of traffic in the vicinity would be considerable.

2.*	Year	Reported accidents	Persons injured	Persons killed
	1975.....	45	5	—
	1976.....	48	3	—
	1977.....	48	13	—
3.*				Reported accidents
	1975.....			9
	1976.....			7
	1977.....			9

\*These are the latest comprehensive figures available.

## ADOPTIONS

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Why did the Minister find it appropriate to appoint an Assistant Principal Officer of an in-country adoption agency to the previous Advisory Committee on Adoptions and yet inappropriate to appoint a person of equivalent standing in an inter-country adoption agency to the reconvened committee?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The diversity of expressed opinion among the inter-country adoption agencies required that they should make independent submissions to a selected expert group.

## ADOPTERS REGISTER

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Why is it not possible, in principle, if the Prospective Adopters Register is maintained properly, to compute the number of outstanding approvals at any given time by the process of cumulatively subtracting approvals from and adding placements, revocations, and withdrawals to, the number outstanding at the present?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** It is possible, in principle, to compute in the manner suggested. The Community Welfare Department is now recording the necessary statistics on a quarterly basis.

## INTER-COUNTRY ADOPTIONS

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

1. What is the yearly quota imposed by the Community Welfare Department on the number of inter-country placements that may be arranged by an inter-country adoption agency with a part-time principal officer, and are there any other requirements relating to agencies which would affect this quota and, if so, how?

2. What interests of a child adopted overseas are being safeguarded by the imposition of yearly or other quotas on placements by private inter-country adoption agencies which are not already assured by:

(a) vetting of prospective adopters by the department; and

(b) the procedures of official welfare bodies in the child's country of origin?

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

1. 25. There are no other requirements which would affect the quota.

2. In the interests of the children being adopted, the adoption of children regulations require a principal officer of a private adoption agency to be a person with social-welfare training and experience who is employed at least substantially full-time. In a particular case and for a limited period of time, the appointment of a part-time principal officer may be authorised, provided that the agency is able to fulfil adequately its functions under such an arrangement. Unless the principal officer is able to give adequate time to selection of approved prospective adopters for a particular child and to making arrangements for the adoption, there is a possibility that an unsuitable placement will be arranged, and that an application for an adoption order will not be granted. The Act requires that the interest of the child shall be paramount.

## PRIVATE ADOPTION AGENCIES

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What were the names of all private inter-country adoption agencies in South Australia, approved by the Community Welfare Department, for each year ended 30 June from 1973 to 1976?

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

Year ended	Private adoption agency
30/6/73.....	—
30/6/74.....	—
30/6/75.....	Australian Society for Inter-country Aid Children Adoption Agency.
30/6/76.....	Australian Society for Inter-country Aid Children Adoption Agency. Australian Adoptive Families Association Adoption Agency.

## ADOPTION PANEL

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

1. For what reasons can the Minister state that boards established under the Adoption of Children Act to hear appeals against decisions of the Director-General of Community Welfare are "free of the administrative power" of the Minister when boards are appointed by, and drawn from, the Adoption Panel whose members hold office "at the pleasure of the Minister"?

2. What provisions of legislation are there that would prevent a Minister of Community Welfare from removing members of the Adoption Panel (so long as they are

replaced according to the Act) who might displease him in the execution of their duties, in particular whilst on an appeal board?

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

1. (a) The Director-General or his nominee on the Adoption Panel will not be eligible to be selected for appointment to an Adoption Board.

(b) The boards will not report to the Minister.

(c) Members of adoption boards will be required to maintain confidentiality of information gained in the course of their duties as members of the board.

(d) The adoption of children regulations will provide that the manner of voting of the members shall not be disclosed to any other persons.

2. The Minister is charged with the administration of the Act and he is accountable for the operation of the Act. The Minister cannot know how members of adoption boards vote or their reasons for voting.

#### PREMIER'S DRIVER

**Mr. CHAPMAN** (on notice): What total remuneration did Mr. Lou Matijevic receive for the 1977-78 year in his capacity as the Premier's driver?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The sum of \$16 440.36.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. When did Mr. L. Matijevic become the Premier's driver?

2. What were his qualifications for being given the job?

3. Were any then serving Ministerial drivers considered for the position of Premier's driver before Mr. Matijevic was given it and, if so, what were their qualifications for the job and why was Mr. Matijevic preferred?

4. Are there any procedures, based on experience and years of service, or other and what criteria, for promotion among Ministerial drivers and, if so, what are they?

5. Did the Premier receive a letter of protest, after Mr. Matijevic became his driver, from any Ministerial drivers and, if so:

(a) how many;

(b) what were the contents of the letter or letters; and

(c) what reply, if any, did he give to each such letter and when were such replies sent?

6. Is it proposed that Mr. Matijevic continue to act as the Premier's driver?

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

1. 23 June 1975.

2. Mr. Matijevic worked as a driver for 19½ years for the M.T.T. Prior to that he was in charge of the Transport Section at the Woodside Immigration Hostel.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No. The only record of any letter in my office is from the Public Service Association. That was replied to fully. I received no further communication.

6. Yes.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

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

1. To how many private organisations has the private enterprise questionnaire on industrial democracy been sent?

2. Which persons will have access to this information when the questionnaires are returned?

3. Will this information be made available to the Tripartite Committee on Industrial Democracy?

4. Who requested that this information be collected?

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

1. Two hundred and ninety-three.

2. Only staff of the Unit for Industrial Democracy will have access to individual responses.

3. The overall results, but not individual responses, will be made available to the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee if it requests such information.

4. The Unit for Industrial Democracy staff sought, and were granted, permission from me and the Premier to conduct the survey.

#### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

##### WOMEN'S INFORMATION CARAVAN

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (1 August).

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** On the recommendation of the Kensington/Norwood/Burnside Community Council for Social Development, a grant of \$260 was approved towards the cost of hiring films and projectionists by a group called "Opportunities for Women in Kensington and Norwood". The grant was intended to cover minor costs of printing and postage, also. The grant has not yet been claimed. I am informed by the organisation that all the films to be shown have been recommended by the South Australian Film Corporation and none of them pertain to radical lesbianism or other similar sexual matters.

##### PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** presented a petition signed by 581 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Petition received.

##### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

**Mr. WELLS (Florey):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. WELLS:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the *Advertiser* carried an article headed "Public accountability". This concerns me and the other members of the Public Accounts Committee. I must read this infamous document for the benefit of the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WELLS:** The article states:

The Public Accounts Committee's delay in completing its inquiry into allegations that public money has been misused in Government hospitals is becoming almost scandalous. The inquiry began nearly 2½ years ago. Yet in answer to the latest complaints about the delay, the Chairman, Mr. Wells, M.P., has refused to discuss the committee's business and says "There are valid reasons why its meetings are not more frequent." As the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tonkin, has pointed out, evidence of wastefulness, and perhaps much worse, on a significant scale first began to appear more than five years ago. Yet still there is no official report on it at the Parliamentary level.

The principle of having a Parliamentary accounts committee at all has been A.L.P. policy for many years. Since its establishment in 1972 the present committee's main purpose has been to examine evidence of maladministration

drawn to Parliament's attention by the Auditor-General. As such, the committee is supposed to be a public watchdog with teeth.

Unfortunately, the longer it has functioned, the less the Government seems to have liked it. The public could be excused the impression that Ministers do not want a committee which includes Opposition representatives probing into what may be wrong in their own departments.

There appears to have been an especially obstructive attitude to inquiries into what is going on in the State's hospitals, where so much of the taxpayers' money is spent every year. Various delaying tactics have been adopted, and it must be said bluntly that neither the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, nor Mr. Wells shows any sign of wanting to get on with the job quickly at the Parliamentary level. It is, however, high time that they did. The principle of accountability is not to be satisfied simply by having an election once every three years.

Nor is the Auditor-General's regular reporting sufficient if Parliament won't act on what he says. A Public Accounts Committee is a logical extension at the political level of what the professional accountants have been doing. But it can't act efficiently on the voters' behalf if the Government of the day won't let it.

I resent that vicious article published in the *Advertiser* yesterday. It is erroneous; it is a villainous document and has no bearing at all on the work of my committee.

The committee examined the situation this morning when it met, and it was horrified that such an article should have been produced in the *Advertiser*. The committee unanimously stated that it was an erroneous report that had no foundation whatsoever. Such was the ire of the committee that it then moved the following resolution:

That the members of the Public Accounts Committee express their complete and wholehearted support and confidence in the Chairman of the committee (Mr. C. J. Wells) and deny any insinuation that the compiling of the report into the financial management of the Hospitals Department has been delayed in any way by the action of the Chairman; and that the report of the committee's inquiry will be tabled as soon as the committee is satisfied it has completed its task.

Apparently, some people wish to bring into disrepute the activities of my committee. They even have the effrontery to mention the Premier in the statement in this infamous document published by the *Advertiser*.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the honourable member has covered his personal explanation on the matter and is now commenting.

**Mr. WELLS:** I've not yet completed it.

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

#### DEATH OF THE POPE

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** With your leave, Sir, I should like to take this opportunity, if I may, to express my sorrow and that of my Party on the death of His Holiness, Pope Paul, and to express my condolences to the many thousands of South Australians who are mourning his passing. He was a man of humility and compassion who will long be remembered for his achievements in guiding the Catholic Church through a most difficult period in its history. He was a strong figure, who was never afraid to speak out against social injustices, and he took a deep interest in the world community. He personally involved himself in attempts to better the lives of millions of under-privileged people throughout the

world and continually strove for world peace. He will be remembered for his achievements and for his great humility and passion. I repeat that I should like to express my condolences to all the people who are so saddened by his passing.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** I join the Leader in what he has said. I do not think it necessary for me to add to the public expressions on this subject which I have already made and which have been publicised widely. I appreciate the Leader's move and I join with him in it.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Now that the Leader of the Opposition has given this opportunity to speak on the matter, I should like to join with him and the Premier in expressing my personal sorrow and that of the members of my Party at the death of His Holiness, Pope Paul. He was, as has been said, a great world figure and a figure for good. Whilst I do not belong to the church that acknowledges him as Head, nevertheless, we all acknowledge the power and influence for good that the papacy commands.

#### QUESTIONS

##### URANIUM INDUSTRY

**Mr. TONKIN:** Is the Premier aware that the Attorney-General has attempted to mislead the public of Whyalla and of South Australia by indicating that "at the most, only a couple of hundred people will be employed" in an uranium enrichment industry, when the report of the Government's Uranium Enrichment Committee indicates that more than 20 000 jobs could ultimately be generated in total through uranium mining and enrichment, and what action, if any, does he intend to take about this?

The second report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee states that a uranium processing centre would give permanent employment in the Redcliff area to 1 500 people. The construction labour force is estimated at 3 000-5 000 while total employment in the industry could be 8 000-10 000 by 1985. With associated employment generated by the activity, up to 25 000 jobs could be created during the next 10 years. Steel and technology for centrifuge manufacture is available in Whyalla, and sulphuric acid from Port Pirie could be used for hydrofluoric acid manufacture. The Government's report indicates enormous potential benefits for the people of the Iron Triangle, contrary to the Attorney-General's assertions. The immediate release of the third interim report is further clearly indicated by the Attorney-General's misrepresentation of the facts.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have not seen the statement by the Attorney-General and I do not want to comment on it without seeing it. Suffice to say that the Leader is about his usual bit of confusion; he cites the Attorney-General's talking about employment in the plant and then goes on to use the plant figures as employment generators and the prospective multiplier-effect of a particular employment generator in an area and say that they are the same things. They are not, and he ought to know that.

##### WORK EXPERIENCE

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Minister of Education say what has been the acceptance, both in schools and in the community, of the work experience programmes for secondary school students? How many secondary schools

in the State education system have some form of work experience in their curriculum; how many students are involved; and how many employers and community service organisations are now co-operating in the work experience system for secondary school students?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** There has been a gratifying level of support for the concept throughout the community from employers, trade unions, and community groups. I do not have the specific answers to the questions asked by the honourable member, but I will obtain them for him. I seem to recall that Mr. Giles, my Deputy Director-General, wrote to the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council last month, and the figures in that letter stated that about half the secondary schools in the State were involved in work experience of one kind or another. Not all students in each of the schools are involved, but about 5 000 young people in our schools were involved, and I think about 1 500 or 1 700 employers and community groups are involved directly in this scheme. I will try and get more specific figures for the honourable member if he wants them, but I think those that I have given indicate that there has been a gratifying level of support for the whole scheme. It is of particular interest to people in country centres, and there has been a good level of support from small employers in those areas for the scheme. No doubt as time goes on the system will be modified in its shape and scope and new ideas will be suggested, and I hope that we will have the resources to implement them.

#### MALAYSIA

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Have the Premier's efforts to develop export outlets in Malaysia for household and white goods been successful? We know that the Government has cancelled the proposed trade fair in Malaysia this year, so it is not now high on Government priorities. On Saturday I heard a speaker from the Commonwealth Department of Trade state, in answer to a question, that Australia had no chance of selling white goods in Malaysia ahead of competitors.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not know to what the honourable member is referring, as to my initiatives about selling white goods in Malaysia. I am not aware that I have ever actually been involved in a white goods sales operation to Malaysia.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Household goods?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** What particular household goods is the honourable member referring to?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member is apparently referring to the provision of elements of hardware to Panelex housing. That is quite a different matter from selling white goods.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Household goods.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** You had better look back at the answers that have been given.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** That is a back-off.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: if he continues in this vein I will take the necessary action.

#### FARM WORK

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Does the Minister of Labour and Industry think the suggestion by the Cattlemen's Union of Australia that the Federal Government should introduce

compulsory farm labour by using unemployed people in an effort to reduce welfare benefits will ever be taken seriously? Under a heading of "Jobless 'should earn dole on farms'" the *News* on 7 July stated:

The Federal Government should force unemployed young men to work on farms to earn their dole payments.

The Cattlemen's Union of Australia director, Mr. Barry Cassell, said there were thousands of young men hanging around beaches and milk bars living off welfare benefits who could work on farms.

"These people are a drain on Government resources of countless millions of dollars a year," he said.

"All young men under 25 receiving the dole should be put to work on farms to earn their handouts."

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am not aware of that statement and have not seen it. I will examine what the honourable member has said and bring back a reply.

#### GAY TEACHERS GROUP

**Mr. ALLISON:** Does the Minister of Education have any personal objection to the formation of a South Australian gay teachers group, membership of which was recently solicited, by male and female homosexual teachers, in volume 10, No. 11, South Australian Institute of Teachers *Journal* dated 2 August 1978? Will the Minister give an assurance that such a group will not be encouraged to promulgate its abnormal lifestyle among their impressionable and captive audience, the children attending South Australian schools? I ask this question because in the letter soliciting membership, the gay teacher who signed it stated:

The experiences of similar groups interstate suggests that there are many positive areas we can work in. Part of the meeting at least will attempt to formulate some of these areas.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** My attitude towards this group, as towards any group, would depend not on its membership but on its aims and the methods it adopts to carry out those aims. I think I should hold any opinion in abeyance until I find out a little more about the aims of this group.

As to the general question, the House would be well aware of the widely publicised circular that I sent to all schools about 12 to 15 months ago covering the whole question of proselytisation as to ideologies and lifestyles in schools. I shall be pleased to make a copy of that circular available to the honourable member, if he wants it. My stand was quite unequivocal and puts beyond any doubt my attitude towards advocacy of such lifestyles in schools. That circular, of course, still stands.

#### COAL RESERVES

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether or not the coal that has been discovered in the Cooper-Pedirka Basins in the Far North of South Australia represents coal reserves that could be exploited in terms of the technology of today?

Monday's *Advertiser* contains a report of the statement made by Senator Webster, the Commonwealth Minister for Science, that 3.5 billion tonnes of coal had been discovered underground in the north of South Australia as a consequence of oil and gas exploration. In the course of his remarks, Senator Webster said:

When we learn how to master the winning of coal and its *in situ* elements from such depths, South Australia could well become a major energy centre of the world.

Senator Webster was also reported as saying that the coal in the Cooper and Pedirka Basins represented a quarter of the world's supplies.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not know whether Senator Webster was reported accurately, but there are certain inaccuracies in that statement, or in the way in which it was reported. First, 3.5 billion tonnes of coal would represent only about 0.05 per cent of the world's total coal reserves. In fact, the amount of coal underground in the Cooper and Pedirka Basins in the north of South Australia is a thousand times greater than the quoted figure: the actual figure is 3.5 trillion tonnes, which is a substantial amount indeed and would be greater than 25 per cent of the existing world's total coal reserves. However, at this stage the resource is completely uneconomic. There is no existing technology available to enable the economic extraction of coal from depths in those basins, which range between two and three kilometres.

As a consequence, while we can speak of that coal as a fantastic quantity and as a resource, it is not classifiable as an economic reserve at this stage. I think it is clear that underground coal of that quantity and at that depth will probably be developed in future only by *in situ* gasification-type techniques for gasifying coal underground without having to extract it to the surface. Because of the existence of that reserve, South Australia has a fundamental interest in any research that may be going on in the world with response to *in situ* gasification, and I hope that we may be able to promote some research in this State into that matter, taking particular advantage of the research fund being established at the Commonwealth level by the coal levy that the Commonwealth Government has imposed.

South Australia's coal reserves, if we include the ones that are probably at present a little submarginal, amount to about 2.1 billion tonnes, to be found mainly in the Lake Phillipson area and in the Port Wakefield and Balaklava area at the head of St. Vincent Gulf. Those coals may be economic, but it has not yet been possible to determine the complete feasibility of extracting them: certainly, at present prices it is probable that the Lake Phillipson deposit is not economically viable at present. Nevertheless, I think that the people of South Australia should be aware of that fantastic underground resource in the Cooper and Pedirka Basins, in the Far North of South Australia: 3.5 trillion tonnes of high-quality black coal. The only problem is that it is not economical at present.

#### SOUTH-EAST WATER BASINS

**Mr. RODDA:** Can the Minister of Works give a progress report on the monitoring taking place on the South-Eastern water basins? Furthermore, has he anything to report as regards the weirs that have been constructed in some of the drains, particularly the one at West Avenue? This matter is vital to agriculture in the South-East, and the Minister is not unfamiliar with its importance. After three dry years, the water level has dropped. Landholders appreciate the monitoring taking place, but I stress that, if a survey is not being made, some examination should be made of the effect of the weir placed in the drain at West Avenue and of any other weirs that may have been constructed.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The monitoring is in fact part of the study that has been undertaken and actually taken over by the Water Resources Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Chairman of the committee responsible for the research and

investigation is Mr. John Shepherd, who heads that branch in the department. The latest discussion I have had with Mr. Shepherd on the matter (because I wanted to be informed what progress had been made) revealed that the data the committee found it necessary to collate over a period of time had been finalised, and indeed I think it has been put in print. That relates to all the background that is necessary from which certain assessments can be made and conclusions drawn. Whilst I have not yet seen it, I know that it is in print.

I urged upon the Chairman, Mr. Shepherd, the necessity (for reasons that the honourable member has mentioned, because we have had a variety of seasons over the period of investigation) to reach some finality on the matter, which is of great importance to people living in the area. Following the honourable member's question, I shall chase up the matter to see whether or not I can get any further or more up-to-date information on the study, although I do not think I will get more information at this moment. However, I have already urged upon the Chairman the need to get on with the work.

At the same time, another study has been going on, and I do not know whether the honourable member is aware of this. In 1973, I asked for a committee to be established, representing the Lands Department, which was responsible for the South-Eastern Drainage Board at that time, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Environment Department, and perhaps some other departments (I am not certain of the exact composition of the committee), to undertake a study to establish to what extent, if any, we needed to further drain the South-East.

The honourable member is probably aware that in some parts of the South-East the drainage schemes have not yet been completed; it is a matter of whether or not they ever will be completed. If they are to be (the honourable member shakes his head), I want to know the answers from people who are supposed to be experts in this area and who I believe have the knowledge necessary to make judgments. It is a question of whether or not we will do anything at all and, if we are to do anything, to what extent, and the resultant impact on the environment and on agricultural aspects of the matter.

That committee has not yet finalised its report, either; to a certain extent, one is contingent on the other, but there has been input from that committee to the committee headed by Mr. Shepherd—the Water Resources Committee—as opposed to the committee looking into drainage aspects. They are inter-related to a certain extent, and I believe there has been an exchange of information. I shall chase up the matter, because it has a bearing on the points the member for Victoria has raised in connection with the management of the drainage system.

Honourable members will know that drainage in the South-East has long been a contentious issue. Depending upon where people are located and how they are affected, there have been various viewpoints over the years. The honourable member would appreciate that, whatever the resolution may be in the eyes of the Government, we will not please everyone affected by the scheme, either directly or indirectly. I assure the honourable member that work is being done, and I shall ascertain whether there is any more up-to-date information than that I have given him and whether there is anything further to report to the House.

#### KIDMAN PARK TRAFFIC LIGHTS

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Has the Minister of Transport any information on the existing situation

regarding the installation of traffic lights at the corner of Valetta and Tapley Hill Roads? This follows previous approaches I have made to the Minister about lights for this particularly dangerous intersection. A Target discount store has been built on one corner, and Valetta Road is the main entrance and exit to the fast developing Kidman Park area. Accidents have occurred in the area. In recent weeks, I have noticed some activity on this corner, and people have asked me whether or not early activity is being planned by the department. I shall appreciate any information the Minister can give me.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Work is proceeding on the installation, although it is not proceeding as fast as we would like, because of the weather. Whilst the State is benefiting in some regards from the rains, it is suffering in other areas, especially in relation to the installation of these lights, because the holes that have been dug are now full of water and, until they are pumped out or drained, not much more can be done. Some work is proceeding. I understand that the pedestals are already up and, hopefully, the whole installation will be completed and operating early in September.

### FOOD PILFERING

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Has the Premier received a police report on the possible pilfering of food from two Government institutions? If he has, what does the report contain, and why has he not yet tabled the report in Parliament? Further, which two institutions were the police investigating? On 18 July 1978 the Premier indicated that the police were investigating two institutions, and those investigations were continuing. The word around Adelaide is that the Premier now has that report. Perhaps he would now like to tell this Parliament respectfully what that report contains before he bothers to release it to the press.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order. I hope he does not continue in that vein. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Glenelg, when asking a question on 18 July, indicated that the Corbett Committee had given the police one week to carry out confidential investigations before the committee started to undertake its own investigation at both the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Hospitals Department. The honourable member then said that interference by the Corbett Committee had greatly hindered the police investigations.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member knows that I corrected the member for Glenelg at that time and that the statements he has just made are without basis and untrue. There has been a full police investigation of any matters that could have possibly given rise to any suspicion that there had been misappropriation of food from Government hospital institutions. I have received that report; I do not propose to table it, because its contents refer to certain individuals, who were brought under suspicion. As a result of the police investigation, there is no suspicion attaching to them, but it would be unfair for their names to be mentioned publicly. However, when the Public Accounts Committee Chairman has received the report, as he will later this afternoon, I will be prepared tomorrow to make copies of the report available to honourable members on a confidential basis (for the reason that those names should not be mentioned), and I will be making a public release as to the findings of the police.

*Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:*

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

*Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport and if he continues in this vein I will take the necessary action.

### PORT PIRIE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Education say whether any decision has been made to construct a new community college at Port Pirie? The Minister will be aware, as a result of a recent visit to that city, that the facilities at Port Pirie do not compare with those existing at Whyalla and Port Augusta. He will also be aware of the mounting public interest in the construction of a new college.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** As the honourable member knows, I visited the Port Pirie College of Further Education recently and inspected its facilities. There is no doubt that either a completely new college or extensive upgrading is required. There is a fine line of division between the two: there is a building there which was originally part of the high school and which may well have some capacity for retention as part of a new complex. If that were the case, of course there would not exactly be a brand new college built, even though many of the buildings we put up would be new. So I do not know whether I should convey to the honourable member that the decision is that there be very extensive upgrading or a completely new college, because that will be contingent upon certain further investigations that have to take place.

Some of my officers will soon visit Port Pirie with a design that will be the basis of further discussion with the people at the college, the council of the college, the Principal and staff. There will be an opportunity then for people to make an input as to the sort of facilities to be provided. But I think it important that my officers should go there with some sort of proposition in hand. There are one or two things that still have to be resolved: one is the relationship of whatever new facilities are generated with the regional arts centre, which is, of course, one of the Premier's ambitions for Port Pirie. I know little about the fine details of that because it is not within my portfolio. But we would want to talk very closely with the people who are involved in the planning for that sort of facility, so that there is no duplication of facilities as between the two. Maybe the arts people and the further education people can each save themselves some money in this respect.

I cannot tell the honourable member at this stage when all this will happen. I hope that his constituents will be sustained by the fact that by at least having an agreed design for the facility we will then be in a position to see whether we can get some Commonwealth finance for the project, and it can be worked into the works programme. Regarding the actual time table for putting bricks on mortar, I cannot commit myself at this stage, although we know it will not be within this financial year. I will give this information to the honourable member in writing, and I shall also be writing to the college in a few days.

### POPULATION PROJECTION

**Dr. EASTICK:** Will the Premier say what population projections the Government and its various departments are now using in relation to planning for South Australia's future public developments? I ask this question against the

background of the Borrie Report, which received criticism by the Premier and his officers, and against the background of the projections which he gave in this House in answer to a Question on Notice at page 648 of *Hansard* on 17 August 1976, indicating that the State population was expected to increase from 1 242 300 at 30 June 1976 to 1 526 600 by the middle of 2001. I ask this question also against the background that Professor Borrie publicly, in Canberra two weeks ago, apologised to the Australian public for having been so optimistic in the figures he originally projected.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We do revise the figures periodically. I will see whether I can get the latest revision for the honourable member.

#### ELIZABETH COUNCIL

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I will ask the Minister of Local Government a question, when I can get his attention.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will make that decision. I have been listening to the honourable member for Mitcham, and so far he has said next door to nothing. I hope he will resume his seat when the Speaker stands. The honourable member for Mitcham will ask his question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Will the Government introduce legislation to assist ratepayers in the Elizabeth city council area to get out of their present predicament? I am surprised that this question has not already been asked.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** He has opened his big mouth and put his little foot in it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. Has the honourable member for Mitcham asked his question?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is the question, Mr. Speaker. If it has been asked before, no doubt I will get the same answer. If the question has not been asked before, I ask the Minister whether he will introduce that legislation because, at present, although the member for Napier is not personally responsible, according to a resolution of the council, I understand, for what happened, he must take his share of the blame.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should resume his seat when the Speaker stands. The honourable member is now commenting. Has he finished his question?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have not finished the explanation. An advertisement the Elizabeth council has placed in the local paper states:

Council deeply regrets the unforeseen consequences of its decision . . . There is no solution to council. Council can do nothing. What can you do then?

