

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 August 1978

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

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a petition signed by 303 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.

PETITION: PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. **HEMMINGS** presented a petition signed by 273 electors of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to provide public transport to the Munno Para area to cater for immediate basic needs and this to be reviewed as development progresses.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

DISPENSING MACHINES

In reply to Mr. **MAX BROWN** (1 August).

The **Hon. D. W. SIMMONS**: Lottery regulations were amended on 29 May 1975 to prohibit the use of any machines to dispense lottery tickets where prizes consist of cash. The purpose for which the proceeds are used does not alter this regulation. Officers of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department are continuously watchful for any breaches relative to the use of dispensing machines.

In accordance with a strict policy, distributors of dispensing machines are required to submit these machines to the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department and, in certain instances, the Police Department, for thorough examination to ensure that they do not resemble poker machines in any shape or form.

In certain isolated cases, it is possible that associations could sell tickets through dispensing machines for cash prizes without full knowledge of the lottery regulations. When these instances are detected, the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department takes appropriate action.

The petrol stations and hotels to which the honourable member for Whyalla has referred have not yet been detected. However, if the honourable member can cite these instances where cash prizes are offered through dispensing machines, officers of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department will take the necessary steps to ensure the discontinuance of this practice.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

In reply to Mr. **WHITTEN** (20 July).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: The Security Officer visited Ethelton and Port Adelaide Primary Schools and Le Fevre

High School in July. He has reported that it would be prohibitively expensive to totally protect them from vandalism, but has advised them on action which they could take to improve security. In addition, he has recommended a number of measures which should alleviate these problems at the Ethelton Primary School and he is currently preparing similar recommendations in respect of Port Adelaide Primary and Le Fevre High Schools.

These measures include modification of equipment storage areas, strengthening and adding to cyclone wire covering of windows, replacement of old doors and frames, and a small amount of external lighting. The Regional Director of Education, Central Western Region, has been asked to implement the Security Officer's recommendations concerning Ethelton Primary School as soon as funds permit. A similar request will be made in relation to the other two schools when the Security Officer's recommendations are to hand.

BLAIR PARK PRE-SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. **HEMMINGS** (2 August).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: In the 1977-78 financial year, a preliminary survey was commenced of pre-school needs in the Blair Park area. A group representing various community organisations discussed pre-school requirements. It was agreed, late in 1977, that the Kindergarten Union develop a pre-school in this area. A teacher commenced working with parents and children of all ages from the beginning of this year.

A kindergarten opened on 19 June in a rented house, provided by the Land Commission, located at 15 Eringa Avenue, Craigmore. It is likely that this will accommodate the pre-school needs of the area for a year or two. Decisions must then be made as to the future permanent location of one or more centres in the Craigmore development area at the school or other site. It appears that the accommodation requested at the Blair Park Primary School is not necessary at this stage.

SURREY DOWNS PRE-SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. **KLUNDER** (3 August).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: The Surrey Downs pre-school has a high priority with the Education Department but no date has been determined for its commencement due to the dramatic turn-down in funds from the Commonwealth in the pre-school area. The Kindergarten Union is investigating the possibility of obtaining funds from other sources to assist with this project.

URANIUM

Mr. **TONKIN**: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the latter's absence. What discussions, preliminary arrangements and understandings were there between the State Government and the Federal Government, and the State Government and URENCO, or any other company associated with uranium mining and processing, at the time of the preparation of the third report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, and what is the position in respect of these now? The third report, which states that the proposed scheme overshadows in importance any other major industrial development activity in Australia in

terms of new employment opportunities, technological advancement, and industrial benefits to be reaped therefrom, also notes the particular advantages to South Australia of the utilisation of industries already established in this State providing technology, steel, and acid, and refers to the involvement of the Commonwealth Government and URENCO in establishing the project.

When the second report was forwarded to Canberra, the Premier said South Australia's chances of gaining the uranium enrichment centre were very high. However, I understand that the third report, which is a more advanced document, has not been forwarded to Canberra. Therefore, I ask whether discussions with other interested parties to the venture have continued, and what is the position at this stage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has been told in this House time and again that the Government is keeping up with uranium enrichment technology. Discussions have continued from time to time with representatives of URENCO, and the Federal Government from time to time has also been involved in discussions. In fact, the appropriate Minister in the Federal Government (I cannot remember his precise title at this moment) had from members of the original committee a copy of the draft report (it was only a draft report) to which the honourable Leader refers. That Minister has referred to it in speeches in the Federal House. Since that time, the Commonwealth on many occasions has been asked for information concerning present matters of uranium development, for the information of the committee, and I referred to the work of revision of the committee in my answer to the Leader yesterday in the House.

ATCO

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Premier provide any information about an export order obtained by Atco from Japan for prefabricated buildings which will be relocated in Iraq? Has this order resulted in any increase in the work force of Atco and does this success in obtaining this contract indicate that the South Australian industry can compete with world competition, despite the persistent knocking of South Australia by the Opposition?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The contract to which the honourable member refers is in fact in respect of Kuwait, not Iraq. Atco has been able to obtain a contract for two colleges which are being erected in Kuwait. It has been successful in competitive tendering. It was able, before the tender had been accepted, and from prospective orders, to build its work force up by 75.

The order itself meant an extra 30 workers being taken on. Atco has been able to compete successfully internationally and I believe it is an extremely good South Australian company.

URANIUM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say why the Government still keeps the Uranium Enrichment Committee in existence if it intends to suppress the reports of the committee and when any chance South Australia had of attracting an enrichment plant appears to have disappeared as a result of the Government's ill-advised and uninformed uranium policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I said in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the Government is keeping up with uranium technology; it said at the time of its previous

announcement of policy on uranium that it would do so. The honourable member has heard that many times before in this House: I do not know why he gets up and asks questions of this kind. As to our having lost any chance of a uranium enrichment plant, he cannot say that, and no-one else can, either. The time, given world demand for a uranium enrichment plant, is considerably postponed, as I pointed out yesterday. Whether we shall be in a position to proceed in this area at this stage I do not know, because the time lag in this matter is inevitably considerable. I can say that at this stage of proceedings there is no sign, and we have been unable to obtain from the Federal Government any indication, that international arrangements being made by it would in any way satisfy the people of this State that it was safe to provide uranium to a customer country.

As I have pointed out in this House, the arrangements that were made with Finland were so inadequate that one could drive a horse and cart through them. They are certainly not such as can give any sort of security to people in South Australia as to the dealings of a customer country with uranium supplied to it by this country, or as to the monitoring in future, or as to the proper disposal of high level atomic waste. Until that can be decided, we cannot take any further decisions in favour of development or enrichment of uranium in South Australia. The Government, having put this State in a position of being well in advance of any other part of Australia in knowledge of uranium technology, proposes to keep this State in the vanguard of knowledge.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are we allowed to laugh?

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders of the House I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is always permitted to do that, because you know, Sir, that the braying of asses is still free in this community.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's about the only thing that gets you by.

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

POPULATION CHANGE

Mr. SLATER: In view of claims made by Opposition members that many people are leaving South Australia to reside in other States, can the Premier indicate, or obtain information about, whether there has been any significant population change in South Australia which may deny or confirm that claim?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The latest population figures for South Australia show us slightly above the Australian average in population increase, but well below the Australian average in natural increase. Free enterprise of that kind seems to be on the decline in South Australia. South Australia is well above the Australian average in net migration to the State, and that makes nonsense of the claim about droves of people leaving this State. If there are some people leaving this State, there are also people coming here.

INFRA-STRUCTURE BORROWING

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Premier say whether, in view of the possibility of utilising a shared infra-structure, with the petro-chemical project on the Redcliff site, as proposed in the third interim draft report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, the inclusion of the proposed uranium

enrichment centre would enhance the case for infra-structure borrowing which was put forward recently to the Loan Council by this Government and which is still being considered?

Mr. Bannon: Why don't you just—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Ross Smith to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe so. Certainly, the matter has not been raised with us by the Federal Government.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Education clarify the comparative funding performances of the Whitlam and Fraser Governments in education? I refer to an article written by the member for Torrens which appeared in the *News* on 10 August 1978 at page 28, headed "Education figures confusing the issue". In that article he revived the old claim that, because one particular source of Government money (that of untied grants) had increased, therefore the total financial position of the State had improved. He then referred to comparative performances of the Whitlam and Fraser Governments.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do have some figures, because the ever-vigilant member brought this article to my attention and I promised to get some information for him which might also be of benefit to the House. The article by the member for Torrens makes two claims which have been made over and over again by apologists for the Federal Liberal Government.

The first thing they say, of course, is that, if the States are not getting indirect grants what they used to get, they are getting more than enough in untied grants to make up for that deficiency. As recently as last week I had a letter from Senator Margaret Guilfoyle relating to pre-school funding, which continued to recite this particular litany.

In writing to the honourable Senator, I have suggested that she excise that litany from further correspondence. If the Commonwealth Government wants to come out and say that it believes that now is the time to reduce its commitment to pre-school education, let it say that, and the electors will deal with that Government accordingly, but it is ludicrous to continue regurgitating this old song about how the States are getting moneys in other ways, in the light of the sort of figures made available to the House on Tuesday by the Premier. Whatever soundness that claim might have had in the first six months of office of the Fraser Government, it has long since lost its validity.

The second claim made is in relation to the Hayden Budget, and I wonder how much longer Liberal apologists can go on hanging their hats on the Hayden Budget, which was brought down by a Government which had a shotgun held at its head and which was told that, unless it brought down such a Budget, the shotgun would be let off and it was let off anyway, as we all know to our cost. Even apart from that, the figures show that the performance of the Whitlam Government holds up well.

The only figures I will give to the House are those which compare the sum that was made available to the States by the Commonwealth for education purposes as a percentage of the sum recommended by the Schools Commission. I have compared the last two years of the Whitlam Government with the first two years of the Fraser Government, as follows: in the last two years of the Whitlam Government, 82 per cent of the money recommended by the Schools Commission to be given to the States through the various programmes was disbursed. In the first two years of the Fraser Government, 61 per

cent of the sum recommended was disbursed. I believe that that is a fair basis of comparison. I will shortly be able to compare the first three years of the Fraser Government with the three years of the Whitlam Government, and I sincerely believe that those figures will show an even greater deterioration of the position under the Commonwealth Liberal Government, because, in 1974, the total needs identified by the commission and quantified by it were met by the Commonwealth, so that 100 per cent is built into those figures. Let no-one go back to the Hayden Budget as any sort of excuse for what is happening now; let people stand up and be counted according to current performance.

URANIUM

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General read the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee and, if so, how can he justify his recent misleading statements on the environmental aspects, and the employment opportunities relating to the establishment of a uranium enrichment centre in the iron triangle? From reports that I have read, it appears that the Attorney-General said that only 200 would be employed in the plant, and that the environmental consequences would be disastrous if the project went ahead in that area. From reading the report, I believe that 1 500 people would be employed in the plant, and an additional 500 employed in management away from the plant.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not read the third report. I know, however, from matters that I have read concerning proposed and existing uranium enrichment plants overseas that, with modern technology, the number of people to be employed in such plants is far fewer than has been suggested. I imagine that it would be possible to check on the number employed overseas and in proposed plants to show that. My comments concerning the whole question of the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia and the question whether or not Australia should, in the present circumstances, mine and export its uranium to customer countries were based on my belief and that of the Government that at this stage it is not possible to be sure that proper safety requirements will be met or that proper safety requirements in the customer country will be adequate.

Certainly nothing that the Federal Government has negotiated over the past few months gives us any cause for optimism about that matter. Even the reduced safety requirements that the Federal Government established as its policy, requirements which, of course, were not those that had been advocated in the Fox reports, were not the safety requirements set out in agreements reached, for example, with Finland and, I presume, similarly with the Philippines. The Federal Government is set on a course of selling Australian uranium overseas regardless of all these matters.

The other matter of great concern to this Government and to the Australian Labor Party (and this matter does not seem to concern members opposite at all), is the future of waste products arising out of the use of uranium and its derivatives in the nuclear fuel cycle. Nowhere in the world does there exist satisfactory and adequate technology for the proper safe disposal of waste products. Even the suggestion that has been made about a product known, I think, as "synrock" does not involve in any way neutralising the atomic wastes, which are still highly toxic and radioactive. The system proposed is simply that the wastes would be fused into a type of synthetic rock and buried in parts of the world where the geological structure

is fairly stable. That means that for thousands and thousands of years human beings, our descendants, must bear the responsibility of trying to look after those wastes.