That means the ratepayers, apparently. The advertisement continues by suggesting only three possible lines of action by ratepayers.

**Mr. Chapman:** Sack the mayor?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No. The advertisement states:

Individual ratepayers can:

1. Appeal against their property assessment . . .
2. Individual ratepayers may apply to council for "a remission of portion of their rates".

Or, if ratepayers are unemployed, they can apply for a remission from the Community Welfare Department. It seems to me as though a mistake has been made. I do not particularly care whose fault it is, but the Elizabeth ratepayers are being put to considerable hardship. The council itself can do nothing about it. The most obvious thing is that Parliament, in the special circumstances of the case, could pass a special dispensation. That is the reason for my question.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The honourable member referred to a mistake being made. The mistake made was that he was not in his place when he should have been when the question was asked by the shadow Minister of Local Government and when I told him last week that the Government was not prepared to act.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why not?

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Works, subsequent to the good rains over the weekend, indicate whether it will be necessary to continue the pumping from the Murray River which has been causing some turbidity of water in various suburbs?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Pumping has been discontinued because of the heavy rains over the weekend and the subsequent runoff that has occurred. The alum programme was successful last year in settling the water before people had to use it. Honourable members will recall that I made a statement last year that the turbidity of the water was the worst on record, because of the flooding of the Darling River. The unusual feature of this is that, for the fourth time in four years, the Darling is causing a similar problem, and that is very unusual.

**Mr. Arnold:** Salt-free water!

**The Hon J. D. CORCORAN:** It is not only the Darling River but also the Murrumbidgee River. It is an ill wind that does not blow someone some good. It is very good water, apart from the aesthetic viewpoint.

That gives rise to problems in the metropolitan area and also in the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, where we can do little or nothing to settle the water, as we can in the metropolitan system. It was intended to commence alum dosing yesterday but, because of the high rate of inflow, it is not possible to distribute alum effectively. That programme has therefore been temporarily postponed, and pumping from the river has ceased. At the weekend there was a 4 per cent increase in the holdings of the reservoirs, and they are now more than half full. On the latest figures to hand this morning we find that there would possibly have been another 4 per cent increase in holdings up to yesterday. The present holdings are as follows:

Supply	Capacity	Storage
	Ml	Ml
Mount Bold . . . . .	47 300	22 524
Happy Valley . . . . .	12 700	7 924
Clarendon Weir . . . . .	320	276
Myponga . . . . .	26 800	21 332
Millbrook . . . . .	16 500	13 422
Kangaroo Creek . . . . .	24 400	4 735
Hope Valley . . . . .	3 470	2 876
Little Para . . . . .	21 400	5 633
Barossa . . . . .	4 510	3 966
South Para . . . . .	51 300	23 153
Totals . . . . .	208 700	105 841

Mount Bold has had a big intake; the increase has been 1 790 Ml over the past 24 hours. Honourable members can see at this stage that the reservoirs are holding very well indeed.

#### WAIKERIE WATER SUPPLY

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Will the Minister of Works provide a domestic water supply from the new irrigation distribution system at Waikerie for residents living adjacent to the

Electricity Trust installation in the area? Those residents are concerned not about turbidity but about a water supply. This goes back to discussions I initiated with senior officers of the Lands Department about two years ago. Following those discussions I wrote to the Minister of Lands on 7 March 1977 indicating that people were concerned about this matter and I asked that a domestic water supply be provided to those residents from the new irrigation distribution system. I received an acknowledgement from the Minister stating that the matter was receiving attention. I then continued my discussions with senior officers of the Lands Department. As the changeover from the Lands Department to the Engineering and Water Supply Department was imminent, I decided that it was best to wait until the changeover had taken place. Since then I have raised the matter with senior officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department but, as yet, no decision has been reached. As it has been about two years since this matter was first raised and since they are within the Waikerie irrigation area, I ask the Minister whether he will follow up this matter and try to provide a supply for these people.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will confer with senior officers of the department and see whether I can get on a little better than the honourable member has done.

#### BEES

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government will consider and, if necessary, introduce the necessary amendments, or proclaim the appropriate regulations, to restrict the movement of bees within certain specified areas of the State in order to control the spread of European foul brood?

The dreaded disease of European foul brood has been detected in some areas of South Australia. The apiarists in my area are concerned that an outbreak of foul brood at Streaky Bay could spread to local hives. Beekeepers in my area believe that the disease has been brought to the peninsula from hives transported from other areas of the State. If European foul brood is to be contained and eradicated, limitations must be placed on the transport of hives by apiarists. A suggested delineation would be to have Eyre Peninsula proclaimed a declared area, and movement of bees between Eyre Peninsula and other areas of the State prohibited. The delineation at Port Augusta is a natural barrier, with natural vegetation and blossoms being confined to the respective areas.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I shall be pleased to have this matter examined. I know nothing of it personally, but I assume that the Minister of Agriculture would be familiar with the problem. I will confer with him to see whether or not anything is to be done. As the honourable member suggested, I think legislation would be needed if we were to do as was suggested in the article to which he referred.

#### WHYALLA ROADS

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the priority road system extended to Whyalla and other areas is working satisfactorily, and whether the system will be extended, particularly in Whyalla? The priority road system seems to me to be working exceptionally well, but can the Minister say whether there is any indication of improvements in safety for motorists using this system?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** We are about to launch a fairly ambitious extension of the road priority system covering the major highways and certainly the national routes within South Australia. National Route 1 from the Western Australian border through to Adelaide will soon be converted to a priority road, as will be the road through to Bordertown. The general view expressed by the Road Traffic Board, motoring organisations, and now the travelling public has indicated support for the scheme of priority roads. The system has improved considerably the flow of traffic and it has helped our efforts to try to reduce the number of accidents. For these reasons, we are extending the priority road system to cover the whole State on all of the major routes.

#### SPECIAL BRANCH

**Mr. BECKER:** Can the Premier say what action Mr. Justice White has taken, and is taking, concerning files held by Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force? Following the White Report, the Salisbury Royal Commission, and a recent reported statement of the Premier that Mr. Justice White is culling Special Branch files, I am sure all members are curious to know what files and what criteria are being used for the removal of these files, and what now is the role of Special Branch.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The judge is proceeding to examine the files and to direct the destruction of files that do not meet the criteria recommended in his report. Those are the criteria: they have been published. He has the assistance of Special Branch officers in that work. Negotiations have been proceeding with the Federal Government about the provision of an interlocking security organisation.

I have just received proposals from Mr. Justice Hope relating to that matter. At present, officers who have been retained in Special Branch (and not all of them were retained of course, only two) have been assisting Mr. Justice White to examine the existing records of Special Branch for the purpose stated. Mr. Justice White has informed me that he is proceeding with the work.

#### RESIDENTIAL CARE STAFF

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how many residential care staff have been transferred from Brookway Park to McNally Training Centre to assist in the acute situation that now prevails at McNally Training Centre? It has been reported that staff morale is at an all-time low and, generally, staff problems are centered in the high security block. It is understood that the closing of Brookway Park will be completed in the first week of September, and many of the 66 staff, who are not all residential care workers, have already been transferred to institutions other than the McNally Training Centre.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** First, in relation to the alleged morale situation at McNally Training Centre, I ask honourable members to put their own weighting on a report supplied anonymously to the press. It is that report which states that morale at McNally Training Centre is under question.

Members often receive anonymous reports about matters, and I suspect that they place the same weighting on those anonymous reports that I do when I receive them. The second point the honourable member asked about is the transfer of staff. A complete programme for the reallocation of resources is involved in the new



methods of treatment and handling of young offenders. It is not just a simple situation such as the honourable member has outlined, that numbers of people will be transferred to other institutions. Much planning has gone into this matter, which has included the greatest possible involvement of the staff concerned. The staff has been actively involved in the question, not so much of transfers, which was raised by the honourable member, but of the reallocation of the resources of the department. There have not yet been many transfers: they will occur in due course and in accordance with the planning time set down. I think that the honourable member is, first, jumping the gun with his references to transfers and, secondly, is acting on anonymous information, which I would refute, that there is an acute morale problem at McNally Training Centre.

#### NORTH-SOUTH FREEWAY

**Mr. WILSON:** Bearing in mind that the Government's 10-year moratorium on the building of freeways will expire during the life of this Parliament, will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is now considering the construction of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study north-south freeway and, if it is not, will he say why 621 properties along the route of that freeway have been purchased at a cost of \$14 000 000?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The Government certainly is not contemplating building a freeway along the transportation corridor. The reason why the properties are being purchased is simply that in 1968 when the Hall Government published the MATS report, which showed the freeway alignment, it automatically made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for people to be able to get a fair market price for those properties. As a result, when the Government determined its policy, in 1971, of not proceeding with the freeways where substantial demolition of private property was involved, it said that it would retain the corridor for future consideration for transport purposes. As a result, whenever owners of properties affected by the corridor attempt to sell these properties, obviously they are unable to do so, and the Government has, on an owner-approach basis, continued to purchase those properties.

#### RAILWAYS TRANSFER

**Mr. VENNING:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the format of arbitration was spelt out in the railways agreement with the Commonwealth over the sale of South Australian non-metropolitan railways? I was pleased to hear the result of the deputation that waited on the Minister last Thursday regarding the future of these railway lines and the Minister's radio release stating that the Government and he, particularly, would fight to retain these railway lines. As it now appears that the matter will go to arbitration, I wish to know whether the format of the arbitration is contained in the agreement, so that everyone involved will get a fair go.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I would have thought that if the honourable member had read the copy of the agreement I gave him he would be able to answer his own question without wasting the time of the House. The agreement simply provides that matters of this nature in dispute between the Federal Minister and me will be settled by arbitration, the arbitrator acting as an independent judge and not bound by any existing laws of arbitration. Unlike the honourable member, unless he has been speaking with

Mr. Nixon, I still hope that Mr. Nixon will see the value of the case the State Government has prepared and placed before him, and that he will not take it to arbitration but accept the necessity to retain those lines and services. Indeed, I think the honourable member might do as I have asked the Hon. Mr. Geddes to do: use his good offices with the Fraser Government and see whether he can get a decent decision out of Mr. Nixon. As we have been unable to do so hitherto, perhaps the honourable member and the Hon. Mr. Geddes, being of the same kith and kin, will be a little more successful, in the interests of residents and citizens in the areas they represent in this Parliament.

#### HAHNDORF MAIN STREET

**Mr. WOTTON:** Will the Minister for Planning give an assurance, following any consideration today by the State Planning Authority of an amended development plan for the main street of Hahndorf, that an adequate opportunity will be given to all interested groups, including local residents generally, to view the amended plan prior to final approval being granted; and will he consult his colleague the Minister for the Environment regarding the necessity to look very carefully at any effect such a project may have on Hahndorf's valuable heritage? The Minister would be aware that the State Planning Authority has deferred consideration of its previous rejection of a development plan for the main street of Hahndorf. As I understand it, an appeal on the matter was to have been heard in September of this year. The Minister also would be aware that a large sum of money has been made available by the Federal Government for a study which is being undertaken to survey and report on the need to protect Hahndorf's valuable heritage, particularly the main street. He would know that the leader of this study team is overseas and was, as I understand it, to have returned to Adelaide as a witness in the appeal between the State Planning Authority and the developer.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member is correct, broadly, in stating the position that applies in relation to Hahndorf. The original application for the shopping centre was refused by the State Planning Authority. The developer concerned has appealed, and that appeal is due to come on in September. In the meantime, the developer has prepared a compromise proposal which, I think, involves retaining two of the three buildings fronting on to the main road and pulling down one, and has asked that this be considered by the State Planning Authority. I expect that the State Planning Authority today will consider the matter and defer taking a decision on it until it has been able to consult with the various Government departments, including the Environment Department.

**Mr. Wotton:** What about the public of Hahndorf?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The council, I think, met last night and expressed its opposition to the compromise proposal. No doubt the National Trust will be approached, because it has been involved in previous negotiations in this matter. However, the heritage legislation passed by this Parliament does not apply to this case, as the application went before the State Planning Authority prior to the passing of that legislation. Whether or not the appeal that has been made to the Planning Appeal Board will be successful in this instance is an open question. If it were successful, the developer would have the right to proceed with his development as originally proposed. So, the matter is a little complicated—unless of course, the honourable member could secure for us the passage of special legislation through the Upper House that would

have retrospective effect on the application that is causing all the concern in Hahndorf.

I should be grateful if the honourable member would check with his colleagues in another place whether or not they would be prepared to apply the heritage legislation retrospectively to the application that is causing so much controversy at present. Without such retrospective provision, it is a fine judgment that has to be made as to what is the best way to secure the future position at Hahndorf. It may be that, if the compromise proposal is refused, the appeal which would then proceed would be successful, and the overall situation in Hahndorf may be worse as a consequence. The present powers of the Government are limited, and the whole question must be considered in that light.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry)** brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

#### CONTAINING, CONTROL AND REGISTRATION OF DOGS

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government)** moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Working Party on Containing, Control and Registration of Dogs be extended until Thursday 24 August.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 334.)

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** In supporting the motion, I join with other members in expressing my sympathy to the family of the former member and President of the Legislative Council, the late Hon. Frank Potter, M.L.C.

The Commonwealth Government's announced intention to cut back expenditure in areas of hospital development programmes, the school dental scheme, water resources, welfare housing, urban public transport, childhood services, community health programmes and many others is of tremendous concern to the State Government and the community as a whole. These cut-backs can only deepen the already depressed area of activity in the national economy and will certainly make the already unacceptably high levels of unemployment even more unacceptable.

I now refer to the health care cost control programme and the recent changes in Medibank and private health insurance announced by the Commonwealth Minister of Health, Mr. Hunt. Medibank, the health system created by the Federal Opposition Leader, Bill Hayden, has now been almost completely emasculated by the Federal Government. It is difficult to predict at the moment

exactly how much each wage and salary earner will be paying for health care by 1980. The Federal Government seems more intent on looking after the doctors and the private health funds rather than the patients. Let us consider some of the proposed changes. Medical benefits will be reduced from 85 per cent of the scheduled fee to 75 per cent, and the maximum contribution for each service, where the scheduled fee is charged, will be increased from \$5 to \$10. The rationale behind this approach is contained in the Ministerial statement, where Mr. Hunt states:

While universal health insurance cover provides security and access to health services, it does tend to weaken the perception of both the providers and users of the real cost of these services.

In other words, if people pay more they will use services less, because they are aware of the cost factor. The effect of that change is that patient contributions will increase for a standard general practitioner consultation. Thus, poor patients and those who need constant medical attention, are liable either to defer visits and treatment because they are unable to meet the increased gap or to suffer considerable hardship because they cannot do without essential medical services.

These people will find their situation is worsened by the requirement of many general practitioners for payment in cash on the spot even prior to treatment. The increased gap is unlikely to affect more affluent patients in restricting their use of doctors' services, since they will find the additional payment much less of a burden than will the poor or the sick. Moreover, more affluent people can insure against the increased gap, which makes nonsense of the rationale of decreasing patient use of doctors' services.

Private health insurance funds are expected by the Minister to immediately lower rates by 46c a week. However, the funds have rejected that and intend to wait until the Budget is brought down to assess their position in relation to other foreshadowed changes in arrangements regarding hospital fees. Bulk or direct billing will be abolished, except for holders of pensioner health benefit cards and their dependants, as soon as administrative arrangements can be made. Apparently, the rationale for limiting bulk billing is to ensure that over-use and abuse are reduced to a minimum. The reduction of bulk billing will, rather than preventing fraud, make it more difficult to detect, since it is more complicated to monitor doctors' activities through a review of patients' claims than from bulk billing.

According to Dr. Dick Klugman, the Federal Shadow Minister for Health, 767 000 social service beneficiaries will be excluded from bulk billing, including such categories, for example, as sickness, unemployment, supporting parents, and special beneficiaries, as well as certain recipients of aged, invalid and widows' pensions. Thus, low income families will be confronted with paying the gap between the rebate and the scheduled fee, or the fee arrived at by the doctor, since bulk billing is no longer available to provide a means of encouraging doctors to accept a rebate as full payment.

The hasty decisions of the Government in relation to the health care cost control programme are highlighted by two small newspaper reports, the first of which appeared in the *Melbourne Age* of 10 June 1978, wherein the Federal Minister for Health, Mr. Hunt, stated that bulk billing would be scrapped only when adequate arrangements could be made regarding doctors' bills in hardship cases, and that the Government was investigating ways of changing the system of "pay doctor" cheques, which would enable Medibank to send cheques direct to doctors, changes that would not be needed if bulk billing was retained.

The other report appears in the *Melbourne Age* also on Tuesday 30 June 1978. It is a report of an appearance by Mr. Hunt on the current affairs television show *Monday Conference*, indicating that doctors had lobbied successfully to have the reduction in the rebate on the scheduled fee from 85 per cent to 75 per cent revised for pensioner patients. Clearly, the voice of the medical profession carries more impact with Government than do the needs of the elderly, the chronically sick, and the poor for adequate medical attention.

These changes lead the way to a return to the old pre-Medibank system that provided poor services for poor people. The abolition of bulk billing and the reduction of the rebate from 85 per cent to 75 per cent of the scheduled fee will affect the availability and the accessibility of medical services to low-income families and individuals, many of whom are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, migrants, single-parent families and other disadvantaged groups, including the growing army of unemployed.

The capacity of general practitioners to bulk bill and the acceptance by many of the 85 per cent rebate on the scheduled fee as full payment has made it possible for medical services to be extended to people and to areas otherwise forced to do without. The most vulnerable members of the community will seek essential medical treatment less, and preventive screening services, such as the smear test, will simply not be an option for poor people. The end result of these gratuitous changes will be the undermining of the health care of the poor and disadvantaged. The result of their inability to pay for preventive care or to obtain early diagnosis will, in the long run, increase the severity of illness and inevitably increase health costs to the community.

Let us consider the impact that this will have on wages. The Australian Government has used earlier Medibank changes to reduce the purchasing power of wages. When the first emasculation of Medibank took place at the end of 1976 the Australian Government argued vigorously before the Arbitration Commission that wage and salary earners should not be fully compensated for the resultant increase in health insurance rates.

In the event, the December quarter consumer price index increased by 6 per cent, and wage and salary earners received only \$5.90 a week increase. This was a loss of \$5.34 a week for a person earning a wage equal to average weekly earnings. There is no doubt that the Australian Government will argue that the c.p.i. should be discounted for any increase in consumer prices arising out of any further changes in the health insurance system. In other words, the Australian Government is using a deliberate increase in health insurance costs and individual responsibility for paying for treatment to slash the standard of living of wage and salary earners.

During the March 1978 quarter wage indexation hearing the Australian Government said that future c.p.i. increases should be discounted for Government-induced increases in health costs to individuals. On page 161 of the transcript of 5 May 1978 the Australian Government submitted the following:

The Commonwealth considers that the effectiveness of a policy designed specifically to eliminate inequities in the distribution of health care costs should be inhibited by compensating wage and salary earners for the impact of policy on the c.p.i.

This means that the Australian Government will be arguing in future wage indexation cases that increases in costs of health insurance, with greater financial demands on families and individuals brought about by Government decisions, should be used to reduce the standard of living of Australians. This should be of major concern to

everyone. Wage and salary earners have already been forced to abide by the wage indexation guidelines and have suffered an erosion of their living standards. The Federal Government has now foreshadowed its decision to impose another increase in health care costs on the community, using it as an excuse to further reduce the purchasing power of wages.

I now return to the explosive unemployment situation. Just as we said last year, unemployment has continued to worsen in Australia. The Federal Government has paid no heed at all to the warnings about the likelihood of increased unemployment in 1978. Indeed, in solving the problem of unemployment the Fraser Government is spending less of its resources than almost any other country in the western world. It will be noted from the newspapers, which are so intent on maintaining Fraser in power, that in March and April there was a slight decline in unemployment. This decline as reported refers only to the previous month. The only real way to compare unemployment figures is over the previous 12 months. In April 1976 over 4 per cent, in April 1977 over 5 per cent, and in April 1978 over 6 per cent were unemployed. The predictions are well known, and by Christmas 1978 Australia will have an unemployment rate of between 9 per cent and 10 per cent. Previous speakers on this side of the House have said much about the disastrous employment situation. Unfortunately, we do not hear very much about it from Opposition benches.

We should all be concerned to learn from His Excellency's Speech that the State Government, in the face of the persistent refusal by the Federal Government to assist this State with its unemployment relief schemes and the restriction on funding generally, must reduce its programme to a level of \$7 000 000 this financial year. That is a considerable drop from the \$22 000 000 appropriated for SURS in the last financial year. How many times do we hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the unemployment relief scheme is a waste of money? He asks why the Government does not do something about creating permanent employment. The Leader of the Opposition can say what he likes. Why does he not talk to those who have had jobs under the scheme? Why does he not talk to local government and community organisations and listen to what they have to say about it? Instead of bleating about the temporary unemployment and the waste of money, why has the Leader not complained to the Prime Minister, who is creating permanent unemployment?

One does not need to be a Rhodes scholar to understand what the Prime Minister is about. He wants to create a permanent pool of unemployment in this country. The Prime Minister will allow unemployment to grow to about 10 per cent or more before doing anything at all about the depressed level of activity. He will then introduce measures to reduce it to about 6 per cent. When that occurs I suppose we will hear the Leader of the Opposition and all the Conservatives saying that Mr. Fraser is a wonderful man for bringing unemployment down from 10 per cent to 6 per cent, hopefully on a permanent basis. In no circumstances will that ever be accepted by the Government, the Labor movement, the trade union movement or the community generally. I read with great interest the report headed "The Cost of a Job" by Ray Folley in the *Advertiser* of 29 July, as follows:

A scheme which has injected hope into the minds of South Australia's unemployed is being undermined by a lack of funds. The State Unemployment Relief Scheme has been effective . . . but can it last? . . . One of the early casualties of South Australia's cash squeeze is the State Government's Unemployment Relief Scheme. It has entered the financial

year with less than one-third of the funds available to it in 1977-78. Prospects for more money are bleak, and, as yet, the problem of how best to use the resources available has not been resolved.

Though SURS as the scheme is known, has maintained a relatively low profile it has provided thousands of unemployed with temporary jobs and work experience. For many, an estimated 30 per cent, the break has led to full-time permanent work. With local job prospects worsening rather than improving and the latest batch of school leavers only a few months away from the market authorities have good reason to be concerned.

SURS has had a major cushioning effect on the impact of unemployment in South Australia. About 1900 people who would otherwise be without jobs are working. Officer-in-charge of SURS, Mr. Wally Bean, heads a team of nine public servants from cramped, spartan quarters on the fourth floor of the C.I.C. Building in Franklin Street, City.

Initially SURS funds were allocated only to local government, State Government departments and statutory authorities, but 18 months ago the scope was broadened to include community organisations. "This increased the competition for the funds and we got better projects out of it," Mr. Bean says. "There is no denying that we have been had on occasions, particularly in the early stages when we did not have the staff to implement the cost controls we have now.

"But, by and large, I believe the community has got value for money in lasting facilities, ranging from park improvement to factory buildings." All people employed on SURS projects are recruited from those registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service.

On average about 65 to 70 per cent of those taken on are receiving the dole. The subject is a sore point with the State Government which has cut little ice with the Federal Government with its argument that it ought to be reimbursed with a sum equivalent to the saving in unemployment benefits.

Because of political considerations the claim is never likely to succeed, but if it did it would increase the SURS employment capacity by a significant 40 per cent.

An idea of the extent of the SURS programme can be gained from allocation statistics covering the period from July 1976 to September 1978. A total of 13 122 jobs was provided on 1 985 projects. Of these jobs 9 362 were in the metropolitan area (from Gawler in the north to Willunga in the south and bounded by the foothills) and were produced by 1 415 projects.

Further figures are quoted in the report about country projects that have been undertaken since the introduction of the programme. The report continues:

Between January 1 1977 and March 31 this year SURS provided temporary work for 7 698 South Australians. Of the 6 060 who left during the period, 1 841 went on to permanent jobs, 364 of them with the sponsors of the SURS project which had employed them. Whatever happens SURS has left a permanent imprint on the South Australian community.

It is with much regret that I read in His Excellency's Speech that the funds for that programme will be reduced considerably. Despite criticism, SURS has provided many workers and their families with decent living standards, and I make an earnest appeal to all members opposite to put as much pressure as possible on the Commonwealth Government to change its hard-line economic policy in order to improve the present employment situation. I support the motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Mr. Acting Speaker, this debate (and I do not single out any particular member) has been, so far, so lack-lustre that I wondered whether I

would bother to speak; more so, when I read the article in the *Advertiser* last Saturday written by that respected political analyst, Mr. Kelton, in which he said that it was downright boring. The fact is he is right, and we all know that he is right.

Obviously, the Government is in no hurry to get on with any real business in this place. That being so, I thought it would be a pity to give up the opportunity to say something about a few subjects that I may not be able to speak on during this session.

I say that the Government is obviously in no hurry with its programme, because, before the session began, the so-called Deputy Premier and Leader in the House made an announcement to the effect that there would be a heavy legislative programme of about 80 Bills and that we would have to get on with it. This made some impression on people. Of course, that is not what has happened. It is perfectly obvious, as we have dawdled along for three or four weeks not sitting at night and just taking speeches at our leisure, that the Government is in no hurry at all.

The reason that it is in no hurry (I suspect), and I can be corrected by Government members if correction is necessary, is that the Government cannot get its drafting done. That brings me to the first point I want to make. At the end of the previous session the then Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Daugherty, was appointed a judge of the Local and District Criminal Court and appears in the Planning Appeal jurisdiction. I like Mr. Daugherty. He has been a friend of mine for a long time and taught me how to make a bed properly in my early days in the Army. Nevertheless, I said publicly at the time, and I say again, that, in my opinion, it was a quite inappropriate appointment to make.

There were several protests about the appointment. The reason that the appointment was made does not, in my opinion, reflect on Mr. Daugherty at all. As I understand it, Mr. Hackett-Jones, who has now been appointed to the position of Parliamentary Counsel, was about to leave the State because he had been offered a position in Tasmania, and the Government believed that it could not afford to lose him. To keep him, it appointed Mr. Daugherty to the bench (a promotion) so that it could appoint Mr. Hackett-Jones as Parliamentary Counsel. It was an altogether wrong thing to do, from many points of view.

As I said, we cannot get on with our business because the Government cannot get its major Bills drafted (it is all very well to repeal Sir John Barnard's Act and things like that), and that shows that the Government has gone from the frying pan into the fire. I protested at the time, and I protest again, at the appointment of Mr. Daugherty as a Local Court judge. The Government has, to some extent, made good that appointment by a very good appointment to the Supreme Court since, that of the Hon. Mr. Justice Legoe, who is an old friend and colleague of mine at the Bar. I suspect that is simply to try to allay any comment that will be made in October when the Hon. Mr. Justice King is appointed Chief Justice.

I want to say something now about the Supreme Court and what I regard as the neglect of the Government to make provision for adequate accommodation for the judges and staff and the courts generally. Nearly 10 years ago the Hall Government approved of plans for an additional court building to be built on the western side of the Supreme Court building where the wreck of the Supreme Court Hotel now stands. Those plans have been scrapped. The Government has, however, managed to build several of the most appallingly tasteless blocks around the city, but it has left the courts quite stranded.

In the criminal jurisdiction there is an acute shortage of accommodation, which means that our criminal lists are

falling further and further behind. At the Supreme Court in Adelaide there are only two courtrooms that can be used as criminal courts if any question of security of the prisoner is involved, and normally it is: they are courtrooms 2 and 3. Even if there is no question of security, it is impossible to have more than two criminal courts sitting because there are only two jury rooms in the building.

With the increase in serious crime, lists are getting longer and longer, and I found out this morning when I made inquiries that there are now at least 30 trials for more serious matters (not run-of-the-mill things that are dealt with in the District Criminal Court), to come before the court. The court is getting through between five and eight trials a month, so it is obviously falling further and further behind with its work.

I now list the charges awaiting trial, and each of these charges is a separate matter. One case of armed robbery; a juvenile charged with gross indecency; rape; arson; two men charged jointly with robbery with violence; a female charged with unlawful wounding; murder; two persons charged with armed robbery; one person charged with threatening a Crown witness; and one man charged with attempted rape, robbery with violence, and four counts of rape.

Also one of possessing heroin; and attempted murder; one man charged with 10 counts of rape and three of attempted rape (and an application is to be made for separate trials for each of those, making 13 trials) and I have included that as one in my count. Also, one unlawful sexual intercourse; two unlawful abduction; three separate rape charges; four charged jointly with rape; three charged jointly with fraudulent misappropriation; two charged jointly with armed robbery; three charged jointly with wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm; three charged jointly with rape; one man charged with rape and unlawful sexual intercourse; one man charged with two counts of rape; a robbery with violence; two jointly charged with robbery with violence; an assault with intent to do bodily harm and larceny; one charged with possessing heroin for sale; one with possessing Indian hemp for sale and possessing heroin; and one charged with larceny from the person. There are 30 trials on major crimes, and there is no hope whatever of those trials coming on within about six months of the committal proceedings.

I had an experience myself earlier this year with a lad at McNally (one of the charges of the Minister of Community Welfare), who was charged with the offence of rape, which occurred on 29 October 1977. He was committed for trial in the Juvenile Court last January, and the trial came on in June. That is typical of what is happening. The reason it is happening is that there is not proper accommodation for the courts to sit, and they cannot get through their work. It is not a question of enough judges but of enough court rooms: yet the Government has scrubbed the accommodation which 10 years ago it was proposed to provide for the Supreme Court. I make that as a serious point, and I hope that the Government will be prepared to do something about it.

Now may I say a word about the discomfiture I felt an hour or so ago during Question Time when I asked a question about the Elizabeth city council rate. Members on both sides rose against me, and I had the feeling of guilt through having made a ghastly mistake for not being in the House on Thursday, when the so-called shadow Minister of Local Government asked a question similar to the one I proposed to ask. I found that, when I looked up *Hansard*, he did not ask the question that I wanted to ask. What I suggest as the most obvious solution and one within the

power of the Government to provide, if it wants to, is that the Local Government Act be amended to dispense with the proceedings at Elizabeth that have caused such alarm and despondency amongst ratepayers. A mistake has frankly been admitted by the council (the member for Napier and his fellow councillors and alderman) so why should we not do that?

May I remind members that in the recent session of Parliament we rushed through a Bill to amend the Local Government Act over some row down at Meningie when the District Clerk was in trouble with his council. That was a special case. If we could do it there, why can't we do it for the city of Elizabeth, when everyone admits that a mistake has been made and everyone acknowledges that there will be great hardship on some ratepayers of that city? It is all very well to say, as I understand is being said by the Minister of Local Government, "I can't do anything. I'm bound by the legislation." That is begging the question. In a case like this, Parliament is able to change the legislation, and the initiative for that ability rests with the Government.

It was noticeable that, when the Minister answered my question, he did not say a word about the reasons for not doing it. All he did was to reflect on my not knowing that a question on this subject was asked last Thursday. The fact that he did not give any reasons shows that there are no reasons why the Government should not do this, if it wants to do it. Every seat covered by the Elizabeth council is in the hands of a Labor member. There are probably three of them. Why should something not be done about it, and why are they not pressing the Government to have a dispensation made?

I come now to the Speech itself. Frankly, there is not much in it, but paragraph 4, which deals with what are at present in Australia the supremely important issues of the economy and unemployment, warrants some mention. I agree broadly with the view expressed by the Government in that paragraph, although I disagree with its bleating about the Commonwealth. Perhaps I am getting into difficulty here. I agree with the general outlook of the State Government in criticising the approach of the Federal Government to the economy, but I do not agree with the State Government's blaming all its problems on the parsimony of the Federal Government.

The announced policy of the Federal Government, that is, to make the States responsible for raising as well as for spending their own moneys, is a proper one, and I have always advocated it. I do not believe that we can have proper government unless there is financial responsibility, but I wonder whether (and this is what the Government would say is being done) the States are not merely being squeezed in the name of that policy by the Federal Government. If that is happening, it should not happen.

If that is to be the policy and the arrangement in Australia, the States must be given adequate resources to raise their own money. I agree with the approach expressed in that paragraph by the State Government to the Federal Government's policies on the economy generally, and I believe that the Federal Government is making a grave mistake in following what is apparently a purely monetarist policy; that is, of operating a policy at all costs (and the costs socially in Australia are enormously high with unemployment), so that there is a restriction in the supply of money, in the hope that this will reduce inflation.

I do not personally (although I say this with great hesitation, because I am not an economist, and this is one of the areas of learning in which I am not very strong but on which I rely on advice) believe that that is a proper policy.

I am fortified when I see in the June issue of the *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, which I obtained only a couple of weeks ago, a report headed, "The Australian Labour Market". This publication is put out by economists from Flinders University and elsewhere who are, I think, Keynesian by and large. This coincides closely with the sort of things I should like to be able to say myself and, therefore, I propose to quote briefly from it, because it sets out what I think is the mistake in the Federal Government's approach and what I think should be done. The report states:

The diagnosis of the current recession in terms of wages being too high is naive. Although the most blatant symptoms of the recession are present in the labour market, the seat of the malady is elsewhere. The wage cutting cure smacks of leeches and bloodletting and is more likely to weaken the patient than to cure him.

Unemployment is getting worse in seasonally adjusted terms. The unadjusted figure will pass the half-million mark in the new year unless major new initiatives in the fiscal policy area are adopted soon.

If the recession is not to intensify over the coming year, effective demand must be stimulated. The best way to do this would be to cut selected indirect taxes, and to increase the levels of selected subsidies.

In other words, it is up to the Federal Government to put more money into the economy. The report continues:

In the "market sector" of the economy female employment is falling more rapidly than male employment. "Blue-collar" women workers are therefore suffering at least as much as blue collar male workers, during the current recession. The time for "waiting for something to turn up" is over. The economics of Mr. Micawber have failed. Major new policy initiatives in the fiscal policy are needed urgently, or a whole generation may reach maturity unable to achieve financial independence, and forced to bear a burden of social stigma.

That social stigma is unemployment. I cannot think, in our society (there are worse things in other societies, of course, because we are very fortunate here), of anything worse than being unemployed when one wants to work. I have never, thank God, been unemployed myself. I have never had to face that, but I can imagine what it can be like from those of my friends and my contemporaries who have had to face it. I have children of my own, and one wonders whether they will get a job and, knowing how they feel about it, thank God they always have had jobs, and I hope that continues. It is a most appalling feeling and something we should do everything we can to try to get over, and yet the Liberals do not even say they are sorry about it. All they ever do is to say we have got to bring down inflation.

They ignore the price being paid in the community, and never express regret for it. This hard-heartedness, because of Party loyalty, is something that I cannot accept. I think every member of the Liberal Party should be ashamed of the hardness of heart that they are all exhibiting in this matter. Other people have said enough on that, and I do not propose to say any more, but I believe that we should take positive measures to try to alleviate unemployment in this country, because that, to me, is a greater evil than is inflation.

**Mr. Allison:** How will you do that?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** If the member for Mount Gambier had done me the courtesy of listening to the quotation I gave from the *Bulletin of Labour*, he would have heard the reasons. Perhaps he can now take the opportunity to read what I have said. I am not going over it again.

**Mr. Allison:** You're a copyist.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The interjections from the member for Mount Gambier exemplify to a "T" the mean

spiritedness of Liberals in this matter—only out to make some Party political point, to criticise me, not to acknowledge what they are doing or the fact that they could not give a damn about it.

Let me leave that matter and come to something which I regard as important and which may be perhaps a little more palatable to Liberal members. There is no doubt that the Australian economy as a whole is depressed. There is equally no doubt that the economy of this State is in worse condition than it is in Australia generally. One only has to go to another State to feel that. A fortnight ago, I had a pleasant few days at the taxpayers' expense (apart from the pleasantness, it was a complete waste of time) in Perth at the Constitution Convention. That was a waste of time, a complete failure, and a flop, as I described it over there. But at least it gave me an opportunity to see another city and to compare the liveliness and activity that is going on over there with what is the general feeling here.

The member for Coles the other day said that families were leaving this State and going to Queensland. I do not know her authority for the numbers, but I have no doubt that something like that is happening, and we can see any number of indicators that we are worse off than are other States. Only the other day I was told (and I have not been able to check this, but I should be glad if the Government would correct me if I am wrong) that at Elizabeth there are now seven empty factories—no-one wants them. They are there, they have been built and used, but they are not being used any more, because no-one wants to operate a factory at Elizabeth.

**Mr. Hemmings:** I'll check the facts.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I hope the member for Napier will check them. I was told by the man who mentioned it that he drove down Hewitson Road and that it reminded him of a scene from *On the Beach*; there were papers blowing on the fences of empty buildings, and so on. I cannot say whether or not that is correct, but, if it is right, it is an example of the great unused capacity in South Australia, because we are not able to attract or to hold industrial concerns here.

Just as serious, twice independently—once in Perth and once here—in the past few weeks, those who would be interested in setting up business in this State have said to me, "You know, we are being messed about." The word they used was stronger and rather coarse, and I shall not offend you, Sir, by using it in this Chamber. They said, "We are being messed about by the State Government." One wants to put up a margarine factory and the other is interested in desalination. They said they could not get through the bureaucracy and red tape in the Premier's Department. One said, "I know Don wants this, but I can't get through the department to get a decision."

I was amused at the way in which the Premier this afternoon, in Question Time, put off the Deputy Leader about some order to Malaysia for white goods. It was obvious that the Premier wanted to get out of giving an answer, and he did it with his usual cleverness. I have an item from the *Australian* of 25 July that a Western Australian company has won a \$8 000 000 contract for the export of solar hot water services to Malaysia and Singapore for the next 10 years. That is a market on which we have been concentrating, and it is a product which can be and is being manufactured in South Australia, and yet it is not a South Australian company that has got the contract but a Western Australian one.

In the meantime, we in South Australia—and in all fairness I must say that we are not alone—are spending money like water. It is beyond my comprehension why the Liberal Party, as the main Opposition Party, as it likes to call itself, has not got stuck into the Government over

anything so far this session. We were off for four months—nothing to do, issues piling up. Nothing has been said. We have been back for nearly four weeks, and nothing has been done. We are meandering along. Every day I have expected the Liberals to do something.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** They might be fighting amongst themselves.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I don't know what they are doing, if anything. Certainly, nothing is showing. We have not had an urgency motion or a no-confidence motion. I thought that at least today, even if it were only to put me off for a little while in this debate, we might have had a no-confidence motion, maybe in the member for Florey, as head of the Public Accounts Committee. The *Advertiser* gave them the lead yesterday morning on that. Not a thing has been done. They sit here and go through a boring debate, just sitting on their backsides. I do not know why they are doing it.

I cannot, in this debate, canvass all the issues that have arisen, but I am going to have a good try in the time I have left to canvass some. Even last Thursday, when the Premier made a Ministerial statement on the Frozen Food Factory that is full of holes, not a word was said by them, either over the weekend or today. I thought they might at least lead off on this. Let us examine the statements the Premier made justifying the Frozen Food Factory. Everyone in the community knows that the costs are substantially higher from it than from privately run concerns. The measure, I have been told, is 40 per cent.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** No!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have a great regard and respect for the Minister, as I know he is loyal to the Government. He wags his head, but everyone knows it is true. The Premier's statement, in part, is as follows:

Inquiries about the vegetable products available for the prices quoted in the table of food price comparisons have revealed that like products are not being compared.

I do not know what the evidence was for that, but it was not given. Later, he continues:

The prices quoted in the food price comparison table cited are believed to be vegetable products in the frozen state only, and require further cooking and expense before they are ready for consumption.

Whoever wrote that explanation for the Premier did not know whether or not that was the case; indeed, he was honest enough to say so. However, the Liberals did not pick him up on that. The statement continues:

Meat for the frozen food factory products is purchased to a specified quality.

There is then talk about meat quality as though it must be much higher in the Government than anywhere else. It continues:

However, having regard to the misleading comparisons drawn for the vegetable products, the validity of the comparisons for the meat products contained in the table is questionable.

One has one assumption built on another assumption to refute what the Liberals had said the day before, but they sat down and did not say a word about it. It is an absurd illogical statement on even the most cursory analysis that one could possibly get. The statement continues (and I quote this for interest because this affects us):

The frozen food service provides pre-cooked, snap frozen foods in bulk—

that makes it awfully mediocre and uninteresting to eat— but based on average meal quantities a plate: an average of the existing hospital menus would calculate out at an average of \$1.18 a meal.

I could not help quoting that, because here we get a full meal with service for a dollar. There it is, but it doesn't

matter, I suppose.

I have already castigated (and I am sorry that I must do it) my friends in the Liberal Party for their supine inactivity during this session. Let me now turn to another topic (and this may perhaps please Government members a little more), but again and again the Liberals have led off on uranium. They did it again today with the first question. They are trying all the time to drive a wedge between different sections of the Government Party on this matter. In my opinion it is a shockingly dishonest exercise on their part. I do believe that there is a good deal of disagreement amongst members of the Labor Party on their policy—there is nothing wrong with that, and why should there not be disagreement between people in the same Party? What about the Liberals? Their record is anything but clean on this.

**Mr. Allison:** At least we're not having nuclear fall-outs.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I thought I had shut up the member for Mount Gambier earlier, but he is at it again. Let me remind him and other members of his Party about the motion that was introduced by the Premier for which all of them voted on 30 March 1977. The motion was as follows:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and unless and until it is so demonstrated no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

The first words of the Leader of the Opposition when he rose to speak in the debate were:

It is difficult to find fault with this motion.

He then added something more about investigations into solar energy, which was perfectly acceptable to all of us. The first part of the motion I have read out with the amendment put on to it was passed unanimously by members of this House. When the Leader was twitted by the Premier or another Minister on Thursday about that motion, all he could say about it in reply was that a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since then.

The only water that has flowed under the bridge since then is that the Federal Government, which is composed not only of Liberals but also of the Country Party, which is leading the band, decided to sell overseas our uranium come hell or high water so that we could get the short-term advantage for the people of this country. Of course it would be a short-term advantage: it would bring in millions of dollars for us. However, it is entirely immoral for us to take that short-term advantage and thus, at the least, mortgage the future of this country and mankind. Yet the only water that has flowed under the bridge is that decision; not one other element in the problem has changed. However, the Liberals have completely turned around in less than 18 months. I regard that as poor indeed, and I use those words charitably. One of the ways in which one can test the Government is by Questions on Notice.

**Mr. Bannon:** Many of them.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** There are too many of them. Some are completely superfluous and are a waste of time. If the cost of answering Questions on Notice could be computed, we would be staggered by it. I must take most of the blame for this, because it was I who started a few years ago to use Questions on Notice as a weapon against the Government. My record has long been eclipsed though, and I am not sorry that it has. The Liberals never seem to follow up the answers they get. I propose to follow up some of the replies I have got in the last week or so and to draw attention to them. Last week I asked a question about the Monarto Development Commission. I asked how many people are now working there. The answer I got was that 14 people are still employed there, but that number will go

down to 10 in the next few months. When one looks down the list one sees an extraordinary group of people. What are they doing? We are not going on with Monarto, even in the Government's knowledge, in the foreseeable future. We still have on the Commission Mr. A. V. Surmon, a senior man, who is the Director of Social Planning. What can he be doing in the field of social planning at Monarto? I do not know, but he is still on the pay-roll. Presumably, the answer is that the Government has been unable to find him another job anywhere.

The only thing that has come from the commission is several glossy annual reports, one of which contained photographs of all the Directors of the commission. I remember seeing Mr. Surmon there because, if my recollection is correct, he has a beard, and I thought that that was a good thing, anyway. He is still socially planning Monarto, although the whole thing is stone dead.

Let us consider another Question on Notice to which I got an answer today. It is the question on which the Government has been pretty quiet lately, and relates to the North-Eastern Area Public Transportation Review. I asked how much planning has cost so far. The answer I got was \$819 714; the estimated cost is \$54 000 000 for construction plus \$20 000 000 for rolling stock. I bet at least half again could be added to those sums by the time construction is started, even if we made a decision to do so immediately. I have said repeatedly (and I am absolutely confirmed by the answer I got today to my question) that we have not got the money for the project and it will never go ahead.

I questioned the Minister of Transport on *This Day Tonight* one night, and all he could do (unusually politely I might say) was to rubbish me and say that I was always negative and asked awkward questions. I thought, well, he is not responsible for the money bags so I had better write to the Premier. On 2 June, I wrote to the Premier as follows:

I should be glad therefore if you could tell me what is the estimated overall cost of the various options, particularly that which you favour, the corridor along the river valley. Will you please also tell me how the Government proposes to find the necessary funds, and over what period the Government expects them to be spent?

I had a reply on 12 June signed by the Premier in person. My word, that is hard to get nowadays. Obviously, the Premier did not like the letter, because he did not say "Thank you for your letter", but stated:

I have your letter of 2 June. I will write to you further setting out the estimated funding programme for the NEAPTR proposal.

That was on 12 June. I got sick of waiting, so I put a Question on Notice today asking when I would get a reply. The answer I got today was as follows:

As the honourable member has already made public statements on this particular matter, clearly having made up his mind on it, I saw no purpose in writing further to him.

There is no answer to my question, because there is no money to pay for the project. You have only to look at the Speech itself. In paragraph 4 it is stated:

The extreme course being followed by the Commonwealth means that it is necessary for my Government to revise planned capital expenditure.

We will never be able to pay for NEAPTR on our own out of Loan funds. That is absurd. The Government is complaining about cuts in Loan funds now, yet it wants to saddle another \$80 000 000 to \$100 000 000 on to it for the NEAPTR public transport system. The whole thing is in my view a cruel joke, and I say no more about it. I asked a question without notice on the first day of the session about the finances of the Government and particularly

why there had been such a steep increase on the miscellaneous line in the Premier's Department in the figures to 31 March 1978. I received an insulting reply saying that I had not done my homework and that a number of lines had been transferred, resulting in a tremendous increase. I therefore asked, as a Question on Notice, what were the details of the lines up to 31 March 1978 as compared with 31 March 1977, and I received a reply last week. I had one of my trusty assistants do the arithmetic for me and found out that out of a total of \$7 727 956 the additional lines which had gone to the Premier's Department accounted for only \$831 512. Nearly \$2 000 000 of expenditure under that line was new expenditure in a total of \$7 727 956. It was up from \$4 951 000 12 months earlier. That is an enormous increase at a time when we are short of money.

The member for Spence was right in what he said about SURS before but he would not pick up my interjection about the Government getting its priorities a bit straighter, and putting more money into that rather than into some of the things it is spending money on. I do not know whether anyone has bothered to look at the Premier's Department miscellaneous line; it has not had any publicity yet, but there was going to be no detailing of it until I asked my question, and all I was told was that I had not done my homework. We find, for some reason (only a small item), that the amount allocated to the Builders Licensing Appeal Tribunal has doubled, but that does not matter much. There is going to be a Government Royal Show pavilion at a cost of \$21 994. Grants and provisions for the arts, whatever that means, have gone up from \$1 003 786 to \$1 200 211. The grant for the Jam Factory workshops is \$457 500 but that I think probably is balanced off by a line for the South Australian Craft Authority, \$407 900 in the year before. The \$457 500 we are spending on the Jam Factory is only \$50 000 more than it was last year so maybe the Government believes we should not complain too much about that. The South Australian Film Corporation (the friend of the member for Fisher) received last year \$1 015 180, and this year it is up to \$1 622 000. The provision for the South Australian Theatre Company has gone up from \$462 000 to \$639 000. The South-Eastern Regional Cultural Centre Trust is to receive \$70 000, but I do not want to tread on the toes of the members from that area. The State Opera is to get \$334 000 this year, having received nothing previously.

Payments for consultant services go up from \$1 881 to \$16 952. They are the ones that took my breath away, and after the time I have been here it takes a lot to take my breath away. Has anyone bothered to think how much Royal Commissions are costing us? All members have suggested Royal Commissions from time to time; the Liberals are always calling for them. Up to 31 March 1977 the Juvenile Courts Royal Commission cost \$34 553 which is a lot of money, but one could excuse that. We have been promised repeatedly that we will get the Bill this session, 12 months afterwards. The Royal Commission into Shop Trading Hours in the nine-month period cost us \$77 493, which seems high to me, and I do not know whether we got value for that. The bunny of the lot, and the one which really did stagger me, was the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs which cost \$268 400 in nine months. What on earth were they doing? Admittedly, I had lunch with these people and I know there is no such thing as a free lunch, but over \$250 000 has been spent. Do you know what the Commissioners told me when I was having lunch with them and we were talking about marihuana? I had known each of them before; they are charming and sincere people, and they said that every commission of inquiry since the 1880's in India had come



to the same conclusion on it and that they could write the report before they started. Every commission has recommended legislation, although it has never been acted on, because the evidence is overwhelming and yet to get to that conclusion this Royal Commission had spent \$268 000 up to 31 March.

**Mr. Bannon:** That is not the only drug they are looking at.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I know it is not but it is one of the most important areas.

**Mr. Bannon:** What about—

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Is the member for Ross Smith defending that figure? Is he? A thundering silence! The honourable member has not gone out of the Chamber; he is still here, and he could answer if he wanted to. It is completely indefensible. At a time when we are running out of money to be spending sums like that, which were concealed until I asked my question, is in my view a scandal.

I do not know how many members have seen an article in the June issue of a magazine called *Superfunds* entitled "Can the community afford superannuation?" by C. J. White. This article sounds a warning on all superannuation schemes throughout Australia. The gist of it is that we cannot afford the superannuation benefits we are giving to ourselves and to others by legislation and by the private schemes, simply because of the changing age composition of the population. There are getting to be more older people and fewer younger people to support them when they are on superannuation. He states, commenting on a table:

The ratio shown in column (6) is a rough measure of the support for the aged required of the producers. In other words, this shows that \$1 paid to each person over age 65 cost each person aged 15 to 64, 13.3c in 1972, and is likely to cost 20.8c in 2032, or an increase in the real expenditure per producer to support retired people of over 55 per cent over the next 60 years.

He says that we simply cannot afford the benefits we have given. I used that as a background to the inquiries I have been making, by way of Questions on Notice, about the State Superannuation Fund and the State Police Pensions Fund. I asked a question (and received a reply) about the investigation which has to be made by the Public Actuary by law into the state and sufficiency of the South Australian Superannuation Fund as at 30 June 1973. We have never seen that report. The answer was:

The Public Actuary investigated and reported on the state and sufficiency of the South Australian Superannuation Fund as at 30 June 1973, pursuant to section 10 of the Superannuation Act, 1969. It is not proposed to release the report.

Since then the law has been changed and, of course, the report has to be tabled under the new Act, so I asked a separate question, because the Premier had to report, under the present Superannuation Act, on the fund as at 1 July 1974 and again as at 30 June 1977. I asked had it been done, if not why not, and when we were going to see it. The answer I got was as follows:

Actuarial valuations of the Superannuation Fund as at 1 July 1974 and as at 30 June 1977, are presently being undertaken and are expected to be available shortly.

The Premier then said that they would be placed before Parliament as required. The valuation of the fund, as at more than four years ago, has not yet been done. I have grave doubts, on the information I have been given, strengthened by the article to which I have referred, about the viability (and I use that horrible word but I think it is descriptive here) of the present Superannuation Fund. That fund is getting more and more generous all the time.

We are talking all the time about reducing the ages of retirement, yet the fact is that the lower the age of retirement the heavier the burden on a superannuation scheme. I am told that, in fact, actuarially all these schemes are in deficit.

So far as the retiring age is concerned, I am told (and I am told this is pretty accurate) that if a person retires at 65, which used to be the age of retirement, it takes nine people left in the labour force to support that person. If the retirement age goes down, which many of us are talking about and which in fact can happen in South Australia, to 60, it takes 5.7 people to support each person; it is a heavier, and very much heavier burden. It is so heavy a burden that we will not be able to support it.

I have a suspicion that the reason why we are not going to see that 1973 report, which the Government is hugging to its bosom despite its vaunted talk about open government, why it is going slow on the 1974 report, and why we still have not got the 1977 report, is that that fund is in difficulty. I may be wrong, and I hope I will be told publicly that I am wrong, if I am. I think that everybody in South Australia is entitled to know what the situation is.