It will not simply be sufficient in future to bury the wastes and forget about them. Someone will have to ensure that they are properly secure and protected from terrorists and others who might seek to use such products for their own ends. That would be an enormous burden on the future of the human race. It is a burden that this generation should not put on to future generations: it is a burden that this generation has no right to place on the shoulders of future generations.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to comply with the request of the Australian Council of the Local Government Association to amend the State Constitution to include reference to local government? At meetings of the Constitution Convention, recommendations have been made that both State and Federal Constitutions should provide for the continuation of local government. The proposition is supported by the Local Government Association in South Australia. I understand that that matter was on the agenda of the recent Local Government Ministers' Conference.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There has been a request about this matter by the Australian Council of the Local Government Association and discussions on it took place at the Constitution Convention. State Cabinet has discussed it and determined the policy that was enunciated at the last meeting of the Local Government Ministers' Conference in May. The Government said that, provided all other States were willing to amend their Constitutions to include a reference to the continuation of local government, South Australia would have no hesitation in doing likewise.

At this stage the situation is that Victoria has drafted a Bill which has been introduced into the Victorian Parliament and, to the best of my knowledge, the Victorian Government intends simply to let the Bill lie on the table and not to proceed with it until there has been adequate time for public debate. Clearly, because of the coming Victorian State elections, what happens to it is anyone's guess. The Tasmanian Government and the New South Wales Government have taken the same line that South Australia has taken in saying that, as soon as all States agree, they will certainly follow suit and introduce a reference to local government in their Constitutions. The two States that are outstanding are the progressive States of Queensland and Western Australia ("progressive" in inverted commas). Neither State has indicated any desire at all to do so; indeed, there has been a complete rejection by Queensland and an indifferent attitude by Western Australia. Until those two States change their minds, it is clear that the desire of local government will be thwarted by the attitudes of those two States.

ADELAIDE GAOL

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Chief Secretary say what specific plans the Government has to build a new gaol to replace Adelaide Gaol; when the proposed new remand centre will be completed; and why the appalling conditions at Adelaide Gaol have been allowed to continue for so long? The Full Bench of the Industrial Commission yesterday strongly criticised conditions at Adelaide Gaol,

as reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

We agree that they are nothing short of appalling and would be regarded as totally unacceptable by any responsible members of the community. Indeed, how any relevant Government authority has, over a long period of time, been prepared to tolerate the existing arrangements for remand prisoners and those awaiting assessments completely escapes us.

We venture to suggest that if the community generally was aware of the substandard buildings and accommodation, totally inadequate toilet and ablution facilities, lack of shelter during inclement weather, absence of changing rooms, and generally degrading conditions existing for persons who have not yet been convicted of any offence there would be a public outcry.

The Full Bench obviously believes that the facilities at Adelaide Gaol should not be used either as a gaol or as a remand centre. The Full Bench obviously believes that the conditions have been appalling for a long time and that something should be done very quickly about them. I understand that when the Minister returned from overseas he made some rather vague promises about a new remand centre.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand, too, that there have been no specific plans (and I ask the Chief Secretary to verify this) to build a new gaol. I therefore believe that the Government should be fully accountable for its lack of action over the past eight years concerning which it has now been so strongly criticised by the Industrial Commission.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is true that the conditions at the Adelaide Gaol are very unsatisfactory. The gaol is about 130 years old and, in my opinion, it should have been discontinued for that purpose some years ago. This was pointed out by the Mitchell Committee some years ago, and the Government has put it on the forward Loan programme for commencement in 1980. I made that statement when I returned from overseas. One of the things I particularly examined on that visit was remand prisons.

It is desirable that they be close to the courts and the legal profession, from the point of view of convenience of the prisoners on remand, and also concerning the logistics in moving prisoners to and from courts. In the eight to 10 months since I have been Chief Secretary several sites have been looked at and discarded for one reason or another. They are either too far from Adelaide, or they are not big enough, and so on. I have narrowed it down to two or three possible sites, about which we should be able to decide soon. When I came back a month ago, I said I hoped a site would finally be chosen and announced within three months. I hope to keep to that.

Mr. Dean Brown: The new building is still three years away?

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

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I made no secret, when I gave my press interview on 18 July, that it was on the forward Loan programme for 1980. It is a reasonable assumption that it will take a couple of years to build. If we had decided on the day I became Minister, it is unlikely that it would have been commenced before the end of 1979, given the need to plan a building that will cost many millions of dollars. I do not like the situation, but it will be about 1980 before the building is commenced.

I took special note of remand prisons while I was overseas. I saw several, including some close to the courts, that my department is not keen on: nor am I, from what I

saw overseas. I hope that, in the next few months, an officer of the department will inspect some of the places I saw, and we will be able to go ahead then with an approved site, and design a plan so that the building will be commenced in 1980. That is the statement I made a month ago: there was nothing vague about it. It is as definite as I can make it. My only qualification was that it was dependent on funding being available, and that, given the state of the present Federal Government, is something that no-one can predict.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister for Transport has his back to the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I cannot guarantee that the funds of the State will be sufficient in two years time to enable that to take place, but I rank it a high priority. The Government has spent a considerable amount on its prisons. In the past three years more than \$2 000 000 has been spent, and this year we are spending more than \$1 000 000 on upgrading industries facilities at Yatala, and also completing the country prisons programme. A limited amount of money only can be made available for this purpose.

As soon as this programme is finished in 1980, I hope we will be able to continue with the new remand centre, which will take pressure off Adelaide Gaol. It will at least get rid of remand prisoners. The next stage will be the provision of a minimum, medium security prison, as was recommended by the Mitchell Committee. It seems that there is no way we can avoid continuing to use the Adelaide Gaol, to some extent anyhow, for another six or seven years. I hope that remand prisoners will be out of there in about three of four years.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's not good enough.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. If he continues in this vein, he will be named.

SOUTH ROAD

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether road safety devices known as cat's eyes are to be installed along the South Road from Darlington to the top of Tapley Hill Road and, if so, when? I have been approached by constituents regarding this stretch of the road, which is not well lit at night. I understand that these devices reflect light, and I have been asked to approach the Minister on the matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a continuing programme of installing these markers on the pavement, because they are of tremendous assistance to motorists, particularly in wet conditions. I am not sure whether the South Road is scheduled soon for the installation of these devices, but I shall ask the Commissioner of Highways for information for the honourable member, so that he can inform his constituents.