The matter of the Police Pensions Fund is even more extraordinary. I received an answer a week ago to a question I asked about that fund. Having asked whether the Actuary had investigated the Police Pensions Fund as at 1 July 1974 and, again, as at 1 July 1977, because he is under an obligation to do so, I received the following reply:

The Public Actuary did investigate the Police Pensions Fund as at 30 June 1974. The report was submitted to the Chief Secretary on 24 July 1978. It is not proposed to release the report.

The reply goes on to say it is not practicable to get on with the later valuation because of computer problems. That is the third time that I have been given that answer as an excuse for the failure to table reports in this House—that we have got in trouble with our computers. Although I was told a week ago that that report would not be made public, it was tabled in this House by the Chief Secretary today. What is the explanation for that? The Government said a week ago that the damn thing would not be tabled and today it is tabled.

**The Hon. D. W. Simmons:** Are you objecting?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No, I am not objecting, but I am puzzled to know why there has been a change in the decision made by the Government a week ago, and I am alarmed when I look at the report and find that, in fact, there is a deficiency of \$1 607 000. That appears on page 16 of the report under "Valuation Summary". The Valuations Balance Sheet is set out there and shows the present value of contributions yet to be received from existing contributors at \$24 758 000. It then shows the present value of future capital and income, receipts from existing funds investments and (and this is the significant figure I am advised), \$5 357 000; a deficit of \$1 607 000. In "Discussion and recommendations" on the next page this is what the Actuary states:

The deficiency of \$1 607 000 is not large when related to total liabilities of \$31 722 000.

It is large if one relates it to what I am told is the figure to which it should be related, not the \$31 000 000-odd but the \$5 357 000. That means that there is a deficiency of about 30 per cent at the moment. The report continues:

In any event, in view of the substantial changes to the fund which occurred in 1976, it would be pointless to place much significance on the deficiency under the structure operating at 30 June 1974.

In fact, in 1976 the benefits were made even more generous than they had been before. That is a serious

matter indeed and one which calls for an explanation from the Government forthwith. We know (and I think this is common knowledge) that the amount by which the Government is propping up these funds is increasing enormously. Under the old Act it was fixed at a ratio of 70 per cent Government to 30 per cent fund. It has gone well beyond that now. That is a ratio of 2½ to 1. In fact, to 1975 it was more than 3 to 1, and for the year ended 1976 it was almost 4 to 1. That is what the taxpayer is doing to support the superannuation funds. I think that that is a serious matter and I hope that we will get some explanation for it from the Government.

I have not given, I am afraid, a very logical speech; I have gone from one topic to another. I have not had a chance to talk about long-range issues, but maybe I will get another chance later. However, I believe that this Government is running out of steam. I believe that it has been in office too long and that, if there were a more acceptable alternative, it would go out of office. When we read, as I suppose most of us did, the thoughts of Premier Don when he got to his 25 years in office last March, we saw how bankrupt of thought he is so far as the future is concerned. Presumably, this was not an off-the-cuff statement: it was something that had been prepared, but we had this sort of nonsense coming from the Premier:

The next major reform for South Australia is, in effect—"in effect" are words he adds to blur the picture—to democratise—

whatever that horrible word means—  
every aspect of life in South Australia.

What the hell does that mean? It has no meaning whatever when you analyse it. The Premier went on to say:

Democracy must be made to operate in the workplace, in schools, institutions and places where people gather for social events. Industrial democracy is a significant part of this plan—but it is nowhere near all of it.

That sounds beaut, if you do not analyse it. Of course, it means absolutely nothing at all. If that is all he, as Leader of this Government and one who wants to stay in office for another couple of elections or so, has to offer, then it is a pretty bleak outlook for us. There was one other thing to offer: that South Australia should become the centre of industry in what he calls the "tertiary field". Apparently, he is going to try to make big companies (those multinationals he does not like anyway) establish their head offices in Adelaide rather than in Melbourne or Sydney.

God knows why they should. There is no reason why they should. We do not even have an international airport here and, until we do have one (and I speak for the member for Hanson), our tourist industry will be no good and there will be no chance whatever of putting Adelaide on the map. Those are the only things he could offer for the future in South Australia, and it is a poor lookout for us.

I come now to my last point, and it is not one that I very much enjoy making. There are two matters. First, I refer to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport (Mr. Casey). In my view, and I say this straight out and I have said it to his face, he should have resigned when he had the conviction a few weeks ago—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order, and I hope that he will not continue in that vein.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Could you tell me why, Sir?

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member can move something of that order only by substantive motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I think that I have made my point anyway. Withers and Grayden have gone. It is a tradition of Parliamentary democracy, but I will say no more about it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable

member does not continue in that vein.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am not going to. The final point I make, and I do not enjoy making it on this occasion for the first time, is that I am quite unable to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, because of the terms in which it is couched. It is couched in respectful terms for a man for whom I have no respect and who should not, in my view, be the Governor of this State and, therefore—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would like the honourable member to be more specific about the person referred to in his statement. Standing Orders 150, 151, 152 and 153 and Erskine May are clear about persons whose conduct may not be reflected on, except by way of substantive motion, and I require the honourable member to indicate to whom he is referring.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I clearly referred to him. I know that you have a paper from which you read, Sir. I refer to His Excellency the Governor.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order. If he continues in this vein, I will not warn him again but will name him for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I see that my time has expired.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Hanson.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I join with my colleagues in expressing condolences to Mrs. Frank Potter and family at the passing of the late President of the Legislative Council, Mr. Frank Potter. Frank was a resident of Glenelg, a very dear friend to us and to my family, and was of tremendous assistance when he moved into the area after I entered Parliament.

I will answer a statement made by the member for Mitcham about the international airport as far as tourism is concerned, and I think that the member for Morphett may be able to support me. I understand that the replacement Senator for South Australia at one stage said that she would not support Adelaide Airport being made an international airport and would do all she could to prevent international flights using the airport. I do not believe that she was aware that international flights were arriving at and leaving from the Adelaide Airport, and I find it strange that there is another split in the Australian Democrats over their policy involving, in this instance, the use of Adelaide Airport as an international airport. The member for Mitcham would do well to support the view of residents that if an international airport is to be established in South Australia it should be situated somewhere farther north, probably in the Dublin area. Listening to the member for Mitcham made me feel that I was listening to Mahommed Ali—"I'm the greatest"! If the waffle he contributed was music, no doubt he would be a brass band.

I am concerned at a recent press statement made by the Premier and reported in the *Australian* over the past weekend in which he said:

Much of the content of company reports prepared for shareholders was "useless", even "misleading", South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said on Friday . . . Concerned shareholders who wished to use their voting "power" found it difficult to obtain the information necessary to make a sound decision.

"If the shareholder does succeed, against all the odds, he is likely to find himself outgunned by a block vote of management proxies," the Premier said.

He went on to highlight the problem of shareholders attending annual general meetings, and the report continues:

He told the meeting prescriptive legislation for the disclosure of more financial information was being considered in the United Kingdom, but in Australia a greater flow of information was possible without such legislative action.

The Premier went on to further denigrate commerce in relation to its reporting on various matters. Members should have drawn to their attention the editorial in the *Advertiser* last Monday, under the heading "Public Accountability", although I will not comment on the section relating directly to the Public Accounts Committee. The final paragraph of the report states:

The principle of accountability is not to be satisfied simply by having an election once every three years. Nor is the Auditor-General's regular reporting sufficient if Parliament won't act on what he says. A public accounts committee is a logical extension at the political level of what the professional accountants have been doing. But it can't act efficiently on the voters' behalf if the Government of the day won't let it. Mr. Dunstan said on Friday that shareholders needed much more access than they now enjoyed to financial details of companies in which they had invested money. Why does he not apply this reasoning to the affairs of the much larger company, i.e. the State, which he himself is managing on the voters' behalf?

I believe that the person who wrote that leading article could not have expressed in better terms just what confronts the taxpayers of this State at present in relation to the credibility of this Government. For the Premier to attack commerce and say that it is not providing information is false, because the Premier, as the Leader of the Government, is responsible to the taxpayers of this State and Parliament to ensure that the people are advised of what is happening with their moneys. At page 226 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1977, he reports, under the line of the Public Buildings Department that "a number of instances have occurred where accommodation was vacant for protracted periods of time", and gives examples. Building A, two floors—vacant for 10 months during the year; cost in rental for the vacancy, \$132 000.

In that same building, one floor was vacant for eight months at a cost in rental of \$63 000. Also in that building, two half-occupied floors were vacant for 10 months during the year, and the cost in rental for the vacancy was \$70 000. In building B, consisting of seven floors, the period vacant during the year was an average of six months, and the cost in rental for the vacancy was \$134 000. In the same building, another floor was vacant for four months, and the cost in rental for the vacancy was \$11 000.

In building C, there were three floors, the period of vacancy varying between five and 11 months, and the cost in rental for the vacancy was \$29 000. In building D, one floor was vacant for seven months, and the cost in rental for the vacancy was \$15 000. This meant that \$454 000 was paid in rental for unoccupied space during the year ended 30 June 1977. As an example of the State Government's credibility, I turn to question No. 228 on today's Notice Paper, which I asked of the Deputy Premier, as follows:

1. What was the total amount of pre-occupational rental and cleaning for premises not occupied for the financial years 1971-72 to 1977-78, respectively?
2. Which Government departments were involved, what was the reason for the delays incurred and the time of the delay in each instance?
3. Can the Minister justify the statement he made on 1 March, 1972 (page 3539 of *Hansard*) regarding future reporting of the Auditor-General on this issue when a similar report was made on page 266 of the Auditor-General's

Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1977?

4. What instructions have now been issued to departments to prevent a repetition?

The answer was what seems to be a stereotype reply that several members received today: the cost of researching this question cannot be justified, and therefore the information sought will not be given. I want to know how the Minister of Works can get away with such a statement, approved by Cabinet, of which the Premier is Leader, saying that the cost of researching cannot be justified and the information sought will not be given, when, over the weekend, the Premier was reported in the *Australian* as saying that commerce must give more information to its shareholders. If there is not a double standard somewhere, I am surprised.

If the Government wants to attack commerce on the credibility of reporting to its shareholders, and if the Premier wants to talk of industrial democracy and worker participation, it is about time the taxpayers were informed of what is happening to the finance they provide to the State Treasury. The Minister of Works must be condemned for submitting such a reply. Question on Notice No. 229, which I asked of the Minister of Works, is as follows:

1. Which buildings and Government departments were involved where rental was paid for accommodation not occupied during the financial year ended 30 June 1977?
2. How did this situation arise and what was the total amount paid during the financial year ended 30 June 1977 for accommodation not occupied for various periods?
3. Was the amount charged to the various departments accrued and, if not, why not?

The answer gives a little detail as to the various departments and the buildings involved, as outlined by the Auditor-General. The answer to the second part of the question was as follows:

The necessity to secure accommodation when suitable premises were in short supply usually entailed the immediate commencement of rental payments. Commissioning work is required before occupation, and the department's needs cannot be defined until details of the premises to be leased are known. The amount of rent paid on unoccupied buildings for the year ended 30 June 1977 totalled \$593 770.

So, we have the answer for that financial year. At page 140 of his report for the year ended 30 June 1971, the Auditor-General made the following statement:

The Government has leased for varying terms up to 1993, accommodation for departments in a number of city buildings. The amount being paid for rental in terms of the leases for 25 premises exceeds \$800 000 per annum, with one lease in process of negotiation with anticipated annual rental of \$158 000. The capitalised cost of these rentals would be in the vicinity of \$14 000 000. In addition to the rental in most cases the department pays for cleaning, electricity and maintenance and in some cases rates and taxes. For a number of properties the pre-occupational capital expenditure incurred or to be incurred has been high and substantial sums have been paid in rentals prior to occupation. In two cases cleaning was paid for buildings not yet occupied.

The Auditor-General gave a few examples to illustrate matters set out in his report, as follows:

Property A—Annual rental, \$61 877—pre-occupation rent (approximately seven months), \$32 424. Capital expenditure before occupation, \$121 152.

Property B—Annual rental, \$107 424—pre-occupation rent, \$74 017. Estimated capital expenditure before occupation, \$170 654.

Property C—Not yet occupied—annual rental, \$80 275—pre-occupation rent to 30 June 1971, \$23 305. Estimated capital expenditure, \$187 300.

Property D—Not yet occupied—annual rental commencing 1 July 1971, \$45 405. Estimated capital expenditure, \$75 000.

At the same time that these rentals are being paid the Government owns a number of city or near city sites in Victoria Square, Wakefield Street, Pulteney Street, and Kent Town. Land in Victoria Square West was purchased at a total cost with clearing of site of \$520 000. It is at present used partly as a departmental car park and part is let to the Adelaide City Council for a similar purpose at a rental of \$250 a quarter.

Therefore, in two financial years six years apart, the total amount paid for accommodation and cleaning of properties not yet occupied was \$723 516. To seek the amount in the intervening period, I placed further questions on notice. I had hoped that I could have got the figures for the financial years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1977-78. To be told that the cost of obtaining the information is too great and that therefore it will not be given leads me to believe that the Government is going for the biggest cover-up of all time. If, in two financial years six years apart, \$723 000 has been paid out, it is anyone's guess what was paid in the other five years within that period.

Taking an average, it would have to be at least \$1 500 000, so when I say \$1 000 000 was paid out on rent for unoccupied buildings, I am being extremely conservative; it appears that it would be about \$2 000 000 or \$2 250 000. Whatever the amount is, the Minister of Works must own up. The cost of getting this information can be justified, and the taxpayers of this State, in view of the Premier's statement, have every right to demand that the Government should make a full disclosure.

The more important part of the whole exercise is that we have to go back to 1972, when I asked questions to try to verify the statements in the Auditor-General's Report. There was a variation of \$3 000 between the amount the department believed it had paid out in rent on unoccupied buildings and the amount calculated by the Auditor-General. We were given some vague reason, that the Auditor-General works on a day-to-day basis while the department works on a month-to-month basis. This shows the laxity in the handling of finances within this department under the Minister's control, and also demonstrates the lack of attention to detail that the Minister allows on financial matters under his control. He has a case to answer. On 1 March 1972 at page 3539 of *Hansard*, in answering a question I asked based on the Auditor-General's Report, the Minister had this to say, in part:

Although the Auditor-General in his report said that we were renting far too much accommodation, he did not say how we could solve the problem or how the Government could obtain more funds, bearing in mind its commitments in other areas. We are currently planning development in Victoria Square, taking in Gawler Place, Flinders Street and Wakefield Street, and this will lead to the erection of two major office blocks, which may relieve some of the need to occupy rental accommodation. However, it may not provide that relief, because the demand for office space will grow in future. I point out that it will probably be about 1980 before we can finally construct these buildings. There are problems involved because often buildings rented by the Government have been used for a different purpose from that which they were intended for. This means that major alterations have to be made to the interiors and there have been unnecessary delays.

That is one example of a lack of co-ordination in the department, a lack of understanding, and a lack of ability to accept conditions that would be accepted in commerce.

A company in private enterprise, the moment it signs the lease, wants to get in as soon as possible.

Certainly, there is nothing wrong with constructing partitions while the staff is there. If anyone complains about that, they should consider the taxpayers of South Australia who have to foot the bill. In the case of some departments accommodated in newer premises in the city, portable partitions can be provided with little inconvenience to the staff.

I believe that taxpayers should not be expected to pay huge sums while prima donna heads of various departments make up their minds about what kind of colour and design they will choose. The whole blame rests squarely on the shoulders of the Ministers responsible for departments, because they are not supervising their departments and are not asking their top public servants to make prompt decisions. Clearly, the whole issue lies on the Minister's shoulders.

Regarding the Deputy Premier, there is no excuse for his lack of action in this regard. In his reply to me the Deputy Premier stated:

We do not want a report from the Auditor-General similar to the one we had this year and the department has been given that message loud and clear.

That was 1972. I can remember that the Minister was rather hostile. The *Hansard* report continues with an interjection by the then member for Heysen (Mr. McAnaney), as follows:

The Auditor-General is being instructed.

The Deputy Premier continued:

I am not telling the Auditor-General not to report it: I am just telling the department under my control to make sure that the Auditor-General is not put in a position where he has to report. In other words, the things that led to that report should not happen again. That is not putting the Auditor-General under instructions.

In 1971 the Auditor-General reported that \$129 700 had been spent on rent and cleaning of unoccupied buildings, and the Minister said that that should not happen again, but in the 1976-77 report we find that the Government paid \$593 700. What was the Minister talking about? What sort of supervision did he give his department? He said that the department had been given the message loud and clear. If the department had been given that message loud and clear, someone has obviously ignored it, or the Minister has forgotten to follow up his instructions.

I believe that the Minister should be relieved of his portfolio covering the Public Buildings Department. Obviously, he cannot supervise the department and the Environment Department at the same time, especially concerning the huge capital expenditure that is involved with the Public Buildings Department.

**Mr. Wotton:** Do you think the Minister is handling the Environment Department well?

**Mr. BECKER:** From my information, which is independent of the information of the member for Murray, that department is in absolute chaos, with hardly any permanent staff and with hardly anyone knowing what is going on. If this is the situation, I believe that the Minister should be relieved of his duties, preferably with respect to the Public Buildings Department.

If one examines the Auditor-General's Reports regarding rental and cleaning payments on unoccupied buildings, there is an ironic twist of fate involved, because in the 1970-71 report, which was made by Mr. Jeffrey, who was one of the finest Auditor-Generals we have had in South Australia, and the 1976-77 report, compiled by Mr. Byrne, who also proved his value to this Parliament and showed how concisely and to what detail he was willing to go in his reports of the various departments, it is

interesting to note what happened to those two gentlemen: they both retired following their disclosures of huge amounts being wasted on rents of unoccupied buildings.

Mr. Jeffrey retired in 1972, and Mr. Byrne retired earlier this year. Clearly, at least one of those gentlemen retired early. He was sent to Coventry over his audacity in reporting these losses, which embarrassed the Government and which will embarrass it from here on. True, the Minister may be embarrassed by my statement; I do know that at least Mr. Byrne was sent to Coventry and had little option other than to retire much earlier than he otherwise would have.

Obviously, the Minister of Labour and Industry was smart enough to recognise Mr. Byrne's skills by appointing him to inquire into workmen's compensation in South Australia. I still believe that the treatment received by Mr. Byrne from various departments whilst he was Auditor-General was a disgrace. The Auditor-General is responsible for providing us with information that the Premier wants commerce to provide its shareholders. Therefore, taxpayers of this State have every reason and every right to know exactly where their money is being spent.

We expect the Auditor-General to report to us unhindered and in detail; in fact, in much more detail than he has reported in the past. We would like some conclusion about what departments are doing to rectify the huge waste of taxpayers' money. Anyone who has studied the Auditor-General's Report over the past eight or nine years will know of the many references to poor accountability and budgeting. Obviously, no-one really cares or takes much care in trying to control the obvious waste that is being continued within the public spending sector.

I refer to the recent press announcement of the Minister stating that the Government would be paying about \$200 000 for vacant premises in Grenfell Centre. The Minister knows, and I am convinced that he knows, that huge amounts have been wasted during the past seven years on unoccupied premises. I have a letter from a person who wants to go further into the waste of public funds in this State. This person wrote to me asking whether I could ascertain the reason for the provision of a monumental switchboard extension at the Hackney tram depot, as he has been led to believe that the whole project is being phased out in the near future.

I asked a question about pilfering of the Deputy Premier, who is in charge of the Public Buildings Department at Netley. We were told that one person had been dismissed and was to be charged. A person purchased a tractor on Kangaroo Island, transported it to the mainland on m.v. *Troubridge*, at the department's expense, had it serviced at the Public Buildings Department garage, had it stripped down and repaired, with parts being replaced, and then sent it back on m.v. *Troubridge* at the department's expense. We do not know what happened about that. We do not know what happened to the person who was supposed to have stolen asbestos sheets. He was fined, but is still employed by the department.

The person who had written to me said, "Have you heard of the tremendous pilfering in the Department of Further Education very recently of all types of equipment?" The officers in the department have heard of it. One only has to examine part of the Auditor-General's Report to see the details of thefts from different departments. They add up to tens of thousands of dollars worth of equipment that is stolen from schools, the roadsides, and from depots of Government instrumentalities. No reports have been given in this House as to

what action has been taken to curb the thefts, the pilfering, and the wastage. There is incompetent control of the stores and supplies of this State. When we refer to tens of thousands of dollars for different departments and add them, we realise that hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars could be saved for the taxpayers of the State.

There is only one thing to do, and that is to put the lid on Government income of the State. The sooner we do that and make the Ministers work within their limits, the sooner we will get efficiency in handling the finances of this State. In my opinion there is no doubt that the Golden Fleece award of the year for waste of public moneys should go to the Deputy Premier of this State because of his failure to recognise and come to terms with the problems of the waste of taxpayers' money. If the Premier does not relieve him of his duties, I hope that Parliament will take the necessary action to record its public protest about what has happened.

The Deputy Premier of the State must now be made to answer Questions on Notice in relation to the rents of unoccupied buildings in this State. He must implement ways and means to ensure that his departmental officers move departments into these buildings without any hesitation, and the forward planning of his department to seek rental accommodation must also be improved. No commercial undertaking would employ an executive which has been responsible for wasting so much of the taxpayers' money. No person would retain him: he would simply be sacked. The person would have to go and he should realise he has not done the right thing by his employer, which in this case is the taxpayers of South Australia.

I also believe that some disciplinary action must be taken against the Ministers of the departments involved. After all, the officers of the Public Buildings Department get a considerable hammering from the *primma donna's* amongst the various Ministries and the outside people they employ in these departments who are the ones procrastinating. So there is a conflict with the Minister's staff, the Public Service, and outside persons employed and brought into those departments. They do not have much to do, and they are really upsetting the whole applecart. I can only condemn the Minister for failing to provide this information to Parliament, and I hope that we can make him improve in future.

There have been excess expenditures and a tremendous waste in many other areas of the Public Buildings Department. Moneys have been spent on projects far in excess of the amounts approved. In April 1977 expenditure in excess of approved funds on major projects within the Public Buildings Department was \$18 000 000, and preliminary expenditure on major projects, where approved funds had not been sought, was \$6 000 000. Who can get away with this sort of fiddling of the books? Who can get away with the incompetent lack of adequate monitoring of expenditure control? The Minister, the Deputy Premier, gets away with it.

Of course, this situation must have a tremendous bearing on the State Budget. It is a clear demonstration of the poor management by the Minister. It is no good blaming anybody else. The Premier must rigidly discipline his team of Ministers, as there seems to be too much waste or incompetence being demonstrated in these two issues alone. He has two Ministers due to retire, because of the Party's policy, and now would be the time to make such a move.

**Mr. Nankivell:** Not because of incompetence.

**Mr. BECKER:** One not because of incompetence and one because of age. I think that in itself is a tragedy when you consider all these matters. During this debate references have been made to the Federal Liberal Party,

and we have heard many new members, true to form, stand up and attack the Federal Government for all it is doing, but nobody has attacked the State Government for the obvious waste of money. We did not hear from any Government member about what he did, or what he has done on behalf of his constituents. Not one member of the Government has told this House that he or she has brought to the attention of the Federal Government the plight of taxpayers. On 12 July, I sent a telegram to the Prime Minister, following a newspaper report speculating that television licences would be reintroduced. I am not frightened to tell the House what I did. The telegram was as follows:

In view of the numerous representations following the publication in a South Australian daily paper that your Government is considering the reintroduction of television licences, I strongly urge you to prevent such a politically dangerous and unpopular move.

Heini Becker, Member for Hanson  
I wrote to the Prime Minister on the same day confirming that I had sent the telegram, and my letter further stated:

I realise that several press reports have been published over the past few weeks speculating anticipated financial restraints to be contained in the forthcoming Federal Budget, but of the many "kite flying" suggestions, I have not experienced such a persistent number of approaches that the recommendation of television licence fees has caused. Not one caller to my office or home is in favour of the idea and many of these people are members and supporters of the Party.

There is no doubt in my mind that such a move would be extremely unpopular and could be damaging to the Party. Regrettably, in the time of economic restraint, we appear to hit our own supporters first. I will be extremely grateful if the speculation to this story could be curbed as soon as possible.

On 27 July I received a reply from the Prime Minister dated 25 July, which stated:

Thank you for your recent messages concerning television licence fees. You may already know that my colleague, the Treasurer, announced on 13 July 1978 that the Government would not reintroduce these fees.

There is not one member of this Government or one other member of this House who has said they have done anything about it. All they have done is to stand up and abuse the Federal Government. They are very active members, really concerned about their constituents, doing their lot on behalf of the poor old taxpayers of this State, but have done nothing but talk. What have Government members done about other issues that they have raised in this House? On 13 July 1978 I wrote to the Hon. Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, Minister for Social Security, as follows:

Several concerned constituents have approached me over the past few weeks following press speculation that family allowances may be taxed and single parent's benefits could be reduced quite drastically and, in some instances, abolished.

I appreciate that there is always a considerable amount of speculation prior to the announcing of the Federal Budget, but such speculative press reports regrettably have been damaging to our Party.

I am being dead honest. I have got nothing to lose. The letter continues:

If they are used for "kite flying" to test the electorate, I wish to assure you that the constituents who have contacted me at my office or at home after hours, have been quite alarmed and every one is totally opposed to the two proposals. If the reports are not authentic, I will be grateful if some action could be taken by you or the Prime Minister to reassure our supporters and members that such drastic action is not contemplated.

I have not heard from Senator Guilfoyle. I also wrote to the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Howard, on the same day.

**Mr. Slater:** You are a voice in the wilderness.

**Mr. BECKER:** I am not a voice in the wilderness: at least I did something. That is more than the Government yackers did. I wrote to Mr. Howard in relation to press speculation about family allowances being taxed. I deplore the action of members of Parliament and members of the Government who criticise the Federal Government when it is trying to clean up the horrible mess that was left after those three glorious years of Labor rule in our Federal Parliament! When members on this side point out to the Government that it is wasting money, we are told that we are knocking South Australia, that we are damaging the State. Not one Government member has given any evidence of what he has done on behalf of taxpayers or for unemployment in this State.

Each and every member of the Government has dwelt on the misery that has been caused to people out of work in this State. Who caused our unemployment? The Whitlam Federal Labor Government started it. We now have a Government that is trying to clean up the mess but, regrettably, we now have more unemployment. There is no mythology about that. The Minister of Mines and Energy is nothing but an academic pedlar of an unusual economic policy that has done nothing at all for this State except rip off the taxpayers. What sort of Administration do we have in this State when the Minister of Works refuses to answer questions because they will damage the Government?