POPULATION PREDICTION

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Premier inform the House on what basis the Director-General for Trade and Development makes his prediction that South Australia's population, which is now 10 per cent of the national total, will be reduced to 7 per cent of the national total by the year 2000? Mr. Davies made this prediction to a Productivity Council dinner held in Adelaide last week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the Director was referring to some figures cited by the Permanent Head, Mr. Bakewell, in an address that has been published.

However, I shall get the figures for the honourable member.

VICTORIAN MINISTER

Mr. KENEALLY: Because of the widely publicised criticism of the Prime Minister by a Mr. Dunstan, who has subsequently resigned his Ministry, will the Premier dispel any confusion that may have arisen by some possible similarity of views on this subject by confirming that he is not that Mr. Dunstan and that he has no intention of resigning? In a rare example of political honesty by a member of the Liberal Party, a Mr. Dunstan has told the truth about Mr. Fraser. As the Premier is noted for his honesty, people may believe that he is the Mr. Dunstan referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is one thing that Mr. Roberts Dunstan has said in the past couple of days that I am not certain that I agree with at all; that was his view about Senator Withers. As to his views about Mr. Fraser, Mr. Dunstan is understandably annoyed. He is Minister of Public Works in a Government which has had its works programme extremely heavily hit by the actions of the Fraser Government. Mr. Dunstan has said that it seems that Mr. Fraser is even more keen to get rid of the Hamer Government than he was to get rid of the Whitlam Government. The Liberal Government in Victoria is looking down the barrel of an election soon, and the way in which it has had to curtail its programme and the enormous depredations that the Federal Government wreaked upon the building industry in this country in the withdrawal of moneys from the construction area for which Mr. Dunstan was responsible have made him understandably bitter.

I entirely agree with his bitterness, because in Victoria he has the responsibility for doing something in relation to the economy of his State, unlike the Liberals in this State who have, and who seem to exercise, no sense of similar responsibility towards the economy of this State. Mr. Dunstan has quite rightly said that every Premier who came out of the Premiers' Conference, regardless of his political opinion, said similar things about Mr. Fraser then, and he was quite right.

UNOCCUPIED PREMISES

Mr. BECKER: I ask a question supplementary to the one on notice that I asked on Tuesday. Will the Minister of Works accept my offer to assist an officer of the Public Buildings Department to extract the information that I sought in my Question on Notice concerning pre-occupation rents? I am willing to give up a few days of my time (preferably during the Show Week recess) to obtain from the department's records the amounts spent on pre-occupation rents and cleaning costs for the financial years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75, and 1977-78. If the Minister will not accept my offer, how can he claim that it would cost \$1 700 to obtain the answers to my question if proper records have been kept and maintained?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand the honourable member's motivation in making his offer; he is rostered to man the Liberal Party caravan at the Show, and he wants to get out of it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He wants to get out of it!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Transport to order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I do not think that that is an honourable thing to do and I am surprised that

the honourable member would think of that tactic to get himself off the string. Let me tell the honourable member seriously that the decision not to supply the information was not taken lightly, because I believe that honourable members should have what information they can get reasonably, where this possible.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Davenport would not accept that, because he does not accept anything that anyone says. He is honest about that. The Director of the Public Buildings Department (Mr. Roeger) reported to me that it would take (I think he said) six officers a not inconsiderable time of about seven or eight days, to get this basic information. Unfortunately, in many of the instances about which the honourable member seeks information, that is, the period between the taking up of a lease and the actual occupation of the building, the information has not been kept.

I can give the honourable member a rough figure of the amount that has been spent on leased accommodation that has not been occupied for that period: it probably would be more than \$2 000 000. The honourable member must appreciate that that \$2 000 000 has not been wasted. The point that the honourable member is trying to make is that, because we have paid that amount, it has been wasted. I shall explain to the honourable member slowly and clearly what happens. In this State the demand for office accommodation is such (and office accommodation is one thing that we are short of in the capital city of Adelaide) that at the time of entering into a lease one must commence to pay rent.

It is not possible (and I think I heard the honourable member suggest this the other day) to put people into an office without lights, telephones, furniture, floor coverings, and all the things that go to make up an office. It is not possible to even lay that office out. Indeed, it would be foolish of the department to presuppose the negotiations surrounding a lease would be successful and to spend money on design for office partitions, especially if the person leasing the accommodation got to know of that: up would go the rent. For that reason we do not pre-empt a situation. When the lease is entered into, the client department to go into the building is given the opportunity of advising the Public Buildings Department what it requires.

I remind the honourable member that we do not waste time regarding the design of these premises. The matter is often handed over to consultants, who sometimes deal with the whole procedure. As I said previously, the Government is accountable to the public. It cannot therefore cut the procedures, or the so-called red tape, that it must follow because, if it does so to the extreme, it cannot, of course, be accountable to the public. Because of that and the necessity to protect the officers involved, certain procedures must be followed.

I have said that there have been occasions when perhaps the rent for a week or two could have been saved, and I have referred to the amount involved in a lease involving a rent of up to \$200 000 before occupation. Where possible, I have cited information regarding buildings that have remained unoccupied while rent was being paid. So, I am not trying to hide anything from the honourable member. True, payment of rent for a week or two could have been avoided. However, in a large organisation such as this, it is not always possible for top management to keep its finger on every move.

I think in April this year the new Director met with the heads of the various branches, or the people involved in this matter, and certainly they have evolved new methods which are to be, or have been, applied and which I believe

will solve some of the problems that we have experienced in the past. I am willing to let the honourable member know what the changes are and to show him that all the changes necessary have been made to try to avoid any possibility of time, and therefore money, being wasted.

Indeed, these measures were taken even before the time to which I have referred. The system has been under constant review because of comments made by the Auditor-General. I think it was last year that Mr. Dunn, who was then the Director of Public Buildings, reported to me that he also had taken steps to try to prevent a recurrence of this. The Auditor-General (and I do not want the honourable member to be confused about this) has from time to time commented not on the aspect to which the honourable member has referred but on the amount of office space that the Government rents.

That is a different question altogether. It is obvious (and should be obvious to anyone) that it would be financially desirable for the Government to own its own accommodation. However, the honourable member would know full well that the loan availability to the Government is not sufficient to enable the Government to build all the accommodation that it requires. It is inevitable that we will have to continue to rent accommodation in which we can put our people.

Also, there has been criticism about the standard of accommodation that the Government provides for public servants. However, I make no apology for that. These people are required to work hard, and they do so and, in my view, they are entitled to the standard of accommodation that the Government provides for them. That accommodation is a long way from what it used to be and, if additional cost is involved in this area, I make no apology for it.

Although I am not certain about this, I think the honourable member may have made his suggestion to get out of manning the caravan. However, I cannot take up his offer, because I do not believe that it is possible accurately to obtain the information. Even if it was possible, I do not believe that the information which the honourable member is seeking is there or, indeed, is worth while.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you think—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader does not understand.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I issued instructions to the Director to get what information was possible, and the report that he returned to me indicated what I think the Chief Secretary said yesterday when giving details of what was involved, including an estimated cost of \$1 700 to collect the relevant information. Also, with the Government's policy regarding the size of the Public Service, the Government does not have people spare to handle this sort of inquiry.

The honourable member cannot have his cake and eat it, too. He cannot, as members of the Opposition have over the past three years, demand that the Public Service be cut and then do as they have done regarding Questions on Notice. If we break down the 320-odd questions, each question may contain six or seven parts, each a separate question, so the total on the Notice Paper probably reaches 1 000 Questions on Notice to be answered.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Glenelg to order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If honourable members think of the time that takes, they may realise what is involved in getting this sort of information. If a reply is obtainable quickly and cheaply, there will be no hesitation

in giving it; but in this case the judgment I made was the correct one.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. BANNON: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the current position regarding hearing dates for workmen's compensation cases? The Minister is on record concerning the delays occurring in hearing workmen's compensation cases, pointing out that such delays can often impede the settlement of cases and the health and rehabilitation of the individual concerned, and he has taken steps in the past to try to correct that. I was therefore surprised recently when a constituent of mine came to me about his own case and told me there was well over five months between the listing of his application and its setting down for hearing.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The matter to which the honourable member refers was discussed with me and, in turn, I talked to the President of the Industrial Court about it, just to see what the current situation was. The letter he has written back to me should be of general information to members so that, if they are faced with the same type of problem with their constituents, they will know the exact position. I will read the letter to the House so that everyone will be aware of its contents:

My dear Minister, Following our telephone discussion I have looked into this matter and find that the vital statistics read as follows.

They were the statistics in this case about which the member for Ross Smith rang up. I do not know whether they are important here, but the contents of the letter are. The letter continues:

As you will note from the above there is a lead time of approximately five months from date of setting down to date of hearing at the present time. This is a little longer than we would desire due mainly to the absence of Kevin O'Loughlin on long service leave. Of course, if it can be demonstrated that there is some unusual urgency, a party can apply for an accelerated date of hearing, and this would be dealt with upon its relative merits. Ideally, we like to work on the basis that the lead time between date of setting down and date of hearing is not more than about four months. As a result of practical experience, we have found that, even if we were staffed to achieve this, it would be well nigh impractical to bring most matters on for hearing in under this time.

We have in the past on one or two occasions made a determined onslaught on the list to reduce the hearing times below four months and, without exception, this has caused more problems than it has resolved. It seems that the profession simply cannot be ready in less than this lead time with the work load which they have and bearing in mind the fact that arrangements for specialist medical evidence to be given have to be made some considerable distance into the future to ensure availability. A further complicating factor is that, in a significant number of instances, it is undesirable to bring a matter on more rapidly because the problem may well be that the workman's position has not sufficiently stabilised. I trust that the foregoing information is sufficient for your purposes. Needless to say, I shall be delighted to discuss the matter further with you if you would so desire.

SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr. GUNN: In view of the importance to South Australia of the export of live sheep to the Middle East from this State, can the Premier give an undertaking that the South Australian Government will give its full support

to the continuation of this valuable project and, in particular, that it will use its good offices to assist those people involved in this export trade?

Concern has been expressed that members of the meatworkers union may again attempt to ban the export of live sheep from South Australia. It has been reported by Mr. Miller, who headed an inquiry into the matter (details of this appear in today's *Stock Journal* and also the *Advertiser*), that if we are going to increase our proportion of carcass exports to the Middle East it is desirable (in fact essential) that we are a reliable market for the export of live sheep. As this scheme creates employment, I know that the Premier would not want to take any course of action that would in any way lead to further unemployment in the State.

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

Mr. GUNN: I believe members of the House and the people of this State would require a firm statement to be made by the Government on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government has always supported an export trade in live sheep. It believes that this is an essential part of our trade. Our experience of marketing in the Middle East has made it clear that, if we are to send carcass exports to that area and build those exports further, it will be related in some measure to our ability to provide live sheep as well. The attitude that the Government has always taken in this matter is that there has to be an agreed and reasonable basis upon which that or the carcass export should proceed, and our effort in this matter has been constantly directed to that end. During the last dispute, the South Australian Government supported the solution of the differences on this matter proposed by the Federal Liberal Minister; we publicly supported what he proposed.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government had put that proposal to the parties.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. The honourable Premier.

Mr. Chapman: God strike me—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member continues in that vein he will receive the treatment.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. It is difficult enough to take when a member is criticised from the Chair for interjecting but, by hell, it is more than I can take to be criticised by the Chair when I do not interject.

The SPEAKER: Order! I inform the honourable member that there were two voices: one I thought was that of the honourable member for Mallee, and I definitely heard the honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. Chapman: No way this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Mathwin: You were caught in slips there, mate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. He has already been called to order, and if he continues in this vein I will name him. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I heard somebody call on the Almighty to strike him a moment ago. I thought you were going to call for a short interposition by Divine Providence to see whether there was any interposition by that Deity. The Government is keen to see that the trade proceeds. I believe that, following the undesirable activity of extremists on both sides in the dispute earlier this year, conclusions have now been reached that will prevent a

recurrence of that sort of activity. I hope that we will be able to proceed with the trade upon a reasonable and sensible basis in future.

STAR FORCE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Chief Secretary say what progress has been made with the establishment of the new emergency squad within the South Australian Police Force and whether it is intended that the total police numbers will increase to accommodate this necessary and commendable precautionary group?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Before I went overseas, the Commissioner told me his plans to set up this Star Force, which, he envisaged, would have 60 members in it, and I referred back to him to ascertain how many of those would be additional personnel. I understand that the Commissioner plans to put people who are in various specialist positions in the force into one special group, so that many of them would be already in the force, but not under the one command. I think the total number of new positions that would be involved was 12, and he assured me that this could be met within the normal operations of the Police Force by moving personnel around, and so on. Because of the urgency of doing this, I have spoken to him since my return, and he still says that he is able to do this by making the necessary rearrangements in the force, and the project is going ahead.