I see up to 10 young people a week who come to my office looking for work. I do everything I can through my electoral office, with the contacts I have in the community, to place these young people in work. Sometimes I have been successful, but the situation worries me. I will do everything I can to help these young people. However, I have not heard any member of the present Government say how or to what extent they are helping their constituents. They are glorifying on the situation of predicting 400 000, 500 000, and 600 000 people being unemployed. In other words, the Government is playing on the emotions of the people, and is preconditioning them to accept unemployment.

What we should be doing as a Parliament is to encourage commerce and industry all we can to create more jobs. Where are all the creators opposite who want to promote South Australia and to do good by South Australia and by their constituents? Not one member of the Government has tried to restore confidence. One must restore confidence, encourage industry in South Australia, and encourage the people of South Australia to spend their money.

If anyone has studied the economic situation (and no doubt the Minister of Mines and Energy would know where all the money now is), he would know that the people have stacked their money in building societies and banks and that deposits are growing. While we have that situation, how can we keep up confidence when people will not spend their money and buy consumer goods, which is what we depend on in South Australia. Are people putting their money in banks because they are not sure of their future, or is it that people are preparing for early retirement and are putting their money into areas from which it is not going back into the community?

It is an indictment on every member of the Government, in fact, every member in the House who says that he is not doing everything he can to encourage confidence and economic sanity and to create employment and the good times that we have known in South Australia. Granted, we will not get back to the days where

workers were trodden on and treated like serfs. Workers are entitled to a fair go, and will be given a fair go. Industry will always overcome the problems, pressures, and demands put on it from time to time by the unions.

It is up to Parliament to see that industry and the work force get a fair go. If we do that, all people in South Australia will benefit. I deplore statements of Government members knocking, presupposing, and glorifying the unemployment situation. We should be doing everything we can to encourage our young people not to accept this situation.

**Mr. Groom:** What would you do?

**Mr. BECKER:** Obviously, the member for Morphett has been asleep for the last hour.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The other evening a point of order was taken on a similar matter. I do not want any reflection made on honourable members.

**Mr. BECKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but it annoys me that, when an attempt is being made by members, irrespective of Party politics, to do something for South Australia, stupid, inane interjections are made across the floor of the House like, "What are you going to do about it?" I believe that I have demonstrated that I will do everything I can, and I have over the years, on the committees (such as the Industries Development Committee) on which I have served to assist industry and the Government to get the State working again. I will do everything I can at every opportunity to encourage industry in my district.

I am pleased that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in the Chamber this afternoon, because he has a case to answer on the next matter I will raise. In my experience young people are being ripped off in the case of some shoddy housing agreements that are being offered. A tragic case came to my attention recently. A young couple who purchased a low-deposit house and were advised by the building company, or whatever one wishes to call it, that they could pay a low deposit and that the company would lend them money at low interest—

**Mr. Keneally:** Is this the private industry we should be encouraging?

**Mr. BECKER:** No, this is the sort of industry I would replace with the Housing Trust. It is a disgrace that that sort of practice is allowed to continue in South Australia. This young couple put down I think, a couple of hundred dollars as a deposit, and was given a first and second mortgage by the developer. The first mortgage was at a low interest, pending the couple's successful application to the State Bank for a housing loan. I deplore any building company, land agent, or developer who advertises and encourages young people to buy houses through them, and informs them that they will qualify for a State Bank loan. No-one in this State, apart from the General Manager of the State Bank, can say who will qualify for a State Bank housing loan until the day that that application is considered.

Some people are making money out of this scheme, and the Government should issue a clear warning that it is illegal for anyone to suggest that a person buying a house and accepting temporary finance will be granted a State Bank loan. I have had too many applicants under this type of scheme come to me, after being on temporary finance for several years, saying that when their application has come before the State Bank to finalise their loan their income has changed to such a degree that they no longer qualify for a State Bank loan and they must go elsewhere for their money.

No-one wants to give up his home. No young couple who have worked hard, gone without, and battled for the first three of four years to get a house of which they can be

proud in which to raise their family want to be told, "Bad luck, you don't qualify, you must go elsewhere." It is not the fault of the State Bank, but it comes back to the shyster developer and the smarty who wants to sell a house for the sake of selling it.

I should be grateful to the Minister for Planning, as Minister responsible for housing, if he could justify the report to which I shall now refer. Under the large headline "Low interest cash to help home buyers" in the *Advertiser* of 18 March is the following report:

An Adelaide home builder yesterday announced a \$3 000 000 low-interest finance plan to help more than 300 low-income earners to buy houses.

The move by Devon Symonds Holdings Limited means buyers of the company's houses will be able to get temporary second-mortgage finance as low as 5 per cent up to five years. The rate now is about 16 per cent.

That sounds very encouraging. The report continues:

The Minister of Housing (Mr. Hudson) said yesterday "I think it will have an impact so far as Devon is concerned and hopefully, it will mean other companies will have to arrange competitive finance."

The 5 per cent interest rate will apply to buyers of completed new houses until long-term first-mortgage finance is available from the State Bank.

The Minister cannot say that these people will qualify, because the circumstances of their income-earning capacity could change over that period. That is an extremely damaging statement to make, Mr. Minister; it is extremely dangerous.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Anyone on the list at the State Bank has been informed of the conditions that are required in order to qualify for a State Bank loan.

**Mr. BECKER:** I know the arrangements. There is no blame on the State Bank whatever. I still feel sorry for the men in the State Bank who have to process these applications and then tell people that they do not qualify.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** If the honourable member will listen, you cannot get on the waiting list at the State Bank without being informed what the conditions for eligibility are.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the Minister has explained his point. I call the Minister to order.

**Mr. BECKER:** The point is that young couples are desperate to obtain a house on a reasonable deposit (and a "reasonable deposit" is in the hundreds not thousands of dollars). I get annoyed when I read these statements. This low-interest finance was promoted by this company and these developers used the Minister, in my opinion, to add credibility to the offer. The report continues:

This will mean a saving of about \$17 a week in temporary finance repayments on a \$34 900 package.

The information I have, which I cannot substantiate, because every valuer places a different valuation on a house, leads me to believe, from the experience I gained while working in a bank, that these \$34 940 packages were highly inflated valuations. That was where I think the rip-off was; it was built into the price, but nobody can prove that.

A house is worth what you pay for it. If you can get a house for \$34 000 and you are happy, all right, but if you can get it for \$26 000, that is better still. The trap for young couples is when a developer comes out and says, as the report states:

Mr. Tanti said all house buyers, regardless of their bank, would benefit from the plan, particularly those eligible for a State Bank loan of \$21 000, which represents about 60 per cent of the cost of an average house-and-land package.

That does not quite add up to \$34 000. The point is that these developers are still using the State Bank as the lever

to sell their houses, and it is not right to do that.

Developers and land agents are also using the State Government Insurance Commission as a prop, because S.G.I.C. (to its credit) is making money available to people to help bridge the deposit gap by way of temporary second mortgages, and so on. I do not criticise that scheme, but everybody is jumping on the bandwagon and using the State Bank and S.G.I.C. as the lever to sell their houses. As the Minister said, people cannot get on the waiting list because these smart developers and salesmen have kicked this scheme to death. The tragedy is that the Minister is involved, as he is shown as making a statement in the body of the report. That, to me, gives the whole scheme some credibility, and suggests that it is a good scheme. I hope the Minister will watch that he does not do that in future.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** I hope you will watch your misinterpretations.

**Mr. BECKER:** I am not misinterpreting. The Minister looks at these matters from an academic point of view; I have had to consider them for 20 years from a practical point of view. People have come to me after problems have arisen, and I have tried to get them out of their difficulties.

I have a constituent aged 25 years who is a qualified carpenter. He lost his job before Christmas. He had two monthly repayments to pay to the developer and because they were not paid his house was repossessed, sold, and he was sent a bill for \$14 000. The finance company found out he was in trouble (he had been to the union but was told that several thousand carpenters were seeking employment) and repossessed his car—that is another couple of thousand dollars. Then he lost his colour television set and other household possessions valued at about \$5 000.

This person was \$21 000 in debt, had no assets, and wanted to know what he should do. We referred him to the Law Society, because he was considering going into bankruptcy. What a tragedy for a young couple, 25 years of age, and a baby nine months old. What sort of future do they face? What opportunity will he have in the future of obtaining credit, if he ever wants it, or ever tries to get it to try to improve his standing in the community. That is where we, as a Parliament, have failed. This is where we, as a State, have failed in not foreseeing that these problems would exist, and therefore preparing young people for these pitfalls. Whether we have failed in our educational process, or wherever, we have a situation in society today in which everybody believes they should have everything now and worry about paying for it later. I feel very sorry for this couple, because to have a debt of \$21 000 while being threatened on every side is heartbreaking.

In the *News* of 30 June 1978 the following headline appeared:

“State Bank housing loans to cost more”.

Unfortunately, this has been forced on the Government by the high interest rates on the funds from the Federal Government. We will find that many people are now being coerced into paying more money, because the Government is cleverly encouraging them to pay off their mortgages sooner than they should be paid, in order for the Government to get more income. People with fixed mortgages on low interest rates do not have to do that and should be advised of their rights.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** What do you mean, “they do not have to do it?”

**Mr. BECKER:** There are about 3 500 people with State Bank mortgages who do not have to pay off the whole of their mortgage until the mortgage term expires. I know that those people will be encouraged to repay their loans

more quickly, if they can. I cannot blame the Government for wanting to do that but, at the same time, the people should be informed that they do not have to do that.

One of my constituents was upset after reading that statement in the newspaper and was in quite a panic when she got to me. We rang the State Bank, and found that she did not have to pay. She was frightened that her repayments would be increased to such a level that she would not be able to afford them. That simply was not so. There was one line in the statement that stated that if people were experiencing hardship they could apply for consideration, but it provided no explanation to the 3 500 people who have low-interest housing loans and cannot be forced to increase their repayments or to pay higher interest rates.

I am extremely sorry for those who have to contest local government elections in mid-winter, and I have said that many times. I wrote to the Minister of Local Government about 15 months ago, suggesting that local government elections should be held in, say, October. I do not want to buy into any dispute that has happened on the other side of the city over the striking of the rate, but it bears out what I have been saying. I do not believe that it applies in the case of the Elizabeth council, because my information is that probably only two new members were elected at the recent council election, and at the second meeting after the election they were asked to strike the rate. I understand that, in another council area, seven new councillors, out of 19, were asked to consider the rate. In West Torrens, three new councillors, who had had the experience of only a few meetings, were asked to consider the rate. It seems difficult for these people going into local government for the first time to be placed in a situation where they have little opportunity fully to understand and appreciate the budgetary arrangements and the financial problems concerning local government.

When we consider that most of our local government authorities within the metropolitan area now handle multi-million dollar budgets, we realise that the people concerned need some experience and the opportunity to discuss over a period with their co-councillors the problems facing the wards. When new councillors come in, they have 101 ideas on issues that should be immediately commenced and on what they should do within their ward and in the whole council area. The best part of the whole system is that we get in most areas an influx from time to time of new ideas. However, to make them decide on a matter without their having fully understood budgetary and financial matters is, I believe, harsh. I hope that the Minister, as he promised in his letter to me of 2 August, will make an early decision and change local government elections to October.

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach):** I support the motion and add my sympathies to those expressed by other members to the family of the late Frank Potter.

In my view, the document that we are considering is a responsible one, in the light of the cut-backs from the Federal Government that have been listed throughout the whole of the document, and I join with my colleagues who have expressed much concern about the impact on health, hospitals and schools, in particular, resulting from the Federal Government's policies as they affect this State. At the same time, I have been pleased to see that, despite the financial constraints, there are several new initiatives, and a substantial legislative programme is also embodied in the terms of the Speech.

After listening to the member for Mitcham, I must say I agree with him that the debate has appeared to be



lacklustre. However, I think that, in defence of that, it ought to be said that the Government speeches have been very good. The reason for this is that Government members have quite properly concentrated on the major aspect affecting the total community, particularly this State, namely, unemployment. We have noticed that Opposition members, whereas they normally tend to draw comments from previous speeches, have on this occasion, with the exception of the member for Hanson, avoided unemployment and spoken about other issues, because they frankly are embarrassed by their liaison with the Commonwealth Government, which is responsible for unemployment in this State. The member for Mitcham said he believed that the Government was not performing and that there was not enough initiative from the Government, and he regretted that the Opposition was completely hopeless from the point of view of being an alternative Government. He also said that the Government was lacking in initiatives. I agree with him entirely about the Opposition and its abilities, and, in fairness, one must question whether or not the Government is lacking in initiatives.

I have read the Speech again and repeat that, within the financial restraints which the Federal Government is imposing on us, I believe that the Government has been using considerable initiative. However, I thought that I would test this further, because the member for Mitcham commented on this matter some weeks ago. Being fair minded, I therefore looked forward to the convention held by the Democrats two or three weeks ago. I thought that, if this was the view of the member for Mitcham, we would see many new initiatives being canvassed after that conference. I felt, as I have always done, that, if people were prepared to come up with good ideas, I was prepared to support them. I awaited the initiatives from the convention. Two things surprised me, one being that they were able to form a quorum for the meeting, and the other being that the meeting spent all of its time dealing with prostitutes and marihuana. If they are the initiatives the member for Mitcham would impose on us, I suppose it may be fitting for him and his Democrats, but they are hardly matters of considerable State advantage.

What has surprised me about the debate is that Opposition members obviously feel under some obligation to support the Commonwealth Government and its financial policies, despite massive unemployment, which is growing monthly. It puzzles me why they were prepared to do this.

**Mr. Keneally:** Hamer won't.

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Mr. Hamer does not support it and several other State Premiers who are feeling the electoral wind certainly will not support it. The Opposition is in a strange situation. It has little State support in South Australia, and it would seem that, when the credibility of the Fraser Government collapses completely, by associating with and defending the Federal Government, this Opposition will also collapse. It may hold the view, which I did until two or three weeks ago, that the community cannot see through the present Federal Liberal Government, because when we consider what was said before the most recent Federal election, namely, that we will not have a tourist as a Prime Minister, take politics off the front page, restore confidence, get rid of unemployment and reduce inflation—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** See New York on \$5 a day.

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Exactly. We have found that everything has gone wrong for them since the most recent election. There have been scandals in the Ministry and unemployment is constantly increasing. On the credit side, perhaps, inflation has been slowed.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** At what cost!

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Yes. All of these things, it seemed to me, were things that the public, after reading about them, would have noted with much interest.

I believe that the Gallup polls taken to gauge people's political feelings tend to be accurate. I saw one about eight weeks ago indicating that, if there had been a Federal election at that time, the Fraser Government would have been returned with about the same majority as it has now, despite all the things that have been going wrong for it. That puzzled me, and I believe that there has been a later development that members opposite should start to consider. In a recent New South Wales by-election, a massive swing of about 10 per cent against the Liberal Party occurred in a seat formerly held by the then Premier of that State. We must consider how much of that swing was against the Federal Liberal Government. I believe it was a substantial amount.

Another poll taken recently showed the deterioration of the Prime Minister's popularity and the increased popularity of the Labor Leader. Clearly, people are realising that they have been badly misled. I think that the community has woken up to Fraser. Frankly, he has woken up to himself, so I cannot understand why members opposite continue to support his present economic philosophy. In an interview with Laurie Oakes, on 27 July, the Prime Minister made certain comments. The report of the interview states:

It soon became apparent that Mr. Fraser's somewhat sombre mood was due to more than a backache. He revealed that last month's overseas trip, which took him to the United States, Britain, and several European capitals, and made him quite pessimistic about economic prospects for Australia and the world. That trip, he said, "brought home to me more than anything else that we are in for long, continued difficulties". Representatives of British industry were predicting a substantial rise in unemployment over the next six or nine months. "The Government has given a great deal of attention to these particular problems and remains very firmly of the view that there are no short-term solutions. There are no easy answers. I think a number of things have happened. We have got less assistance from overseas trade than we thought. There is less growth in the world economy than one might have expected a year ago."

The Prime Minister himself is admitting that, although before the last election it was easy to say that, if a Federal Liberal Government was returned, confidence would be restored while unemployment and inflation would go away, that will not happen. If the Opposition in this House continues to support him blindly, it will collapse when he collapses.

I suppose the member for Hanson has noticed the difficulties his Party is getting into by supporting the Federal Liberal Government, and he made some attempt to justify his actions in relation to unemployment. He indicated that he had sent telegrams complaining about the proposed television licence increases and other matters. He tells us of his great concern about people who visit his office, so why does he not send telegrams to the Prime Minister asking for funds to be released in areas where these people can be employed? Why not ask the Prime Minister to undertake the policies of the former Federal Labor Government by providing unemployment relief schemes so that there would be work for these people? Why not ask the Prime Minister to make available for the housing industry, health, and education, reasonable amounts of money to employ these people? He is silent about such actions. He is prepared to send telegrams about television licences and to sympathise with people coming to his office who cannot find work, but

what does he do about it? I challenge him to send telegrams in the light of what I have said.

Community feeling is running steadily against the Federal Government. Over the years, people have become accustomed to credit squeezes. We have gone through periods, on about four occasions in the past 10 years, of up to a year where we have had recessions, where the economy has run down, and where people have been out of work for short periods. The situation has changed dramatically and people are now realising that the economic experts throughout the world, and particularly in Australia, are saying that things are different.

We are going through a world economic crisis that will leave Australia with 500 000 to 1 000 000 people permanently out of work. We will be unable to find jobs for them to produce goods if we do not have markets. We may be faced with a constant situation of unemployment, no longer a passing phase. I shall refer briefly to an article in the most recent edition of *Saturday Review*, under the heading, "Focus on unemployment—A world shortage of work", as follows:

In the world's largest trading bloc there is only one really pressing current shortage . . . work. Europe has an unemployment problem of massive proportions—about 6 000 000 or 6 per cent of the work force registered as unemployed and no-one has yet discovered a way to beat it. The future looks bleak. In Britain the pessimists forecast that the present 1 500 000—or 6.5 per cent of the work force—on the dole will rise inexorably towards 5 000 000 or 6 000 000 by the middle of the next decade. Industrial forecasting pundits suggest that whole sections of our present wasteful style of life will have to go—with or without its agreement—simply because Earth will lose the capacity to support our present system.

But it is not only shortages which toll doleful bells for our future prosperity. The invention and the explosive development of the silicon chip is considered by eminent brains to be of even greater significance to the world than was the industrial revolution in Britain. In many industries machines using such mini-electronic brains could wipe out literally millions of jobs.

The article indicates that France has an unemployment rate of 4.7 per cent, West Germany 4 per cent, Italy 6 per cent, Japan 2.2 per cent, United States of America 6.1 per cent, and Britain 6.5 per cent. It is clear that the article supports what I am saying and what other people are saying: technological changes and computers, instead of being a great boon to mankind, have created a situation in which we cannot employ the number of people we wish to employ in the community.

I suppose we could tackle the situation to some extent as the Federal Whitlam Labor Government did by attempting to stimulate the economy, providing for unemployment relief schemes, and placing people in employment. However, the problem is too big for such short-term solutions. We must look at what we will be doing between now and the end of the century. We have to accept that 500 000 people will be permanently out of work or we have to find some other solution. It suits the Opposition and the Federal Liberal Government to say that, as long as we can get by, we can live with that number of unemployed. We cannot do so, because of the tremendous social difficulties involved for so many people, particularly the young people in our community.

We have to consider seriously the introduction of a 35-hour week, so that we provide 40 people with work for 35 hours rather than providing 35 people with a 40-hour week. We have to consider earlier retirement for some people, and we have to consider keeping people at school for longer than we do at present. Perhaps this suggestion

will not work, but we must face the fact that such proposals will have to be introduced. I should like to think that Liberals throughout Australia would join with the trade union movement, the A.C.T.U., to see whether or not such proposals are workable, because they would be difficult to introduce.

Only over a period can it be done. If what I have said is accepted as being accurate (that we will have the level of unemployment to which I have referred), we need to look at it immediately. To my surprise, Sir Norman Young, who would not be a strong Labor Party supporter, agrees with what I have said on this matter. In his William Queale Memorial Lecture, Sir Norman said many things with which I do not agree, but I agree with his conclusions, as follows:

But even if inflation is brought under control, we will still have to deal with the question of how we are going to provide conventional employment for all who are able and want to work; and with the question of how we are going to restore a respect for law and order. The answers to those two questions will also have a distinct bearing on whether the private enterprise system will be needed in the social order of the future.

As Galbraith points out in *The Affluent Society*, "The need to provide jobs requires us to face the unhappy choice either of having the economy constantly under inflationary strain, or consigning some part of the workforce to joblessness and inferior income."

It is a widely held view that idleness, or being unemployed, is a "species of fraud upon the community"—a view that surely must be difficult to sustain if those who want to work (like most of our recent and prospective school leavers) are denied the right to do so because society cannot offer them a job.

To meet this extremely serious social problem the conventional answer requires the central Government to stimulate economic activity and for those engaged in private business operations to fabricate a demand for, and to produce an increased volume of, merchandise that, in many instances, will provide the purchaser with neither satisfaction nor utility. This procedure, at best, can provide some measure of employment assistance for a limited period. In the end it is self-defeating.

It is in relation to this particular issue that our conventional attitudes and policies need to be re-examined.

If affluence and modern technology have brought us to a state when we no longer need the available workforce to satisfy our production requirements, then, clearly, we should be doing something about shortening prescribed working hours, retiring people at an earlier age, providing training courses that will give employees a range of skills that will fit them for alternative employment, and, of the greatest importance, using our educational system to enable the individual members of society, from childhood, through to advanced adulthood, to develop interests that will give greater meaning and satisfaction to their increased hours of leisure.

I commend that address to all members. Clearly, Sir Norman Young is advocating the same philosophy that I am advocating in relation to the problems of the unemployed now and in the future. Commissioner Lean, on his retirement, recently indicated that he believed that the 35-hour week would come before the end of the century. The sooner it comes the better, if it can solve the problems of our unemployed. The cost of implementing a 35-hour week could be substantially met from the amount of unemployment relief payments currently being made. If at present we have 500 000 people out of work, we are paying \$1.8 billion a year in unemployment relief. This would go a long way toward offsetting the cost of a shorter

working week. If those people were working and if the relevant sum were to go back to the Federal Government in the form of direct or indirect tax, we would be looking at a total benefit to the Federal Government of about \$3 billion a year.

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

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** As I have said, unemployment is a serious problem for the community. It will not go away of its own accord. Unless policies are adopted that look to the future and ensure that everyone who wants work is able to work, there will be great difficulties for the total community. I have suggested that we need to consider a 35-hour working week, earlier retirement and an extension of our education system to ensure that more people stay at school for a longer period. Tremendous sums are currently being virtually wasted by being paid directly to the unemployed with no gain for the future. Those payments amount to \$1.800 000 000 annually. If unemployed people were working, the Government would not have to pay out such a sum, and significant sums in direct and indirect taxes would flow back to the Federal Government. That would go a long way towards subsidising industry in its implementation of a 35-hour week.

I suggest to Opposition members that they consider what I have to say because, if I am right, and they continue simply to mouth the policies of the Federal Liberal Government, we will be that much later in introducing the reforms I have advocated. It was significant that the member for Mitcham, who has no axe to grind in this matter, was able to concede the point being made by Government members, that the Opposition was simply refusing to accept the difficulties caused by unemployment and was hoping that those difficulties would merely go away. He thought that their short-sighted view would cause great difficulty.

The only real proposition we have heard in respect of overcoming the difficulties of the State's finances, together with unemployment in this State, came from the Leader of the Opposition, who has suggested publicly that he could save \$40 000 000 annually for South Australia by not sacking public servants (he makes that point clear) but by merely not replacing those public servants who leave their employment.

If this is the only form of suggestion coming from the Opposition, the community has little to hope for regarding support for any useful suggestions from the State Government to the Federal Government. It is useless to talk of saving money by ensuring that another 3 per cent of State public servants are unemployed and are unable to obtain work. This will simply not do, yet it is the only suggestion from the Opposition in relation to these problems.

Finally, I noted with much surprise the other evening the touchiness of the Leader of the Opposition, who leapt to his feet after a Government member had criticised him for knocking the State. Obviously, the Leader has been getting the same message that all Government members have been getting over the past five years. People have come to us saying, "What is wrong with the Leader of the Opposition? He never offers any constructive criticism. He is always knocking the State and never agrees with any useful ideas advanced by the Government. He just opposes the Government merely for the sake of opposing, and knocks the State completely."

I was stunned to see his reaction last week, and I gather

that the message is starting to filter back to him through his own Party. I believe that the Leader has adopted this attitude because of the statements made by his two serious rivals on the other side of the Chamber, the Deputy Leader and the member for Davenport, who has also adopted that tactic. I do not think either of them would be any better.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** What about the member for Alexandra?

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** He would hardly be a challenge. The comparisons that we ought to make—

**Mr. Whitten:** What about the member for Mount Gambier?

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** No, I have not listed him as a challenger. The previous Leader of the Opposition (the member for Light) and the member for Mallee and the member for Hanson, if they believe they are right, are willing to attack the Government and make suggestions where legislation or other action should be adopted.

**Mr. Whitten:** On a constructive basis.

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Yes. The Leader of the Opposition should take a leaf out of their book, so that he would not have to be so touchy on this subject. Fortunately, it now seems that he is starting to realise the position, and I look forward to hearing more constructive suggestions from him rather than his continually knocking attitude.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion, because it is the traditional thing to do. Several comments were made by the Governor in his Speech, and I will refer to them in turn.

First, I add my sympathies to those of other honourable members to the family of the late Frank Potter, the former President of the Legislative Council. Although I did not know Frank well, I certainly had the highest respect for him, and my condolences go to his family.

One prime matter to which the Governor addressed himself in his Speech concerned the rural scene and how it had vastly improved since the first week of June. It is significant that this aspect is among one of the first matters dealt with in the Speech because, at least, it acknowledges that South Australia still largely depends on rural industries.

I have noted in my time in this House that this matter has always been one of the early comments by the Governor in his Speech, saying that the rural scene is either in a good or bad position. I think the break in the season has brought with it a new air of confidence among rural people. Certainly, I was most pleased to see that break, because the real tragedies of the rural situation were just starting to happen. Farmers, who had been farmers for all their working life, had suffered three or more years of disastrous seasons and harvests. Their income was virtually nil. They had been able to carry on this far, but they were getting to the point of no return. In the last few weeks of May and in the first part of June the really serious problems were starting to develop. Indeed, I shudder to think of what the consequences might have been had we had another dry year following the succession of dry years that we had had. That succession of dry years was seriously compounded in so many areas, particularly in my district, through two seasons of rust damage to the crops and the resultant poor harvest returns.

I refer to the wide publicity given to my district late last year and in the early part of this year, about Eyre Peninsula being another desert. If anyone was to be condemned, it was the person who made that comment. Certainly, at a time when primary producers were at an

all-time low, when their morale was down, the last thing they needed was a kick in the gut, if I can use that crude expression. They were in dire straits, but it was through no fault of their own. There had been a succession of dry years, and no-one can control when we have rain. Therefore, for a professor to fly over the area in an aircraft and make a judgment, casting aspersions on such an area, was utterly degrading. The gentleman concerned is to be condemned.

I am pleased to say that that so-called Eyre desert that was referred to is now a very prosperous area. It is looking lush this season; the feed is great. I would say 90 per cent of the peninsula can look forward to a harvest well above average; there are good prospects of crop returns. I see that some of the grain-producing organisations are predicting that Eyre Peninsula could produce up to 50 per cent of the State's grain for this coming harvest. For a desert to come forward, in a few short weeks since the first week in June, to an area that can produce 50 per cent of the State's grain, is an effort to be commended. The commendation must go to those landholders who have been living on that land. They know how to farm it and to get it back into production, and create a farming enterprise of which the State should be proud.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Who made the statement about a desert?

**Mr. BLACKER:** Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** What would he know about it?

**Mr. BLACKER:** That is an extremely good question. He flew over it in an aircraft. He made sweeping predictions in headline news about Eyre Peninsula being an Eyre desert. The gentleman concerned is to be condemned. I believe he should go back now and look at the areas concerned, see how they have progressed, and now make a judgment. I am sure he would be somewhat surprised.

However, there are far more serious matters to talk about. Unemployment is without a doubt the most serious problem facing this State, and is not a short-term problem, but a long-lasting one. It has to be approached with a new outlook and new ideas, because the situation is now changing and traditional employment opportunities are changing. We need not only a re-education programme but also a completely new set-up that can be skillfully adapted to meet the changing situation. There has been much accusation from both sides of the House about the people responsible for this. The Federal Government has come in for much criticism. I note that in His Excellency's Speech on 24 occasions the Federal Government has been mentioned, and aspersions have been cast on it about the bad things it has been said to be doing.

Equally, it could be said that His Excellency's Speech does not indicate any real effort by the State Government to assist in a programme. If has found someone to blame, but it has done practically nothing to assist on its own behalf.

**Mr. Hemmings:** What about the State Unemployment Relief Scheme?

**Mr. BLACKER:** Paragraph 5 of the Speech refers to SURS, and I intended to praise it later. I will do so now. It played a valuable part in relieving the unemployment problem for certain citizens in our community. The part it played and its value is now in jeopardy because of the actions of the State Government. I wish to bring to the attention of the House the anomaly that has arisen. Last financial year the State Government appropriated \$22 000 000 for the purpose of the scheme. It has now reduced that to \$7 000 000, which in effect means that there has been a reduction of \$15 000 000 in the scheme. If we consider how insignificant that \$15 000 000 is in

relation to State-wide finances, we can then cast the stone back into the court of the Government and ask just what it is doing. That sum of \$15 000 000 is in fact only 1.3 per cent of the State's finances; that is all. The State Government could easily maintain that \$22 000 000 or increase the sum available, and it could satisfactorily explain to the people of South Australia why that 1 per cent or 2 per cent has been increased. For the State Government to blame the Federal Government and reduce that sum is playing politics with the unemployed to the lowest degree, and the Government is to be condemned for doing that.

The member for Stuart, when talking about unemployment, mentioned the 40 per cent investment allowance made available to primary producers and to some businesses. He said:

We have a paradox in the Federal Government's present policies: it provides a 40 per cent subsidy for businesses to buy new equipment, but businesses are using that 40 per cent to buy labour-saving equipment. The result of that 40 per cent subsidy is an increase in unemployment.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I am referring not to the unemployment aspect, but to the reason why the 40 per cent investment allowance was created. It was not created to assist primary producers or businesses; it was created to get the machinery manufacturers back into business. They had stockpiles of equipment lying around their yards in Adelaide. Members would know how much agricultural machinery was lying around Adelaide; it could not be moved; nobody was buying it. There were no sales, and manufacturers were faced with getting out of business altogether unless the Government did something to create a market. The creation of a 40 per cent investment allowance resulted in a greater use of that money. First, it enabled the machinery manufacturer to maintain full production again. It allowed all the retailing outlets, the servicing groups, the primary producers, and the end users to get back into business. Therefore, in one move the 40 per cent investment allowance helped five or six industries in this State. It did a worthwhile job. Yet the member for Stuart said it was only done to increase unemployment. He must be condemned for saying that, and he should be corrected for the way in which he went about it.

Unemployment is the greatest problem facing this nation. Unemployment statistics have traditionally been a significant economic indicator, and rightly so. Not only do they give some indication of the strength or weakness of the economy but they also reflect a degree of human suffering which no government can afford to ignore, if only on grounds of political expediency. Traditionally, a substantial rise in unemployment has been enough to bring down governments. Yet we have recently been through a general election where rising unemployment completely failed to earn the sympathy of the voters. Why?

One area worth investigating lies in the significant change in attitude throughout the whole community towards unemployment. Social welfare benefits are now such that the nightmare possibility of utter poverty and destitution is no longer the alternative to holding down a job. We should not be surprised if the community feels less concern for the suffering of the unemployed when a Government has assumed the responsibility of providing at least the minimum material requirements for existence. Changing attitudes have also affected the unemployed themselves. With a lessening of the social stigma attached to being jobless, coupled with the relatively high level of social welfare benefits, there must inevitably be less incentive to find work.

Most economists have come to regard the figure of up to 4 per cent unemployed as acceptable in economic

conditions of full employment, but perhaps the changing attitudes among the unemployed themselves should lead us to revise this arbitrary figure upwards. If the result of last December's election is any guide, then the community would seem to be prepared to accept 6 per cent unemployment.

Be that as it may, the solution to the problem of material hardship among the unemployed has spawned other problems with which we need to concern ourselves. A major problem is the psychological effect on young people of going straight from school on to the dole. There is a case, and a very strong case, for instituting short-term schemes for employing young people which are not necessarily to the immediate advantage of the economy. From a purely economic point of view this can be supported as an investment in the future. We should do all in our power to discourage the emergence of a large minority of embittered or anti-social youngsters entering the adult community and, as a result, being disinclined to contribute to the productivity of the nation in the course of time.

Of course, for the long-term, we should be identifying the causes of youth unemployment and eliminating them in order to ensure that it does not become a permanent feature of our society. In this respect the following figures are most revealing: the percentage of unemployed in the 15-19 age group at May 1974 was 4.2 per cent; at May 1975 it was 10.0 per cent; at May 1976 it was 12.1 per cent; and at May 1977 it was 15.3 per cent.

The Labor Party has tried hard to persuade people that the present rise in unemployment is the fault of the Government, but, prior to 1974, the number of young people unemployed by May each year was about 3 or 4 per cent. It is clear from the above figures that our current problems date from the 1974 wage explosion initiated in the Whitlam era that have been exacerbated by plateau indexation decisions which have further reduced wage relativities. There can be no long-term solution to youth unemployment until reasonable wage relativities are restructured.

Another problem which is bewildering the public is the difficulty of determining the figures for those who are "genuinely" unemployed—those who really do want work but through no fault of their own cannot find work. These are the people who deserve our attention and the urgency of their plight is obscured by the swelling of the unemployment figures by others who are not genuinely in this category.

The community knows this and it is not surprising if a general feeling of antipathy towards the unemployed is engendered as a result. We do the genuinely unemployed a disservice by allowing this feeling to go on. Using the figures from the Bureau of Statistics rather than the Commonwealth Employment Service—a move to be commended—may reduce the "official" unemployment level, but it does nothing to solve the problem.

Much as we deplore the attitude of the "dole-bludgers" they are not necessarily law-breakers. Among them, however, are those who criminally abuse the system, and the unemployment figures could be significantly deflated by making a concerted effort to expose them. Rarely are such people brought to trial. So complacent have we become that stories are rife of individuals who openly declare their fraudulent activities in general conversation. It is no wonder that surveys show that companies offer less than half of their employment vacancies to the Commonwealth Employment Service. There can hardly be an employment officer in the country who has not, more than once, interviewed a C.E.S. candidate for a job and been advised that he is there only for the formality of

claiming the dole. "It supplements very nicely what I'm doing on the side, thank you very much", is the usual comment.

Such people, besides those who are abusing the system by other means like using false names to claim more than one payment, are criminally embezzling public funds, and the Government is strongly urged to tackle the problem by instituting much stiffer penalties. Current penalties are ludicrous and they hardly warrant taking action. At the very least, offenders should be required to pay back the amount embezzled in addition to a fine. Where other offences call for prison terms, it would be more appropriate for these offenders to be required to serve usefully the community they have cheated. The genuinely unemployed are victims of changing attitudes and they deserve a better deal from society.

Among the numerous schemes operating in my district is one which has been operating through the Further Education Department and which has been most effective. Of all the schemes instituted, all with the best intentions, this scheme has come up with some results and has actually put people back into the work force. It has given people an ambition to continue and has given them something effective to do. I commend the Further Education Department scheme. I have personally spoken to the Minister about the scheme in an endeavour to have it continued, but only time will tell whether that is the case. Of the several programmes that have been introduced in the Port Lincoln area this programme is the only one that has achieved some tangible results. It has been under the control of Mrs. Pat Biddle, whose efforts have made this scheme work.

The problems of the unemployed can be attributed to many factors. However, the factor that makes our problem unique is that we are isolated on the southern extremity of Eyre Peninsula and, as a result, have little access to employment opportunities that may arise elsewhere in the State. This isolation creates insurmountable problems for young people born and bred on the peninsula, and they have little ability to re-establish themselves in areas of greater job opportunity.

It is envisaged that, by the end of this calendar year, job opportunities could improve, because industries associated with the land and with fishing are showing good prospects for expansion. For this reason we believe that our young people should be kept in the area, because we firmly believe that job opportunities will arise in parallel with improvement in the rural and fishing industries. We hope that this programme can fulfil interim needs. I again add my support to the Further Education Department's scheme which does work and for which the department is to be commended.

Unemployment in my area has increased, as the figures show. At present it seems that we have 500 young (and I presume that they are under 18 years of age) junior males and junior females, and about 775 adults, who are unemployed. Our problem is great and we must continue to look for ways to solve it.

How do we solve our unemployment problem? If any member could say how that problem could be solved, he would be the greatest politician that ever existed. It is a difficult job. The problem has been brought about because we have lost that relativity between the cost of labour and the production received. It is that relativity that is now creating our problem, coupled with the lack of incentive for would-be employers even to want to employ people. If work is available, every person in this State has the right to work. However, no employer has an obligation to provide work unless he can get something out of it. The only way employers can be encouraged to offer their facilities, be

they factories, farmlands or means of expansion into new areas, is for the employer to cover his expenses for the trouble he takes to employ people.

Rising wages have created a problem. The average wage is now about \$10 800 a year and, in addition, there are ancillary expenses. I believe the ancillary expenses for an office worker amount to about 37 per cent of the wage paid. The ancillary expenses for a farm worker, or a labourer who works with his hands, is about 50 per cent. To engage a person to perform physical labour, the employer has not only to pay his wage of \$11 000 but also an amount of \$5 500 a year for ancillary expenses. That means that, for an employer to employ such a person, he must have a return from the employment of \$16 500, otherwise it is a waste of time employing that person. If the employer cannot get that return from the employee he is not going to be inclined to employ additional labour.

This problem has been the cause of the diminishing job opportunities in this State, because employers are not inclined to expand: they do not want to put on extra staff, because there is no incentive for them to do so. Until such time as there is an incentive, the problem is not going to be solved.

On 17 June 1978 an article appeared in the Saturday Review section of the *Advertiser* entitled "Please, sir, I want a job." I do not intend to quote from that article, but I recommend that any person listening to, or reading my remarks read that article. The article is compiled as though by a year-11 student who is going out into the work force. It gives examples of how he can "rip off" an employer. It lists the additional costs and handicaps the employer is obliged to pay for, and lists all the abuses that the employee can impose on his employer. Any potential employer, who read this article at a time when he had intended to employ further staff, would change his mind.

**Mr. Klunder:** He was the result of a brilliant education system; an excellent letter, well styled and well written!

**Mr. BLACKER:** I doubt whether this article was written by a year-11 student. I think the whole context of the article is accurate, and it must hit home to every employer. It must, also, be of some concern to the Government.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Do you know who wrote the letter?

**Mr. BLACKER:** I have no idea.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I will tell you privately later because I know.

**Mr. BLACKER:** It was a reprint from the *Journal of Industry*, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry's paper in this State. That article is of significance and tells some hard-line truths about the employment situation.

Another matter that concerns me relates to small businesses. Small business people are predominant in our community. In my district 39.1 per cent of male voters are either self-employed or employers. That means that only 60 per cent of male voters, that is persons over the age of 18 years, work as employees. With a high content of employers and self-employed, there must be a greater opportunity to absorb the unemployed in my district. I think it is fair to say that if we examine our respective State districts, we can see a similar pattern. Those districts with a high proportion of self-employed and employers have a smaller number of unemployed.

During the previous sitting of Parliament I asked the Deputy Premier whether the Government would consider giving direct grants under the Drought Aid Assistance Scheme to country businesses, in much the same way as grants are made to primary producers. As the House rose before the reply was given, I received a written reply from the Premier which concluded as follows:

No assistance is currently provided direct to businesses in

drought affected towns, but a survey conducted by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department recently showed that businesses in such areas are not being badly affected by the down-turn in farm income because drought carry-on loans enable farmers in those areas to maintain near-normal business activity.

I do not think there is one member who would agree with that reply. While the payment of drought carry-on loans may have assisted slightly in some areas, in no way did it allow business people in those towns to escape unscathed. Businesses in drought-affected areas were seriously affected and in many cases were almost pushed to the wall and some were unable to continue. I think it was foolish of the Premier to make such a sweeping statement. I showed that reply to many people in business houses in my district, and I must point out that the Premier's remarks were not warmly received.

When considering the unemployment problem, we should examine it in a definitive manner. By that I mean that we should define where the real problems of unemployment lie and what are the categories of unemployment. I quote from an explanation given by the Department of Labour about seven years ago. Although this is obviously out of date, I think the principles outlined still apply. At that time unemployment was divided into five categories. First, frictional unemployment; that was people moving from job to job. People doing that were finding that it was not easy to get their next job.

By way of explanation, I attended a meeting designed to bring the unemployment problem to the attention of the local community, and one of the chief stirrers about that matter was a person in that category. Both he and his wife had good, sound jobs, but two years ago decided to go on a round-Australia trip. They both gave up their jobs, in which they probably would have been secure for life, and went on their trip. When they returned, they could not understand why jobs were not readily available to them. I think there is a lesson to be learnt from that: if people have a sound and secure job, they should hang on to it and treat it with respect.

The second category was structural unemployment. This referred to people who were unable to adjust to existing patterns of demand for labour. An example of that is young people who lacked the skill and experience to get a job. The third category was hard-core unemployment. There were people who found it difficult to get into a job and stay in it even during times of high employment. These were people who suffered physical, emotional or psychological problems.

The next category was seasonal employment, relating to people doing work such as fruit-picking and shearing. The next was technological unemployment, consisting of many people who were put off work because of changes in production processes and who needed retraining in order to be employed again. Of the five categories, we hear most about technological unemployment. Another two categories could be added: one would be that category of unemployed people who are not inclined to accept their responsibilities in society, but who are only too happy to accept unemployment benefits and to live off society. Generally speaking, that is what they are doing. They are doing nicely, and getting a reasonable cheque, which they put together with the cheques of a few friends. They have no incentive to go and look for work or to make themselves productive again within society.

Then we have the unemployable section of people who, in many cases, through no fault of their own cannot get a job, and who certainly are not a proposition for any potential employer to employ. When considering the whole unemployment problem, we should look at the

responsibility of some of our unions and our employers. Perhaps there are potential employers who could make more jobs available. As I mentioned previously, they must have the incentive to do that, either by way of increased production or a growing capital investment.

Recently, Samcor has come to some arrangement with the respective unions, which is to result in increased productivity. This situation is to be commended, and I think that it shows a responsible attitude by the unions. They saw their own industry and livelihoods at stake, and could see that, if they continued in the way in which they were working, Samcor would soon be finished, their jobs would be finished, and they would be unemployed. As a result, they decided to make some effort to compromise.

**Mr. Nankivell:** They had the advantage of being principally members of a single union.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Yes, and the union allowed reasonable negotiations to take place without in-fighting among the unions. The union in this case is to be commended. If we could get other unions in other industries at least to make some attempt to increase productivity within their work, I am sure that they would be better off.

Samcor and A.M.I.E.U. offered a 15 per cent increase in productivity. How they did it, I do not know, but obviously they have the physical ability to be able to obtain the 15 per cent increase. The workers and

management have come up with a reasonable compromise, and I hope that they will be able to save their jobs as a result. I cite Samcor as an example to the community, and I hope that other unions and unionists will see the error of their ways and will act to protect their jobs, because the problem will not improve. Employers are tending to become more mechanised, if possible. If it is a matter of operating a machine, they have fewer problems than they have if working entirely with a staff. This arrangement should be repeated time and time again.

During his speech the member for Stuart, to whom I have already referred once, said that Labor-held seats have a higher unemployment problem than do the non-Labor-held seats, and I think that there is an explanation for that. As I mentioned previously, my district has a 39.1 per cent component of employer and self-employed. I have statistics on this matter, and I have arranged the districts in order of the Labor vote; in other words, I have gone from the strongest Labor-held seat to the lowest Labor component.

I believe that from those figures we can get a clear indication of where the Labor vote is; not only that, but one of the key reasons why Labor-held seats have a higher degree of unemployment than do non-Labor seats. As the material is purely statistical, I seek leave to have the statistics inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### ATTRIBUTES OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ELECTORATES

The following data are drawn from the 1971 census and analysed in terms of the 1976 redistribution. The data should be read with one major point in mind: the socio-economic data are from the 1971 census, and hence are six years old. In electorates which are changing in population such data could be out of date.

Electorate	Two-Party vote A.L.P. %	Male work force	Male work force	Male work force
		over the age of 18 involved in agriculture %	over the age of 18—employer and self-employed %	over the age of 18, and education qualification degrees %
Spence	77.20	0.4	6.7	0.8
Stuart	73.92	4.0	8.9	1.7
Whyalla	73.20	0.5	5.8	2.0
Elizabeth	72.35	0.6	4.8	1.8
Semaphore	72.19	0.5	5.9	1.2
Ross Smith	72.16	0.3	6.1	1.3
Napier	72.95	3.2	5.9	1.5
Salisbury	69.50	3.2	8.5	1.0
Price	69.39	0.6	4.2	1.3
Peake	67.42	0.7	8.3	2.0
Playford	67.03	0.8	7.0	1.0
Florey	67.03	0.3	6.2	1.3
Baudin	66.70	1.1	8.7	1.6
Adelaide	66.21	0.6	8.2	2.7
Albert Park	64.12	0.3	6.0	4.7
Gilles	62.80	0.6	10.0	3.2
Ascot Park	62.50	0.5	8.0	2.4
Mitchell	61.40	0.5	8.5	2.7
Hartley	60.44	1.0	11.2	2.6
Norwood	60.23	0.5	9.9	6.5
Unley	60.06	0.5	9.2	5.1
Newland	59.81	1.5	9.2	2.4
Henley Beach	59.34	1.6	10.5	2.3
Brighton	58.07	0.5	9.5	3.1
Todd	56.51	1.9	10.7	3.2
Mawson	56.47	1.4	10.0	2.1
Morphett	50.35	0.4	9.9	3.7
Coles	48.61	2.0	13.2	5.5
Mount Gambier	48.57	20.8	20.6	1.7
Torrens	47.50	1.0	12.3	12.4
Hanson	44.59	0.9	11.4	4.9

Electorate	Two-Party vote	Male work force	Male work force	Male work force
	A.L.P. %	over the age of 18 involved in agriculture %	over the age of 18—employer and self-employed %	over the age of 18, and education qualification degrees %
Eyre .....	44.07	20.9	19.3	2.1
Rocky River .....	41.78	33.8	35.8	1.3
Glenelg .....	40.54	0.5	11.5	6.3
Chaffey .....	40.36	39.1	31.2	1.4
Murray .....	39.97	24.8	26.2	1.6
Fisher .....	39.57	2.9	13.2	9.9
Light .....	39.34	31.9	32.3	1.8
Mitcham .....	38.82	0.9	12.8	11.0
Bragg .....	34.72	1.1	14.0	13.9
Victoria .....	34.66	37.9	32.7	1.7
Kavel .....	31.25	29.9	29.5	2.3
Alexandra .....	31.05	46.1	40.1	1.9
Goyder .....	27.29	51.8	47.4	0.9
Mallee .....	27.15	55.2	44.0	0.9
Flinders .....	25.76	41.6	39.1	1.3
Davenport .....	25.82	1.9	16.8	18.1

Note: The two-Party vote is taken from the 1977 House of Assembly elections and, in most cases, is the actual figure. In electorates where there were more than three candidates estimates have been given which take into account the likely drift of preferences from eliminated candidates.

**Mr. BLACKER:** The statistics clearly indicate where the non-Labor efforts are more effective than are the Labor efforts, and vice versa, and give a clear indication of the work force opportunities and the ability to be able to win votes in those respective areas.

About a week ago, the member for Coles, in a grievance debate, referred to the situation as she found it to be of people leaving the State. The situation to which she referred related basically to the metropolitan area, and to the number of estate agents who had spoken to her who were concerned that people were leaving the State. One has only to look in the real estate pages of newspapers to see that many homes are being sold and, what is more to the point, probably the lowering of the values of houses. Many houses are available at relatively cheap prices. I say "relatively cheap" thinking in terms of the past 12 or 18 months house sales.

I add to that, not from my experience of the metropolitan drift of people moving out of the State, but of people involved in agriculture and fishing who are no longer inclined to stay in South Australia but who are only too pleased to get out. Some of my friends have actually left the State, and I can think of three immediately who have left in the past six months. There must be dozens who have gone. I know that Queensland has been much the better for it. The western part of New South Wales has benefited, and many farmers have moved to Western Australia, because they were sick and tired of the restrictions that continually applied on the South Australian scene.

In the fishing industry, the drift is probably even more marked, because fishermen can pick up their assets and move. Their shore-based activities tying them to a specific port are limited. Last week, I asked the Premier what the Government was doing to encourage members of the trawling industry to remain in South Australia. This is a real problem. Fourteen trawlers operate out of Portland, Victoria, in or near South Australian waters. Most of the fish come from South Australian off-shore waters but, because of the lack of port facilities, those fish, and the processing of them, are lost to South Australia.

What concerns me most is what is to happen to the trawling grounds in the Great Australian Bight. There is a

potential of thousands of tonnes of fish that could be processed in South Australia, principally at Port Lincoln. We have large vessels that could be provisioned and refuelled in South Australia, if not at Port Lincoln, but, from the fishing ground within the 200-mile limit in the Great Australian Bight, it is just as easy to go to Albany in Western Australia as it is to come back to South Australia. It is simply a matter of pointing the ship in that direction. There is no reason why the fishermen should come back to South Australia. With the Western Australian Government offering all sorts of incentives to go to its area, how are we to keep our trawling fleet in South Australia? This State must consider the matter well and quickly.

Trawlers are getting larger. A \$1 000 000 vessel has been built at Port Adelaide and is about to be commissioned. That vessel will be operating out of Portland, although we have had the benefit of its being built here. What other tangible benefits have we had from it? If that vessel were landing its catch in South Australia, we would have potentially more opportunities for employment. The trawlers catch fish by the hundreds of tonnes, not just by a few baskets or crates.

Recently, I spoke to a fisherman, one of those who is leaving South Australia. He makes no bones about it. He says, "Why should I hang around in this place where you are always protecting your back? Why is it that in other places when you go to the Fisheries Department they ask how they can help?" In South Australia they say "No, what do you want?" That is an indication of the attitude of departments in the respective States. I am referring to Western Australia and Victoria, although the specific instance I have just mentioned related to the Fiji Government.

One of our local fishermen is off to Fiji in a few months. He is sick of the restrictions applied by this Government, and his is not an isolated case. That gentleman named for me several fishermen who are considering doing the same thing, although most were considering going to Western Australia, not to Fiji, as he was. It is a trend that the Government must examine. We have not got port facilities. We could make do with processing facilities, as I believe there are facilities that could be renovated or



adapted to cater for the trawling industry, but port facilities are virtually non-existent. If we do not act quickly, these fishermen will be lost; once they are lost, they will take some getting back.

**Mr. Arnold:** Didn't Raptis go to Queensland?

**Mr. BLACKER:** The Raptis organisation has shifted a large part of its fishing fleet to Korumba, and established a large processing factory. Much of the fish processed in South Australia is road freighted from Korumba, Queensland, and one must ask how long they will continue to road freight prawns over such a great distance.

The member for Alexandra referred to certain aspects of the fishing industry. A few weeks ago the Agriculture and Fisheries Department circularised 259 fishermen, some of whom were B-class and some A-class fishermen, endeavouring to clarify the Government's records on those fishermen. Obviously, some of those circularised were genuine B-class fishermen and had a right to remain so, while others obviously were A-class and had a right to remain so. Within that 259, there is a group of fishermen who were not, under the Fisheries Act, entitled to either an A or B-class licence. As a result of the "show cause" letter, each of the 259 was asked to give a reason for being allowed to continue to hold such a licence.

I believe that there is need for the Government to clarify its records on the fishing industry but, following the remarks of the member for Alexandra, I am concerned that the Minister gave Ministerial permits for a selected handful. I do not know the criteria for the selection of these people or why anyone should have been picked out from the list, but some were given exemption. That fact nullifies the efforts of the department, and brings the whole exercise into jeopardy.

I am concerned, because I have had one fisherman—and I speak for that one fisherman—who endeavoured to do the right thing by the department, by himself, and by me. This time he came to me and I liaised with the department. As a result, he gave up his job, as suggested by the department, on the understanding that he would be given an A-class licence. At this stage, I have no reason to suggest that that might not be carried through, and I hope it will be. I raise the matter only because, if at some later stage I have to do so, I can say that I raised it on behalf of this constituent.