However, there are problems, not the least being accommodation, because we will have to find some place to put all these people together, and that is currently planned to be at the Thebarton barracks area. I think the Country Fire Service is moving from there to new headquarters, and its accommodation will be available in the first instance for the Star Force. Although that will take a little while to bring about, the Commissioner has the necessary organisational steps in train.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Health whether the new extensions to the Whyalla Hospital have in any way been curtailed or affected by the recent severe financial cut-backs in hospital expenditure by the Federal Government? I understand that some hospitals in the State have been considerably affected by the lack of Federal money. Also, as there has been about eight years of debate to get the proposed extensions off the ground, I would be most disappointed if any financial difficulties were apparent at this time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will certainly endeavour to obtain from my colleague the information the honourable member needs.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. CHAPMAN: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport and is supplementary to a question I asked last week. Has the Minister had an opportunity to examine his reply, and is he prepared to retract some of the reply he gave me on that occasion?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member, if he so desires, can start his question again.

Mr. CHAPMAN: My question to the Minister related to a road maintenance tax and his procrastination about joining other Ministers in Australia in supporting the

introduction of legislation in South Australia to cover straw companies. In his reply, the Minister said that no request had been made to him from recognised and reputable trucking industries for legislation to be introduced to cover straw companies. I have had drawn to my attention again, since asking my question, that on 17 February 1977 representatives of a reputable trucking organisation in South Australia, being Messrs. Lewis and O'Flaherty, officers from the Professional Transport Drivers Association, incorporating professional drivers, professional owner-drivers and truck operators, in the company of the Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Johnkinke), State Transport Authority Adviser (Mr. Preston), and the Minister's Secretary (Mr. Campbell), put this subject to the Minister and asked him to take into account the effect that straw companies were having on the policing and overall subject of road maintenance tax.

The representatives put to him that that legislation, covering straw companies in this State, should be introduced and supported. Subsequently, on 24 February 1978 at an Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting at Hobart, representatives from the same organisations put to the Minister exactly the same proposal and request, and at that time it was done in the company of the Director-General of Transport (Dr. Scrafton). This if not direct then very implied criticism of this respected organisation in South Australia may not have been intended. However, it is quite clear from the evidence to hand that official approaches have been made to the Minister, and I therefore ask him whether he is prepared to convey to the House what is the position, in view of those comments.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, the honourable member is in some difficulty with this subject. I noticed that he went back to 17 February 1977 to talk about an approach from the professional drivers association.

Mr. Chapman: A representative.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I see. I think he ought to get his thinking updated a little because he was at a meeting called by the professional drivers association, as I was, at the Challa Gardens Hotel on Torrens Road about four or five months ago. Arising from that meeting, a decision was carried opposing completely the road maintenance tax. I think the meeting was the first conference or convention of that organisation and, following that meeting, the organisation wrote at length in its journal on the question of the straw company problem and stated that if the straw company legislation was passed it would put most of the organisation's members to the wall. They violently opposed the proposition that legislation dealing with straw companies should come in. The honourable member has just got his thinking on transport so muddled that he really does not know where he is going.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will warn the honourable member for Alexandra if he continues in that vein.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The point in relation to the straw company problem as far as South Australia is concerned has been made abundantly clear to everyone who wants to understand it. We have said consistently, that, if and when the Crown Solicitor of this State is prepared to give us an opinion that he believes that an amendment to deal with the straw company legislation would be valid, we will introduce the amending legislation. One could not get anything clearer than that. Up to this stage we do not have such an opinion. Indeed, to the contrary: we have been told consistently that it would not be possible to introduce amending legislation that would stand up in the courts. I have told the honourable member that before. I also told the member for Goyder, when he

was the shadow Minister, and I am sure that he understood it. I hope that the member for Alexandra will now understand the situation and try to temper his attitude to the question in a more reasonable way.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 456.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg): As is traditional in the Address in Reply debate, I support the motion. I take this opportunity to join other members and the Governor in expressing sympathy to the family of the late Hon. Frank Potter, one of nature's gentlemen in every sense of the word. Frank was always ready to advise, and he was always polite and friendly. He lived in my district, and he was well known throughout it as a fine family man with the interests of his family at heart. He involved himself with them in the community, and he will be sadly missed by all who had contact with him. As a friend and adviser, he will be sadly missed by me.

His Excellency's Speech contained very few surprises. As a document prepared by the Government, it contained the Government's policy. Most of it blasted the Federal Government. Of course, this is quickly becoming the national sport of the socialist Party, particularly the socialist members of the socialist Government of South Australia; that is, to blame the Federal Government for everything. The Premier will blame anyone, whether friend or foe, for anything, to take the pressure from his own shoulders. I hope that when the Premier reshuffles his Cabinet, as no doubt he will, he will relinquish his portfolio of Treasurer, because he is making a botch of it. Other Ministers in the Ministry at present are more than well qualified to do a much better job than the Premier is doing.

Mr. Wilson: Who do you think will get the portfolio?

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Ross Smith is one of the front runners. From inside information, I believe he has a fair amount of backing, although, except for a small ailment, the member for Morphett was running him close last week.

Mr. Wilson: What about the Liberal Party's candidate for Morphett?

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Morphett had a lump in his throat last week which caused him considerable concern. The Deputy Premier commented on the number of questions that Opposition members had on the Notice Paper. It is obvious to me, and surely it ought to be obvious to other members and to the community generally, that Question Time is now termed "Ministers' talking time". When there is a new child in a family, that child always has a special crying time. At present the time allocated to Ministers as talking time is Question Time, with Government members being supplied with questions by Ministers, who are prepared with reams of paper containing written answers to their own questions. Coupled with the Government's policy of talking out Question Time at every possible opportunity following questions from the Opposition, what chance have Opposition back-benchers to get in any questions at all? If we are lucky, we get in one question a week.