The fact that the Minister gave a list of persons who were allowed to continue to fish places the whole scheme in jeopardy. If the Minister has given a list of some sort, I believe that all fishermen should be allowed to continue until the determination is made. The whole problem concerns me, because it could put the scheme in jeopardy. The fishing industry is in accord with the "show cause" letters going ahead, and it is in accord that those who should not be fishing should be taken out of the industry. I would prefer to see the natural decline taking place, taking effect over a longer period, without too many people being hurt. This time some people could well be hurt.

At the end of the previous session, the live sheep issue was raised. I am certain that that issue is not yet settled, and may be raised again. I reiterate my support for the continuance of the trade in heavyweight export wethers. When that trade commenced, such sheep had no value, and, generally, they were referred to as boners. No-one could get rid of them. When the trade first started, \$2 or \$2.50 was the going price. When the Kuwait trade commenced, the going price for that type of sheep, which is not a type of sheep or mutton used in this State, rose to \$6. The figures have dramatically changed since the commencement of that scheme, and the increase from \$2.50 to \$6 has been of immense value to the primary producer, who is getting rid of a class of sheep that is of no

value to South Australians.

This problem has compounded inasmuch as, since the commencement of the scheme in 1972-73, 890 000 sheep actually left Australia's shores for \$9 200 000. In 1976-77, 3 200 000 sheep left Australia's shores for \$46 300 000. In 1972-73, 15 700 tonnes of processed mutton left for Middle East countries (the same market areas as those to which the live sheep were sent) for \$9 600 000, about the same value as the value of the live sheep exports. In 1976-77, 70 000 tonnes of processed mutton was exported to the Middle East for \$62 900 000, as against \$46 300 000 received for live sheep exported to the Middle East. So, in that four-year period exports of processed mutton increased from 15 700 tonnes to 70 000 tonnes. If the live sheep trade is stopped or hampered, it means that exports of 70 000 tonnes of mutton will be lost, with a resultant loss of work for meat trade employees.

I ask the unions to consider that, if they stop the live sheep trade, they are also stopping the export of 70 000 tonnes of processed mutton to the Middle East. The Middle East will not buy our frozen mutton if we do not sell them live sheep; it is a package deal. They say, "We will take a certain quantity of frozen mutton if you will sell us so many live sheep." It is a take-it-or-leave-it situation. The Middle East frozen meat market will be the most valuable market in the world. Over four years it has increased fourfold, and there is no reason why it will not continue to expand at that rate, and we will see a drift off of the live sheep trade. This trading arrangement has to be continued, because the Middle East countries insist on it. I referred to the subject of bees this afternoon and time will not permit me to deal with the matter again this evening.

I hope the Minister of Transport can reply later to a point I wish to raise in connection with the gross vehicle weight of trucks. A constituent of mine purchased in good faith a truck that he believed to be a Boxer 9 Leyland truck from a constituent in the Murray District. I believe that the agent concerned acted in the best of faith. The truck was registered as a Boxer 9 by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles but, after getting the truck home and endeavouring to register it, my constituent found that the Registrar had made a mistake and, instead of its being a Boxer 9 Leyland, it was in fact a converted Boxer 8. The difference means a great deal to my constituent. The Boxer 9 was a tandem drive cab chassis truck, and it had a load rating on the Registrar's assessment of 18 tonnes. This was the vehicle that my constituent was purchasing but, when he got it home and found that it was a converted Boxer 8, the load rating was four tonnes.

It is ridiculous that a tandem drive truck should be limited to four tonnes carrying capacity. It would be even less, depending on the body put on the truck. My constituent has no recourse. He has gone back to the agent, who acted in good faith. He had the Registrar's figures. Because of a mistake in the Registrar's office, my constituent is caught with it. I will raise the issue again with the Minister in the hope that the Act can be amended to give some recourse so that this anomaly can be rectified. My constituent has been financially embarrassed, because he has a vehicle of no practical use to him. Because the police and the Motor Vehicles Department know about it, he will not be able to use it in the streets without being under notice. I support the motion.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** I, too, support the motion. I congratulate the mover, the member for Morphett, and the seconder, the member for Mawson, on their contributions to the debate. I join with other members in conveying to the relatives of the Hon. Frank Potter, M.L.C., condolences in respect of his sad and sudden

passing.

The Governor's Speech has outlined the Government's legislative programme. Reference has been made to the number of instances in the Speech concerning cut-backs in funding by the Commonwealth Government to the States. No matter how the Opposition views the situation, the cut-backs are taking effect, and the full effects have yet to be felt. The Governor's Speech indicates that these funding restrictions will accentuate difficulties already being experienced in the economy.

The Commonwealth Government has either cut back or announced its intention to cut back in the specific areas of hospitals, school dental schemes, water resources, welfare housing, urban public transport, and community health programmes. Only last week I highlighted one area of cut-backs when I asked that a question be referred to the Minister of Health seeking justification for the Federal Government's decision to withdraw Commonwealth health benefits in connection with medical tests undertaken at the Institute of Fitness Research and Training. Such tests had previously been accepted for the purpose of Commonwealth health benefits, but such benefits are now being refused. The institute has assisted many thousands of South Australians to maintain a level of fitness and wellbeing by a programme of fitness reconditioning. It is imperative that, before commencing a programme, a person should have a medical test to ensure that it is safe for him to undertake the course and to ensure that he can train at a beneficial level.

It is scandalous that the Fraser Government should prejudice the institute's work by withdrawing Commonwealth health benefits in connection with the medical tests. There is little enough done in the community in respect of preventive medicine, and the Federal Government's attitude further restricts the opportunities in this field. The medical tests conducted by the institute include a test of the condition of the heart under pressure, a test of blood fat levels, a blood pressure test and a general medical examination which, if conducted in a private medical practice, would probably cost much more. I trust that the question that I directed to the State Minister of Health will stress the importance of this programme in relation to community health, and I hope that the institute can continue to do its work on behalf of the community.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the Liberals would revise legislation that over-regulates, is unduly restrictive and intrudes unnecessarily on individual freedom. From such comments, one would expect that, if by some remote chance the Liberals came to power, legislation dealing with such matters as consumer protection, builders' licensing, planning and development and other measures passed by this Government would be in danger. The Leader also intends to improve efficiency in Government departments as regards both spending and staffing, to the extent of, I think, 3 per cent or 6 per cent. That is a vague sort of statement. Does the Leader intend to dismiss teaching and ancillary staff, persons employed in the Police Department, nurses in public hospitals, and persons employed in public transport services, etc? In which areas does he intend to cut back by 3 per cent?

In December 1977 the Australian Bureau of Statistics reported that there were about 108 000 South Australian Government employees. Which of those persons does the Leader intend to dismiss? I challenge him to be more specific about the Public Service. The Leader concluded his speech by extolling the virtues of free enterprise. However, if he examines closely the economic system of Australia, he will find that, instead of being really

competitive, Australian industry and commerce is rife with monopoly control and restrictive trade practices. So much for free enterprise!

I refer now to a matter that I dealt with recently in the adjournment debate, that is, the consistent efforts of Opposition members to denigrate South Australia. Last Thursday, the member for Davenport spoke in that debate, or perhaps I should say that he read a prepared statement relating to the South Australian Development Corporation's purchase of shares in Allied Rubber Mills.

The honourable member told us that the State Government had been criticised for involving itself in such a purchase, and for its failure to justify that purchase. However, what the honourable member conveniently forgot to tell the House and the press (I regard his speech as nothing more than a press statement; he read it more or less *verbatim*, and it appeared in the press the following day) was that, before the corporation can become involved in the purchase of shares in a public company or in a Government guarantee, there must first be a recommendation to the Treasurer by the Industries Development Committee, two of whose members are Opposition colleagues of the member for Davenport, namely, the member for Mallee and the Hon. Mr. Geddes, from another place.

Both of those honourable members I regard as people of integrity, and that is more than I can say for the member for Davenport, who deliberately misinterpreted the situation by not stating the full situation and pointing out that the Industries Development Committee must report favourably to the Treasurer before the South Australian Development Corporation can involve itself in the purchase of shares in a company. The decision taken in relation to Allied Rubber Mills was a unanimous decision. We acted on the evidence given to us in what we believed were the best interests of the State. We also acted within the terms of the Industries Development Act. Certainly, I do not intend to make public the reasons for the recommendation made, because I believe it is unethical in this House to air matters that may be prejudicial to South Australian companies and individuals involved in those companies.

Nevertheless, it is sufficient to say that committee members examine every matter before them in terms of what is in the best interests of the State, and we do that under the provisions of the Act. The recommendation regarding Allied Rubber Mills was, as I have already indicated, a unanimous decision, and the member for Mallee and the Hon. Mr. Geddes agreed with that recommendation. Therefore, it ill behoves the member for Davenport to use this House in an endeavour to rubbish the South Australian Development Corporation and to obtain cheap press publicity.

Having referred to the Federal funding of health programmes and the effect that these cut-backs will have on State finances and the people needing such services, I now refer to some of the reductions in Commonwealth contributions to State programmes this year, as follows:

Community health: Commonwealth contribution to operating payments has been reduced from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. Cost to State in 1978-79, \$1 960 000.

Domiciliary care programme: Commonwealth contribution to domiciliary care programme under States Grants (Home Care) Act has been reduced from 66½ per cent to 50 per cent. Cost to State in 1978-79, \$335 000.

School dental programme: Commonwealth contribution to those areas which were cost shared on a 75 per cent/25 per cent basis has been reduced to 50 per cent. Cost to State in 1978-79, \$370 000.

Hospital development programme: The Commonwealth

has abandoned the hospital development programme under which \$13 000 000 was received in 1976-77, \$5 120 000 in 1977-78 and a further sum of at least \$5 120 000 was expected in 1978-79. Cost to State in 1978-79, an additional \$5 000 000.

Welfare officers: Commonwealth contribution towards employment of welfare officers by local government under States Grants (Home Care) Act has been reduced from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. In 1978-79 this will cost local government in South Australia about \$16 000.

These figures emphasise my original point, which cannot be denied by the Opposition, that the Commonwealth Government's attitude to State Government finances is to be deplored. The school dental programme, as a programme involving preventive medicine, would in the long term reduce the cost of health services to the community and to the individual, yet the Commonwealth Government's attitude places this programme in jeopardy.

Health is most important to us all, and we need to encourage young people to adopt sensible habits in relation to health. I believe that many of our adult population are medically unfit, and preventive medicine and preventative measures are needed to encourage people to pay attention to their health.

We spend increasing amounts of money on public health, but not a great deal on preventive medicine. We abuse our bodies by eating processed food, and still expect to function normally. One only needs to look around the community to see that obesity is one of the problems resulting from over-indulgence and lack of exercise. One of the causes of obesity is the type of food we eat and the type of education given to the young regarding their eating habits.

Let us look at the food industry and see whether it is playing its part in providing the necessary balanced diet for good community health. It has been said that we are as good as what we eat. Foreign-owned multi-national food companies have gradually encroached on the Australian food industry. In the retailing sector we find that this is occurring. Also: there has been a tremendous growth in the number of supermarkets over the past 10 to 15 years, and the quiet revolution in the fast-food and take-away food industry has changed Australian eating habits and worried dieticians.

I believe that the Australian consumer has been a convert to the fast-food industry, the hamburger, the take-away pizza and fried chicken are fast becoming our staple diet, particularly among teenagers in the community. I have heard, although I cannot confirm this, that Adelaide is the take-away chicken capital of the world. I read that in the *Nation Review* in an article by Sam Orr, who is regarded as something of an expert in these matters, written after he had visited Adelaide. Nutritionists know that the types of food I mentioned, pizzas and hamburgers, etc., are responsible for a high cholesterol and triglyceride level in the blood.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What about the pie and pasty?

**Mr. SLATER:** The pie and pasty would come into that category. I am no dietician; I am expressing a personal view. I think the member for Florey is a greater expert on pies and pasties than I claim to be.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The honourable member must not reflect on any member.

**Mr. SLATER:** We need to educate our young people to eat properly in the interests of their health, helping them resist pressures from fast-food proprietors and food processors, and informing them about nutrition. Public and private spending on health care amounts to over \$6 000 000 000 a year in Australia. It appears that this

public spending has produced meagre returns in the way of improved health and has not led to an efficient low-cost health service. The Federal and State Governments should review their attitudes to health-care expenditure.

One area of expenditure that needs to be significantly boosted is to that of preventive medicine. The Federal Budget preventive medicine allocation in 1977-78 was a miserly \$9 000 000 out of a total of \$3 000 000 000. Although we will hear about the Federal Budget next Tuesday, I hope that more money is allocated to preventive medicine than was allocated last year, and I hope also that part of this allocation will provide for a Commonwealth health benefit to be paid regarding Institute of Fitness and Research Training medical tests. I support the motion.

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I support the motion. In doing so, I take this opportunity to express my allegiance to the Crown.

I would like to express my condolences to the Catholic community in this State, especially to the Catholic parishes and institutions in my own electorate, in their sorrow on the death of His Holiness the Pope. I have just come from a Requiem Mass in the parish of Saint Francis of Assisi at Newton. The Deputy Premier as the member for Hartley, was there also, and I am sure he would agree with me that it was a great privilege to be present with members of the Italian community as they mourn the death of their spiritual leader and fellow countryman.

I also express my condolences to the family of the late Frank Potter, former President of the Legislative Council, whom I knew as a very friendly and gentle man and a diligent member of Parliament.

Anyone involved in politics today must be aware of the strong and growing disenchantment throughout the community with politics, politicians and the effectiveness of Parliament. People are starting to believe that politicians either run the show for themselves or, perhaps worse, do not know how to run it at all. In many cases that assessment is not far from being wrong. In this State, throughout Australia, and indeed throughout the Western world a great deal could be done to improve this unhappy and potentially very dangerous situation.

We can either muddle along as we are and risk serious and disruptive political and social consequences by ignoring the growing public frustration with Parliament, or we can use the vast resources that are at our disposal to reform the Parliamentary process so that it responds sensitively to people's real needs. The best resources of any Parliament lie with the people it represents, and we are foolish if we do not recognise that. For the first time in the long and painful history of Parliamentary democracy, we have two priceless advantages that have never existed before: one is universal education, and the other is mass communication.

We have an electorate that is better educated and better informed than ever before, and yet we continue to treat that electorate as though all wisdom resided in Parliament. Indeed, the State Government acts as though all wisdom were contained in the State Administration Building, and as though the Executive were its sole mouthpiece. A number of simple, straightforward and obviously desirable procedures could be put into practice without delay which would in themselves help transform the Parliamentary process and hasten generally much needed reforms. The first of these, of course, is to let people know what is happening in Parliament. It is not good enough to put your trust in a political Party just by voting for it at election time. Political Parties must be monitored all along the line, and that means in between elections.

All proposed legislation should be subjected to the scrutiny of the wider community as well as that of the Opposition and the Upper House. Before this session of Parliament opened I made public comment about the need for more effective public involvement in the Parliamentary and legislative process. The first means towards achieving this end is to inform people of what is going on in time for them to be able to influence legislators before decisions are made.

It seems that I am not the first person to advocate publication in the daily press of the Parliamentary Notice Paper; I am sure that I will not be the last. That the *Advertiser* has responded to the request is gratifying, but I admit that I had something far more substantial in mind than the abbreviated fragment of the Notice Paper, which was appropriately placed under the "What's Your Problem" column in the *Advertiser*.

I believe it should be a requirement for Parliament to publish daily all legislative items that appear on the Notice Paper together with brief explanatory notes and to ensure that they appear in a prominent position and are referred to in the front page index. Obviously no newspaper should be expected entirely to cover the cost of such a considerable outlay of space, so Parliament (and that means the taxpayer) should pay for this space. The cost would be trifling compared to the cost of the television films which explain State Government activities in various spheres and which the Premier insists are vital for the information of the people of this State.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Nothing but propaganda.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Correct. Notice of proposed Bills should be printed in time to give interested people a chance to study the legislation that is going to affect them. Select Committees should be used more frequently and should be streamlined so that a comparatively small Parliament like this could handle the public participation process without getting swamped. Evidence should be given in public unless the committee has good reason to determine otherwise. One obvious way of making greater use of Select Committees would be to have less legislation so that what there was could be scrutinised carefully.

The volume of subordinate legislation should be pruned to an absolute minimum. Surely even the Government would acknowledge that it is anti-democratic to continue to churn out a flood of regulations that bind the general public when the public itself, let alone the members of Parliament who are supposed to be responsible, has not got a hope of being made aware of what is happening.

To allow regulations to go through automatically unless someone moves to have them disallowed is not good enough. There should be an affirmative motion put and passed in Parliament before any regulation takes effect. To do otherwise is thoroughly bad practice, yet that is what happens in South Australia. In addition, something must be done to ensure that regulations, once passed, are promulgated effectively so that the people who will be affected by them have at least a sporting chance of knowing that they will be affected.

Advice to the public about the introduction of regulations should be required to be published in a prominent place, and the regulations themselves should be freely available at easily accessible outlets. Every council library, post office and police station should have a copy of all regulations properly presented and indexed for easy reference. South Australia lags behind the rest of the world in this respect. For a Government supposedly committed to civil rights, this State Government is guilty of serious neglect of its responsibility to make the law understood and accessible to the people who must abide by it.

To summarise, here is a short list of procedures which in themselves would help to create better communication between Parliament and the people and, in doing so, would lead us closer to the ideal of government by the people for the people: First, daily publication, broadcasting and televising of the Notice Paper when Parliament is in session, with explanatory notes; secondly, a guaranteed and truly effective opportunity for people to influence their representatives either by allowing reasonable time between publication of proposed laws or by making wider use of Select Committees to call for evidence and examine Bills; thirdly, a requirement for an affirmative motion before subordinate legislation becomes law; fourthly, proper publicity for new regulations; fifthly, easy availability of regulations; and sixthly, regular review of regulations to ensure that we do not become overburdened with a mass of outdated and unnecessary requirements and restrictions. These are small steps to take, but they could be significant. They form part of the wider issues, such as controls on Executive power and the rights of the Opposition, and a multitude of other issues that should be debated and resolved to ensure that Parliament is made more effective and people are given a greater say in the way they are governed.

I wish now to turn to the Governor's Speech. Studying it, one wonders how it could have been drawn up at all without this Government's almost pathological hatred of the Federal Government, a hatred that comes through line after line. Certainly, if references to the Federal Government are removed, it becomes a thin Speech indeed. I think that criticism is also valid for the speeches of many members from the Government side. If we remove the bias and examine the Government's statements in the light of the facts (that is, all the facts, not just a selection of the facts), what do we see? First, let us examine the following statement:

The severity of the constraints imposed by the Commonwealth in the field of State funding is highlighted by the fact that, in the past two years, the Loan programme available to this State has been subject to rates of growth less than the level of inflation while, in the forthcoming year, the Loan programme is to be kept to the same dollar amounts as in the year 1977-78. This means a considerable reduction in real terms.

The Speech then goes on to list a range of projects right across the board that will have to be cut as a result of this alleged mass reduction in Commonwealth funds. In the light of these claims by the State Government, it should be remembered that, under the Fraser Government, there has been a massive taxation reduction and tax indexation. Other than South Australia, all States have had reasonably balanced Budgets and all have been able to make significant tax cuts. South Australia alone has a deficit of \$25 000 000 and no tax cuts, significant or otherwise.

Under the Federal Labor Government, the States were forced into tighter and tighter central control. In 1972 specific purpose grants represented 37 per cent of all Commonwealth funds to the States. Within three years of the Whitlam Government, that figure had risen to 52 per cent, a majority of the funds, and was rising inexorably. Under the Fraser Government's federalism the States have had substantial sovereignty restored. All have been able to make individual choices between new or expanded State initiatives or taxation relief.

An illusion has been created that the Commonwealth is the huge spender and raiser of public moneys and that State Budgets are of minor dimensions and consequences. The fact is that the States and local government together spend 52 per cent of all public funds in Australia. They are the majority spenders. That is why they must play their

part in overall restraint and good housekeeping.

A tax revolt is developing across Australia and with it a realisation that, if we are to maintain levels of Government services and facilities and, where necessary, improve them, we can do so only by adopting one of two options: either we can increase taxes or manage the tax dollar far more efficiently than has been the case in the past. The State Labor Government has a lot to learn when it comes to efficiency, except of course when it comes to promoting its own Leader or Ministers.

Next in the Speech we see that the Government will "continue its efforts to encourage and assist the industrial development of South Australia". If that is true, it is certainly true only in the eyes of the beholder.

A glance at the editorials of the *Journal of Industry*, the journal of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, indicates that industry itself feels far from encouraged and assisted by this Government. On the contrary, it feels beleaguered, and I quote from an editorial published in the journal on Monday 15 May 1978, as follows:

Undoubtedly the present political and social climate in South Australia is not ideal for industrial growth, and any further ill-timed meddling, no matter how slight, will only aggravate the situation still further.

The editorial continues:

With the economic situation in South Australia as it is at the moment this [the actions of the Minister of Labour and Industry in trying to introduce industrial democracy] smacks of rearranging the furniture on the *Titanic*.

The editorial then states:

Even the most acceptable social legislation must rely heavily on correct timing—and that is certainly not when companies have their backs to the wall and unemployment is rife.

So much for the assistance to industry by the Government of this State.

Further on in the Speech we see that health is an area which is facing considerable cut-backs in funding from the Commonwealth. Further still, it states that Commonwealth reductions will mean that further work on hospital development projects will need to be reviewed. How can any Government which acknowledges that more than \$1 000 000 has been poured down the drain with the purchase of a worthless computer (purchased against overseas advice and experience for the Flinders Medical Centre); which admits that bed capacity is far in excess of need at that same hospital; and which admits that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of food is wasted annually at major hospitals and institutions, how can such a Government apportion blame for lack of funds to another sphere of Government? The mismanagement, waste and lack of planning in the health field in South Australia is slowly being shown to be of monstrous proportions. At the same time, neglect of real health issues is serious.

I was pleased to hear the remarks of the member for Gilles about preventive medicine. I think they were remarks that his Government should take to heart. The medical profession has been saying for years that our health policies are directed more to illness than to health. The community is starting to realise this. Why is this Government so slow to recognise and put into practice effective programmes of health education and health promotion that would help slash health bills to a minimum and create the fit and healthy society which we all want and which a combination of healthy living patterns and medical technology would enable us to have.

Let us look at a few of the basic abuses of health that are clearly evident in our community to see what, if anything,

the State Government has done about them. First, let us consider drugs.

**Mr. Groom:** What about pornography?

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I will come to pornography in due course. The honourable member would be wise to take a sensitive view of the subject, because I doubt very much whether his constituents share his amusement about what, in fact, is a serious subject. Any member who is hanging on to his seat by the skin of his teeth would do well to take that subject seriously.

A call to place legal restrictions on the use of analgesics in this State was first made, in 1975, by Dr. Jim Lawrence and Dr. Tony Clarkson of the Renal Unit of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It has been made repeatedly since, both by the medical profession and members of the Opposition. The Minister of Health has the power to restrict the use of analgesics, yet he does nothing. Meanwhile, the kidney dialysis machines continue to operate in major hospitals at a cost of thousands of dollars and people continue to suffer needless, self-inflicted pain that it is within the Government's power to prevent.

Doctors have confirmed that there would be a drastic fall in the incidence of analgesic nephropathy if the following actions were taken. First, there should be a cessation of the advertising of analgesics in the media. Secondly, there should be a cessation of over-the-counter sales of analgesic drugs; this would preclude sales of analgesics containing combinations of aspirin, phenacetin, paracetamol, codeine, caffeine, etc. in delicatessens, supermarkets and other common outlets. Thirdly, the availability of compound analgesics should be by prescription only. Fourthly, the availability of only simple analgesics, for example, aspirin and panadol, should be from retail outlets.

As a result of the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare on Drug problems in Australia, the Queensland Government has instituted legislation; legislation is planned by the Governments of Tasmania and New South Wales. It is reprehensible that the South Australian Government has so far refused to respond to an obvious need. I hope that the Minister of Health has it on his conscience that it is in his power to change this situation and that he must act quickly if further pain, illness and death is to be prevented.

The member for Gilles raised the subject of nutrition and I am pleased indeed to see that both he and his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture in another place, have recognised that preventive medicine and good health largely depend on healthy living and dietary patterns. I could not disagree with anything the member for Gilles said; I have said it myself previously in this Parliament. I wish he would urge the Government to adopt a nutrition policy similar to the one presented by the Liberal Party before the previous State election.

When speaking of preventive medicine one must also look at physical activity, particularly the habits of physical activity developed by children at an early age. The fact that so many children spend so many hours in front of a television set is definitely affecting their present and future health. Postural defects are becoming apparent and will ultimately affect liver and kidney functions in the developing adult.

Two of the most critical health problems are scarcely dealt with and certainly not dealt with effectively: I refer to alcohol and tobacco. The abuse of alcohol in Australia has the potential of becoming a national disaster, as the Senate committee on drugs indicated when it reported to the Federal Parliament last year. Alcohol is the major drug of abuse and constitutes a problem of epidemic proportions. Any failure by Governments or individuals to

acknowledge that a major problem and potential national disaster is upon us would constitute gross irresponsibility.

The report finds that alcohol has been a major factor in the deaths of more than 30 000 Australians in the past 10 years. Deaths from cirrhosis of the liver have risen 75 per cent in the past 10 years. From 1965 to 1976 the per capita increase in the consumption of beer has been 27 per cent, of wine 122 per cent, and of spirits 50 per cent. More than 250 000 Australians can be classified as alcoholics. One in every five hospital beds is occupied by a person suffering from the adverse effects of alcohol.

Two in every five divorces or separations result from alcohol-induced problems. Problems directly related to alcohol, including industrial accidents and absenteeism, cost the national economy more than \$500 000 000 in 1972-73. About 73 per cent of men who have committed a violent crime had been drinking beforehand. Alcohol was associated with half the serious crime in the country; perhaps more seriously than in any other respect, alcoholism among the young is increasing dramatically, and as many as 10 per cent of schoolchildren between 12 years and 17 years of age get very drunk at least once a month.

One has only to drive past hotels around closing time or to enter the bars of hotels during trading hours to see that the law is not being enforced with regard to under-age drinking. This, to me, is an extremely serious failing of the State Government, and one that must be corrected if we are going even to begin to fulfil our responsibilities to the young.