Ministers have taken 15, 16 and 17 minutes to answer one simple question. How on earth are Opposition members going to get information from the Government other than by putting Questions on Notice? The

Government has successfully cut down Question Time by half. When I came here it was quite easy for each Opposition member to ask three questions a day, often four. Because of the number of questions it was asked, the Government found it had problems, so the first thing it did was to cut Question Time by half. The Government said, "We will cut it down by half, so that they cannot ask as many questions." Now, if we want information from Ministers we have to put Questions on Notice, yet the Government is bleating again that we are putting too many Questions on Notice. Ministers cannot answer those questions, either. It is about time that the Government woke up to itself and understood that there is a job to be done, as far as members of this Parliament are concerned. We search for these questions. The only way open for us is to put Questions on Notice in the hope that Ministers will answer them. Ministers have refused to answer a batch this week.

Mr. Abbott: How many people do you employ preparing them?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Ministers all have public relations officers and a number of staff. What on earth does a public relations officer do with his or her time each day, just to promote a Minister? If they have not got time to do a bit of research, there is something wrong with them.

Once again the Governor's Speech referred, in the section dealing with the environment, to that hardy annual, the off-road vehicles legislation. This matter has been raised for a number of years now, and I suppose it will still remain after this session finishes. What has happened to the environmental impact statement legislation, which the first Minister for the Environment was going to bring to this House? The member for Henley Beach, probably the best Minister for the Environment we ever had, said in his first year of reign, when he was the junior Minister on the front bench, that he would bring in this legislation. That was some years and three Ministers ago. We still have not had that legislation. I tried to bring in a private member's Bill on the matter, but, of course, that did not get very far. I thought at least it would give some incentive to the Government to get on with the job.

We all know the history of the E.I.S. legislation of the Federal Government, which has been manipulated by this South Australian Government. That was tried out on the Morphettville bus depot. The general public was most successfully manipulated; people had things put over them right, left and centre. The way the Government put it over the people of Morphettville Park, with the public relations job done by its advisers, leaves a lot to be desired.

The same thing is happening in the territory of the member for Torrens, with manipulation of an E.I.S. You quieten the public, take away every weapon it has and get people into a corner. Then the Government does the exact thing it wanted to do in the first place. The only difference is that it is a long public relations job, and it costs the taxpayers of this State many thousands of dollars.

A number of Questions on Notice are awaiting replies, and the Minister of Community Welfare recently refused to answer a reasonable Question on Notice. He sent me the following letter dated 25 July:

I am writing to lay before you certain facts relating to Question on Notice No. 203 standing in your name. First, I should say that some parts of the question should be directed to the Police Department and not to the Community Welfare Department. Other parts of the question can be answered from annual reports which are readily available to you from the Parliamentary Library.

That is a challenge! It is a challenge for any member who looks at these reports to try to find answers from them; the information is spread from page 1 to page 16. How on

earth members of Parliament, with the limited time available to them, are expected to collate that information, I do not know. The letter continues:

The estimated cost of this exercise, including the cost to the Police Department and the courts, would be in the order of \$1 500.

I replied to the Minister's letter, and said that I was more than surprised that the information for which I was asking was not simply a matter of continuous monitoring by his department. It would be needed in the preparation of the annual report of the Juvenile Court, which is done by the Community Welfare Department.

Although the Minister said the cost of obtaining the information was not warranted, one of the questions asked related to traffic offences committed by juveniles. The following question was asked:

In the years 1970 to 1977 respectively, how many juvenile traffic offences were dealt with by the Juvenile Courts and youth aid panels, and how many of those offences involved death or serious injury?

If that is a minor matter, I shall be surprised. The question also asked for information in connection with criminal offences and property damage, as well as driving under the influence of liquor. If the cost of finding those details is not warranted, I do not know what is. We were asking about people appearing in the Juvenile Court who would be under the age of 18 years, and those appearing before the juvenile aid panels who would be under the age of 16 years, and we are asking about driving offences. The report shows that in 1972-73, juveniles under 18 years of age committed 2 576 minor traffic offences and 543 other traffic offences; in 1973-74, they committed 3 081 minor traffic offences and 601 other offences; in 1974-75, the figures were 3 287 and 805, respectively; in 1975-76, with the numbers increasing, they were 3 902 and 815, respectively; and in 1976-77, the figures were 4 208 and 735, respectively.

I am drawing to the attention of the House the fact that the Minister believed that the cost of seeking this information was not warranted, that the questions were too expensive to research. I refer to the Juvenile Court annual report of 1972-73. "Other" traffic offences and major traffic offences are referred to, but the material does not include offences in relation to liquor. At page 26 of the report, the definition is as follows:

16. Liquor offences . . . All offences under Licensing Act. Exceed .08.

The Minister of Community Welfare did not believe these questions were important enough to research. He regards these offences as minor offences, including drunken driving above the 0.08 level, and he refused to give me the information. In researching this matter myself (it took me half the night) I obtained, in addition to the information provided to me, the following figures:

Juvenile Liquor Offences

	No. of offences
1972-73	328
1973-74	406
1974-75	466
1975-76	561
1976-77	464

True, one could assume that these were not all driving offences, but of course I was refused further information from the Minister. Therefore, I can reasonably assume that 50 per cent of these young people under 18 were caught drunken driving. These people would be placed on a bond, released after a few weeks, and put back in society in a short period. What generally happens to people who are caught driving with a blood alcohol level in excess of

.08? They would be given a three-month suspended suspension of their licence, for a start. If they were caught a number of times, they would receive a term of imprisonment and would lose their licence for years, certainly for 18 months or more.

What is the situation regarding juveniles, which the Minister believes is not sufficiently important to research? I sought information about juvenile aid panels, and information concerning traffic offences of juveniles under the age of 16 years involved in driving charges. I obtained the following figures:

	No. of offences
1972-73	309
1973-74	412
1974-75	615
1975-76	851
1976-77	792

If the Minister will allow his statistician to provide this information to Parliament and the public, I want to know how many of those offences of children under the age of 16 years, who do not have a licence, anyway, involved driving under the influence. How many of those offences involved readings greater than the .08 level?

I understand that evidence was given to the courts that some of these children had a blood alcohol reading well over .08 per cent. As I said previously, if these young people are under the control of juvenile aid panels, they must be under 16 years of age, and, therefore, have the Minister's protection. Such young children can be let out in a matter of days. In fact, the decision regarding how soon they are released depends on the situation obtaining at the time.

One knows what happens at places like McNally Training Centre and how easy it is for young offenders to get out of that institution. Indeed, I heard recently of a case involving assault at McNally. Two or three young people were involved, and a residential care worker was injured. However, one offender (probably one of the worst offenders ever to be admitted to McNally) was released 20 minutes before the police arrived to ascertain what the disturbance was all about. Why did that happen?