The same situation applies to tobacco smoking. It is clear from a reply the Chief Secretary gave to a question I asked during the recent session that the law with regard to the prohibition of the sale of tobacco to children is not being enforced. This is yet another example of adult double standards that has such a powerful effect on the young when we say one thing and do another. It is absolutely essential that the laws covering the sale of tobacco and alcohol to minors are thoroughly enforced by the Government and are consequently upheld by members of the community who have an influence on young people.

Another area of preventive medicine that deserves far more attention than it receives is medical research that is directed towards preventive health. I refer particularly to an extremely important programme, namely, the Pregnancy Environment Programme, being conducted by the Queen Victoria Research Foundation. The philosophy underlying the programme is as follows:

The aim is to compile a wide and deep amount of information regarding pregnancy, covering family and personal medical history, social history and lifestyle, and to correlate this information with the results as shown by the status of the infants. The infants are then to be followed up as they develop to maturity. Where indications arise from these data of possible harmful influences, the aim is to institute close *ad hoc* investigations.

One such study has already been instituted in relation to a chemical which, it is believed, may be connected with the incidence of Potter's syndrome in new-born babies. It seems to me as being absolutely grotesque that the reason this programme cannot proceed is that there is not sufficient money for the extremely prosaic need of cages for rats, on which the experiments that will enable doctors involved to prove whether or not this chemical is dangerous. The cages to enable this proof to be obtained cannot be built because the hospital cannot afford them.

This pilot study could be completed for \$3 000. A positive result of this study would open up a large field for similar investigations of this particular chemical on other species and of other chemicals. A large capital sum where

interest would enable progressive research to be carried out, both by the present foundation staff and by other workers sponsored by the foundation, is an urgent necessity.

I know that the Minister of Health has been responsible for the funds that have been granted to the Queen Victoria Research Foundation, and I commend him on his personal interest in this project, but I implore other members of Cabinet to regard this as an extremely important project that could have a profound effect on the lives of future citizens in this State.

No parent who has had the pleasure of producing children who are perfect both physically and mentally could possibly understand the agony, sorrow, and misery experienced by the parents of children with congenital defects. It is absolutely essential that funds are found to enable this research to be undertaken. The human misery resulting from congenital birth defects is incalculable; in addition, the economic effects are perhaps calculable, and are immense.

Research that has been conducted in this area needs funds, and it is terribly wrong that a Government should be niggardly with these funds but should splash money around in other areas where it is being wasted. It seems that our priorities are wrong, if we withhold funds from such a programme. It has long been recognised that factors in pregnancy can have an adverse effect on the developing child, and that various metabolic disturbances in the pregnant woman, such as may be exemplified by persistent anaemia, hypertension, hypotension, obesity, or other conditions, can have an effect on the developing child.

What we have not yet discovered is the effect of all drugs. Rubella and thalidomide factors have been largely responsible for an increased awareness, but none of us knows for certain the effect, for example, of marijuana or L.S.D. on the developing child. We could be building up untold tragedy for the future unless we find out. South Australia has a research project that is attempting to find the answers to these questions, and it is imperative that it be given the money to finance proper research.

I commend the State Government for its initiative in relation to the "Life. Be In It" programme. The Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department is to be congratulated on the way in which it has adopted a good idea, initiated in Victoria by Mr. Brian Dixon, Minister for Youth, Sport and Recreation, and implemented in all manner of practical and imaginative ways. With the adoption of the programme on a national basis, South Australia has co-operated splendidly with national initiatives. The current edition of the department's publication *Recreation Lines* provides plenty of encouragement for all of us who want to see provision for constructive recreation opportunities for all age groups and a wide range of interests.

The publication is simple and straightforward and contains a wealth of good news and good ideas. It provides hopeful signs that Australians are starting to emerge, both as individuals and as a community, from the physical inactivity that results from neutral, negative response to the effect of technology on our lifestyles. The dreaded "Norm" of "Life. Be In It" fame was a well-chosen symbol and the timing of his realisation that it is no good living life secondhand through the exertions of others coincides with growing community awareness of the importance of constructive leisure activity. A glance through last weekend's published programme of W.E.A. courses showed the richness and diversity of what is offering to those who want to be involved in cultural, recreational, or physical activity.

In my own district last weekend, there was a magnificent example of a local community responding to the idea of

"Life. Be In It". Hundreds of parents and children attended at the Athelstone Primary School in drenching rain to take part in a great variety of activities presented as a part of the "Life. Be In It" programme.

The school's recreation officer and its sports and recreation committee planned an afternoon that enlarged everyone's understanding of how to spend a wet Sunday having fun, whether it was playing parlour games, making kites, learning how to do the Hustle—and the member for Coles increased her knowledge of the Hustle on that Sunday afternoon—

**Mr. Becker:** We won't go into that.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I understand it was quite a sight. Some were modelling clay or tackling the slippery slopes of Black Hill. It brought all age groups together and turned watchers into doers. It demonstrated the potential of the school to influence the wider community for the good, through the initiative and co-operation of teachers and parents.

Whilst the promotion for the "Life. Be In It" programme requires the expenditure of taxpayers' money, in Victoria at least a major part of that expenditure has been recouped through the sale of associated products, and the resulting benefits to the community have been immense. The whole message of "Life. Be In It" is that you do not have to spend money to be fit. It is a wonderful example of the initiative of a Minister in a State Government having a positive beneficial effect that, slowly but surely, is spreading throughout the nation.

Many speakers have castigated the Federal Government and the Liberal Party for their alleged non-caring attitude on unemployment. This is a most unjust charge, because I am certain that there is not a member of this or any other Parliament in Australia who is not deeply concerned about the issue of unemployment, and who is not deeply distressed by the obvious effects it is having at present and by the self-perpetuating effects it will have in future. It seems to me that there should be less castigation on both sides and far more working together in an attempt to evolve constructive solutions.

All of us must come to grips with factors, some of which are beyond our control. We have to realise that there are many factors, ranging from increased technology to a baby boom in the post-war years that have brought many young people into the work force when economic conditions have made it difficult for them to obtain work. To suggest that the Federal Government does not care and that Opposition members in this Parliament do not care is not only unjust, but wrong.

I want to demonstrate how wrong it is by referring to the speech of the Productivity Minister, Hon. Ian Macphee, as reported in the *News* last week. In his political column, Rex Jory makes the point that the Federal Government has begun a revolutionary campaign that could change the employment and recreation lifestyle of Australia's 6 000 000 workers. It must be remembered that 170 000 Australian workers, 2.7 per cent of the work force, have a second job. That point should not be forgotten when we are looking for constructive solutions to unemployment. Rex Jory's article states:

In effect, Mr. Macphee was saying the technological boom which has been quietly sweeping Australian industrial areas in recent years will demand radically different employment patterns in industry. Workers must break free from the traditional thinking that the working week embraces, in broad terms, Monday to Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

"We need a more positive approach and we should begin by recognising the nature of the trend towards capital intensive industries, and recognise also that our greatest area of comparative advantage relates to our highly educated

workforce," Mr. Macphee said.

As Mr. Macphee says: "One of the challenges facing the community, therefore, is to harmonise the rate of change between the introduction of new technology into existing industries—technology which should be designed to create more stimulating jobs—and the creation of new industries by technology which will also be designed to improve the quality of working life as well as to improve productivity.

Mr. Macphee said: "The traditional five-day, 40-hour week was designed for family lifestyles of decades past."

He goes on: "A destandardisation of working hours could maximise the individual's freedom of choice for labour market participation and enable the individual to decide what form best suits particular needs, responsibilities, and aspirations.

Obviously, there need to be flexibility and new thinking, and that will not be generated by a slanging match between the two sides. All political Parties should be getting together in an effort to provide constructive solutions. Employers and employees should be getting together. Schools and teachers should be getting together with parents, and there should be far less polarisation than has been evidenced by the no doubt strongly felt but, in my opinion, rather thoughtless criticisms that have come from the other side of the House on this matter.

If one looks at the lengthy speeches made from both sides, one can see that members are making an effort to come up with creative political solutions to some of the problems we are experiencing in society today. It is part of our adversary political system that there should be conflict, and that is not a bad thing, but there should be times when we recognise that, by working together, we can work for the benefit of the people we represent. I support the motion.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I, too, support the motion. Like others, I convey my respects to the late Frank Potter. He was not, during his lifetime, of the same political persuasion as are my colleagues and I, but I think Government members, when voicing their respects to the late Mr. Potter, would all recognise the sacrifices made not only by him, but by public persons generally. Any person in public life has tried to do his best, whatever political and industrial philosophy he may have. I truly extend my sympathy to the wife and family of the late Mr. Potter.

In their opening remarks in this debate, two members have said that the debate had not aroused any great activity, and both questioned whether it played and real role in Parliamentary proceedings. One of those members was the member for Ross Smith, who took his full hour to make his speech. The other was the member for Mitcham, who also took his full time.

**Mr. Wotton:** That's understandable.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** That may be so, but I wonder whether I shall complain about this debate and then take my full time. Many things that happen in this House and in Parliament seem rather strange. For instance, I often wonder why the Lord's Prayer is read when we come into the House. The prayer is read, and two minutes later we all come out fighting.

Discussions have often taken place in connection with proposed changes in our system. Every time a change is proposed everyone confesses that there ought to be change, but somehow changes are never implemented. I question whether the ordinary people themselves are willing to accept change readily. When we have referendums the people almost invariably vote for the *status quo*. On only two occasions did the people support changes to the Constitution; the changes in question related to Aborigines and the retiring age of judges. So,

although people say that they want change, when the opportunity comes they do not usually support it.

When I was in the trade union movement, workers generally did not accept change. If the trade union movement recommended change, invariably the workers were more interested in the question of going to work, going home, and being with their families in the evening. So, the trade union movement found it difficult to implement change. I believe that the member for Alexandra was hypocritical in his attack of the Minister of Fisheries. I wish to refer to his contribution—

**Dr. Eastick:** In this session?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** In this debate.

**Dr. Eastick:** Is it within Standing Orders to quote from a debate in this session?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The member for Alexandra made a personal attack on the Minister of Fisheries. I do not care whether or not I read it, but it ill behoves the honourable member, here or anywhere else, to make such an attack on the Minister. Referring to the Minister of Fisheries, the member for Alexandra said:

He is also involved in and has a significant interest in secondary industry as a winemaker. He is a full-time Minister of the Crown, we know enjoying a salary, with direct allowances, of \$43 410 per annum. His wife is a full-time employee in the Premier's Department by the Premier's own admission, and, believe it or not, she is advising the Premier on the very subjects for which her husband is the Minister . . .

I understand that her annual salary brings into that family directly a further \$18 400 per annum. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister justifies his claim to being humane (and that is his word, not mine) in his application to his job and in his administrative position? How can he reconcile his own financial position with the action he has taken against the hard-working, low-income citizens of my community?

The member for Alexandra is referring to B-class fishermen as low-income citizens of the community. He should take a long look at his own position.

**Mr. Rodda:** The B-class fishermen are not doing really well.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** B-class licences were taken from B-class fishermen who were on a personal income of \$200 a week. Let us be realistic. I am not saying whether or not the decision was absolutely correct, but we are talking about people who are earning \$200 or more a week. I wonder what the member for Alexandra is getting at when he refers to an inhuman decision. He himself has two jobs. When I was on Kangaroo Island I saw his homestead, but he did not invite me in for a cup of coffee.

**Mr. Rodda:** He does all his work for nothing as shadow Minister.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** That may be so. I wish to say more about the honourable member. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary)** moved:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. KLUNDER (Newland):** I wish to deal with something that has been irritating me for some time; that is the attitude expressed by the Liberal Party in regard to flexible plan schools. I am annoyed by both the Liberal education policy and the attitude of the Leader and the shadow Minister regarding these schools. The relevant section of the Liberal education platform is on page 3 of the policy that was revised for the last time, I believe, on

12 August last year.

**Mr. Wilson:** Wait until you see the new one.

**Mr. KLUNDER:** I can hardly wait; it will have to be an enormous improvement on the last one. The relevant section states:

As a general principle we will be planning for smaller open-plan units to be built in new schools with the four-teacher unit the desirable optimum size. Existing open-plan schools will not be subjected to radical change where they are already operating effectively under sound leadership.

Two points emanate from this. First, in typical innuendo style some schools are implied not to be operating efficiently and, as usual, the Liberal Party declines to name such schools. Secondly, the policy is, as usual, several years out of date. On 6 October last the shadow Minister (the member for Mount Gambier) asked the Minister of Education a question about the size of open-space units, quoting the Liberal policy. The Minister's reply indicated that Government policy had already changed some years earlier.

More important are the attitudes displayed by the member for Mount Gambier and the Leader regarding the education that is available at flexible-space schools. I refer to several articles that appeared in the press in June last year. I believe that they were part of the pre-election build-up at that time. The member for Mount Gambier was quoted on 22 June in the *Advertiser* as saying that educators in Britain and Canada who had advocated open-space teaching there were now moving away from the concept. A clear implication of that was that open-space teaching was found to be lacking overseas and, therefore, lacking here.

**Mr. Allison:** True.

**Mr. KLUNDER:** I see the honourable member still stands by that statement and that is a pity, because it shows a deplorable lack of understanding of basic structural of isomorphism in the buildings constructed there and those constructed here. The buildings from which overseas authorities are moving away are not the units that have been constructed here. On 24 June a *News* report of the Leader's comments (I do not like quoting at length, but it is important) was as follows:

Mr. Tonkin's view is that children in open-plan classes can be much more easily distracted in the open-unit atmosphere. "The type of child who is easily distracted is facing an immediate disadvantage in an open plan," he says. "These children would benefit from the conventional single classroom environment. There is a place for open-plan teaching in some subjects—things like arts and social studies where children of different ages can be involved together. But there is also a need for privacy and more withdrawal room facilities. That applies to all children. They should have the opportunity to build up closer relationships with their teacher." He said, "One of the best ideas would be the provision of sliding doors and walls which could be arranged on a semi-permanent basis to create a series of individual classrooms."

I was not in Parliament at that time but was, in fact, teaching in an open-space school. Before the morning recess on that day I had had contact with about a dozen teachers, who said some incredibly uncomplimentary things about the Leader, which I would prefer not to quote here. It is unfortunate that there is ignorance on this gigantic scale in the Opposition. I think that the best way I can deal with it is to give examples based on my personal experience. I taught in a flexible-plan school for about three years, and for two years prior to that I taught in a school comprising both flexible and non-flexible (traditional) components, and for 10 years before that I taught in a totally conventional school. Therefore, I have



probably a reasonable base for comparison between the two kinds of system and perhaps even a better base than the Leader of the Opposition and his shadow Minister of Education have.

**Mr. Groom:** Who is the shadow Minister?

**Mr. KLUNDER:** I do not know—they all seem to have a go at it from an equally uninformed base. At that time, that was the opinion of a relatively senior teacher in the Education Department. In my opinion, flexible-space schools offered a superior social environment and education to children, and least as good an academic environment and education. At that time I was not really prepared to say much more because the school in which I was posted had not then put its first group of children through Matriculation, and I wanted to see how those youngsters would do before I started to boast about it.

**Mr. Allison:** You could have put it down to your good teaching.

**Mr. KLUNDER:** In fact, 1977 was the first year that Matriculation took place at that school, and I refused to teach Matriculation on the grounds that there might be an election during that year and I did not want the youngsters to get caught without a teacher at a crucial time during that Matriculation year.

I would rather deal with the social side first, because it is a difficult part of the education of children, and one about which it is difficult to get comparative figures. But fortunately during my three years there, four surveys were carried out into the social education of children.

One was done by the Research and Planning Branch of the Education Department into student attitudes, and the planning branch found that the results in that school (an open-space school) were quite good compared to the results in other schools in the survey. The second survey studied the effect and the ways that grouping of students affected their attitudes, and the results were again excellent. The third survey showed there was a greater staff satisfaction in that school compared with other metropolitan schools, and the fourth survey indicated that the difference between staff expectation and student results was larger than in comparable schools, but that the results were better.

I am aware that many people do not think that the non-academic side matters at all. They still agree with the statement attributed to Arnold of Rugby, who said that it does not matter what you teach them as long as they hate it. For these people only academic results matter. I quote briefly the academic results for the first Matriculation students from that school. Sixty students from that school sat for their Matriculation, of whom 45, or 75 per cent, matriculated. I believe the State average is somewhere about 61 per cent to 62 per cent.

**Mr. Allison:** In Mount Gambier the average was always—

**Mr. KLUNDER:** The honourable member will get his chance to boast about his area; I do not suppose he taught much there. The students sat for a total of 304 subjects and passed in 273 subjects, which is a 90 per cent pass rate. In no subject did the pass rate drop below 81 per cent, and in four subjects it reached 100 per cent. That is the kind of school where there are eight teachers and 280 students to a teaching floor. It is the kind of school that the Leader and shadow Minister is prepared to damn with faint praise. I hope that they are prepared to withdraw and reconsider their attitudes.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish to comment on the recent Australian Federation of Travel Agents Convention which was held in Adelaide, and on some of the aspects related to that convention. It was timely that it was held here at

the time when it was held. I give credit to the Adelaide Convention Bureau for playing a key role in securing the convention for Adelaide and with the AFTA organising committee playing a major part in its organisation. One must give credit also to the AFTA delegates and organising committee in making sure that the convention was held in Adelaide so that delegates from South-East Asia, Australia and other parts of the world could appreciate Adelaide.

There was public comment that the Festival Centre is an ideal venue for a convention, if banqueting and seminar rooms can be created close by. South Australian delegates and visitors believe that the Adelaide Railway Station would be the ideal spot if it could be upgraded for that purpose. The Adelaide City Council is looking at the recommendation of one of its members that the railway station could be developed for that purpose. If that could be done it would be cheaper initially than developing a separate centre at Wayville although, in the long term, we must have a trade, exhibition and sports centre somewhere in Adelaide. I hope that the Government will release the report it got from its consultants in July this year so that the community can consider the report and see whether there are any recommendations in it saying that Wayville or another site is the ideal site for this major complex.

What was the Government's role in the AFTA convention held in Adelaide? It gave a reception at the Festival Centre and put on a dinner dance at the Oberdan reception centre, Findon. What other part did it play? When the Barossa Valley people put on a dinner for a thousand people it was virtually boycotted by the Government and by officers from the Government department concerned. I make that point because delegates from other States asked me why there was no Government representation in an area where we claim to have one of the greatest tourist attractions, the Barossa Valley, yet the Government boycotted that function for a reason unknown to me or to many of the delegates at that dinner.

The point was also made to me by an American delegate, "Why is it that South Australia always directs tourists in the first place to the Barossa Valley?" He said, "Do you realise that Australia is about seventeenth in wine production in the world and that even Chile and Argentina are in front of Australia in wine production?" There are plenty of places in the world where one can look at wineries and their associated industries. He made the point that South Australia must have other areas that we should be showing delegates, particularly delegates from other countries where they may already have wineries and areas similar to the Barossa Valley. He has raised a good point and we should be conscious of it in this State.

I excuse our Minister last week for not attending, because he was interstate, owing to a family bereavement. However, I do not excuse other Government members for boycotting many of the functions. In the case of the Barossa Valley function, some departmental people could have been there to show their interest.

That aside, Victoria has had four promotional campaigns in this State within the past 12 months. Our Minister has attended most of them and has actually spoken at them praising Victoria for its efforts in tourism, saying what a wonderful job Victoria has done here. He has encouraged it to show its tourist wares in our shopping centres and has given Victorian tourist businesses the benefits of his comments. He has not, on one occasion, nor have his officers, organised in the other States such a promotional campaign in relation to our regional areas. The only thing the Minister has done is to open our new promotional office in Victoria, which is worth about

\$1 000 000. Not once has he promoted our regions in the same way that Victoria has promoted its regions. Instead he has praised, encouraged and helped Victoria to sell Victorian tourist attractions to South Australia.

To show how easy it is to be conned (and this applies especially to our Minister and the Government) in the tourist field I would point out that last Friday evening, at a function paid for by our taxpayers to entertain delegates from other States and overseas, Rolf Harris turned up and was to put on an item that was not programmed. I wondered why the Western Australians were so elated about the item. I sat with them and talked to them for a while. They said, "You want to listen to Rolf Harris. Your Minister is going to introduce him thinking that he has pulled off a coup but he will be promoting Western Australia." Sure enough, Western Australia's 150th birthday was promoted virtually at our Minister's instigation, with no promotion for South Australia. We must congratulate Western Australia for the way it recently took over Rundle Mall. It was a great promotion of that State's 150th birthday during the 21st convention of AFTA that was held in Adelaide last week.

It actually won the day for its tourism, and left our State for dead. The Government did nothing to promote South Australia, nor did any agency of the Government. The Australian Federation of Travel Agents, the Adelaide Convention Bureau, the Barossa people and the agents did something; the Government did nothing.

The other timely thing about the convention was that it was held when the two-airline policy report was published. One recommendation in particular in that report should be put into operation immediately; that is, that travel agents will be able to take a more active role and involvement in selling packaged tours. They will be able to organise their own conventions and tours, package them and sell them. That is a thing they have not been able to do in Australia in the past because of the two-airline policy. The airlines themselves used to undertake most of the primary role of working out package deals. It will now be in the hands of travel agents, if that recommendation is accepted and I hope that it will be accepted. We should give some credit to the other States that vigorously and successfully promoted tourism: Queensland particularly (for its promotion of the Gold Coast) and Tasmania.

I think that it is pretty poor when a Minister or Government member resorts to what I call "cheap politics". I have never failed to recognise a Government member at any function that I have attended. Three times recently the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, particularly last Friday evening (even though I was his guest—a guest of the Government) has failed to recognise me as shadow Minister.

The Minister of Education would know that recently I brought to his notice the fact that one of his associates was in the gathering. I did that so that he could make known to the community at large that one of his colleagues was present. I think that the sort of politician that ignores Opposition members is the poorest type. The courtesy has always been extended that any member of Parliament in a group is acknowledged by the Minister or whoever is speaking from the platform.

I think we failed at this AFTA convention to promote South Australia. The Government and its agents failed miserably to promote the tourist industry in South Australia. I believe that tourism is flagging in South Australia, because the Government is not interested at all in tourism in this State.

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I wish to discuss the possible effect of the present unemployment problem on the

young. We are a nation that places the welfare of the family unit very high, but what are present attitudes of members of that unit towards their parents? What effect does unemployment have on the respect shown to the father, for instance, as head of the family?

Recently, I read a book about a study of children during the great depression. The book is called, "Children of the Great Depression" and was written by Glen H. Elder Junior and printed by Chicago University Press. Several attitudes were apparent in that book, the first being recorded at page 58, concerning children's desires for their fathers, as follows:

The desire for a happier father was expressed most often by children whose fathers had suffered unemployment and a heavy economic loss, and it did not vary by social class or sex of child.

That was the ideal, if you like, of what children would like for their fathers, but when the reality of it was assessed this is what came out. I quote from page 278 as follows:

In the area of family relationships, mother's centrality as decision-maker and emotional resource is the primary theme among deprived households. Severe economic loss increased the perceived power of mother in family matters within the middle and working class, and diminished father's social prestige, attractiveness, and emotional significance, as perceived by sons and daughters. These conditions weakened father's role as a control figure for the children and the effectiveness of parental control in general, though especially in relation to sons; and encouraged dependence on persons outside the family. More than other children, the sons and daughters of deprived parents sought companionship and counsel among persons outside the home, especially among teachers and friends.

I am pleased the survey made the last point, that they sought counsel outside the family among teachers and friends, because in a situation where we have severe unemployment and severe strains on the family unit, it is possible that children of the unemployed will seek counsel outside the family, apart from teachers and friends. Unfortunately, I fear that in today's society children of the unemployed will seek such counsel of people other than teachers and friends. On page 280, we find the following:

Family losses increased judgment errors among the Oakland children regarding their status in the eyes of age-mates; they believed that they were held in lower esteem than was actually the case.

Obviously, we see that the children themselves, because they were the children of a deprived group, saw their prestige lowered in the eyes of their friends, age-mates, etc. I fear also that this will have a detrimental effect, because we are applying effects of that nature to today's society. We have in Australia the largest unemployment since those depression years. Therefore, it would not be illogical to ask, "Are the effects of this unemployment going to be similar to those of the depression years?" I believe that they will be.

We will have sons and daughters of the unemployed who will see their status and prestige lowered, because their parents cannot provide them with the same things that their friends and classmates have.

Frankly, I do not see that as being good for our society. We ask ourselves whether that is the situation existing today, and I believe that it is. But what of the future?

We have about 6.2 per cent unemployment at present. We were told this evening by the member for Flinders, who quoted extensively from the Institute of Public Affairs Review of last January-March, that we may well have to live with 6 per cent unemployment. I think that the Review has made an incorrect interpretation of the December 1977 Federal election results, because I do not think that

Australians are prepared to accept such a high level of constant unemployment.

Nevertheless, we are going to be faced with at least 3 per cent or 4 per cent structural unemployment. What of the future? Unemployment will be brought about by three things: first, by automation, a word with which we are all familiar. It has been happening for decades from the time the tractor on the farm replaced the horse until the fork-lift, so that today machines are doing more and more.

In addition to automation, we will be faced with another revolution called cybernetics. This is an interesting concept. An American named Norbert Wiener wrote a book in 1950 called *The Human Use of Human Beings*. In that book, he said:

The possible fields into which the new industrial revolution is likely to penetrate are very extensive, and include all labour-performing judgments of a low level, in much the same way as the displaced labour of the earlier industrial revolution included every aspect of human power.

It is obvious that such a revolution will reduce the need for people to be creative, to use their abilities in the form of income producing activities.

The third revolution is eugenics, which is population control—and we have heard enough about that. In toto,

our future for a number of years yet will be hamstrung with 3 per cent or 4 per cent unemployment, predominantly of the young, and where it is not of the young, it will be of people with young families, children who will grow up in a deprived section of our society. I think that unless we take action shortly, even if it is by Government stimulus, such as a mild increase in Government spending by both Federal and State Governments, we will have a situation shortly in which we will be forced to increase Government spending in the form of enlarged police forces, and increased penal institutions and other corrective establishments.

That is not a good situation, and as legislators we should not accept it. We have heard a few speeches today on unemployment and its various interpretations. If this trend continues, and if we must put up with a Government which accepts 6 per cent unemployment, we will be faced with the situation which I have described from this book. To sum up, I recommend this book as compulsory reading for all Opposition members.

Motion carried.

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 August at 2 p.m.