I demand that the Minister of Community Welfare give to the public the relevant figures, particularly in relation to traffic offences involving children. Many of these young people do not have a driver's licence. Indeed, they are not old enough to have one, but could well be drunk while driving. Everyone knows the situation regarding drinking and driving: a person, no matter what his age, who is drunk while behind the wheel of a car is a potential killer.

It is therefore a disgrace that the Minister does not provide Parliament with the figures. He says he has not had the figures collated because he does not think they are sufficiently important and, when asked a simple question regarding the matter, the Minister says that it will cost too much money to get the information because his department is short of money. What is the Minister's department doing?

In another question, when asked about the renovation and upgrading of the high security block at McNally Training Centre, the Minister said that the renovations would cost so many thousands of dollars. He said that \$10 000 was to be spent on putting carpet in the high security block at McNally. Anyone who has been to the centre and looked around it will agree that there are perhaps recreation areas that could be carpeted. However, that is completely different from carpeting the whole block at a cost of \$10 000! What is being put in there? Is it top-grade Axminster? Is a shag pile off-white carpet being put in? What sort of carpet that will cost \$10 000 of the

taxpayers' money is the Minister putting into McNally? For goodness sake, the Minister must get his priorities right.

The Minister has been asked reasonable questions which affect the State and which involve expenditure of taxpayers' money. More important, he has been asked questions involving the protection of the people of this State and concerning young offenders, to whom I have already referred. The Minister is indeed wrong when he refuses to allow those questions to be answered in this place.

I have referred to young people who obviously drive without licences, as they are under 16 years of age. We do not know how many of these youngsters drive while drunk. Members know what would happen to them if they were caught driving while they were drunk. They would soon realise whether or not they had the protection of Parliament. They know how they would suffer in those circumstances. The Minister of Labour and Industry would know that full well.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What protection should Parliament give you? It shouldn't give you any.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is so, and it has no right to. However, these young children who drive without licences are given protection because they are under age. How many of them drive while they are drunk?

That is the big question; that is the question to which the Minister referred in that letter to me, that he does not think the cost is warranted in getting this type of information for the people of South Australia. That is a disgrace. Anyone can have an accident, but we know the ratio between the total number of accidents and drunken driving accidents: there is a distinct tie-up.

There is only one way in which we can consider the situation, and that is that the Minister of Community Welfare is working a big cover-up for his department and for himself, in particular, in this matter, because he knows it is serious and that the people of this State are concerned about it. What cost he can put on that sort of thing I do not know. The cost was given merely as an excuse. I believe that the Minister, particularly in relation to serious accidents involving drunken driving, should be made to release this information to the people of South Australia.

When he says that the figures are not available, we have to think back on the situation. Not long ago it was announced that a crime-fighting professor was now being taken on by the Government. A 33-year old American professor is Director of the State Government's new office of crime statistics. He is Mr. Peter Grabosky, an associate professor of political science of the University of Vermont. We are told that his \$24 000-a-year job launches a new Government offensive against crime in South Australia.

We know that at least one person is employed in the department who can research that information for the Minister. I wonder how many staff this gentleman has: it is said it is three, but I suspect it could be far more. In the *News* of 7 March 1978 it was reported that the Police Department was to upgrade its system of gathering statistics to help improve crime prevention and detection. The Commissioner of Police (Mr. Draper) said that the quality of crime statistics in South Australia needed improving, for a variety of reasons. Of course we will not argue about that. We have seen one instance of it here, and that is only part of the 15 questions I have asked. We agree with the Commissioner of Police that there is a need for improvement. The report states:

"Eighteen months ago we introduced a new crime report and arrest report which was designed to give far greater information," he said.

It is apparent that 18 months ago the police had an up-to-

date report system, which is designed to give more information. I wonder whether the Minister is concerned about statistics held by the Police Department. The Minister mentioned it in his letter to me. Perhaps the Minister of Community Welfare does not talk to Commissioner Draper. If he does not, perhaps he can get another Minister who is on better terms with the Commissioner of Police to talk to him and see whether he can get figures for drunken driving, particularly amongst juveniles, in this State.

Let us consider the Royal Commission into the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act and Other Associated Matters, under Judge Mohr. It seems that he is not quite like the Minister. Let us see what Judge Mohr thinks about the situation in respect of drunken driving and juveniles.

At page 32, paragraph 29.2.5 of the report of the Royal Commissioner states:

Offences relating to liquor and driving are dealt with in many cases more leniently than simple speeding offences. We know that. We know what the Minister of Community Welfare thinks about that offence: he does not consider it is serious. It is not dealt with as a minor traffic or other traffic offence. The report continues:

Evidence was produced showing that quite serious offences of driving under the influence received penalties such as:

Age 17: Offence driving under influence, blood alcohol 0.160. Disposal—no conviction. Costs—\$35. Bond not to drive except to and from work and in course of employment for 3 months.

I wonder what would happen if a member was caught driving with a blood alcohol content of 0.160? The report continues:

Police evidence was that many bonds with conditions not to drive except in the course of employment, etc., were a joke among those concerned because they (that is, the offenders) realised that the worst that would happen to them for disobedience was the forfeiture of \$30, \$40, or \$50, and the end result would be an unrestricted licence to drive.

I am reading from Judge Mohr's report. The Minister says that that matter is not serious enough for him to obtain for me the figures related to those offences. He and his department believe that drunken driving by juveniles does not matter: it is not worth taking out figures. The report continues:

It seems that driving offences stand outside the main stream of juvenile crime. If these matters were transferred to ordinary courts of summary jurisdiction then the disadvantages listed above would disappear, and hopefully young drivers would be much more aware of their responsibilities as drivers. It cannot be beneficial to the young offender, or to the community, for him to escape relatively scot free from a serious driving offence. On the other hand, to convict and fine a young traffic offender and release his friend, who has committed a comparatively serious criminal offence without penalty—and in the same court or before a panel on the same day—cannot be seen as justice being done.

29.3 There was no opposition and a fairly universal approval of a proposed recommendation that all offences against the Road Traffic Act and Motor Vehicles Act be removed from the jurisdiction of the Children's Court, provided the offender was aged 16 years or over, and be dealt with in the ordinary way by courts of summary jurisdiction. That was what Judge Mohr said about this matter, and it certainly makes sense to me. The reasons are shown quite plainly for the Minister of Community Welfare to study. I suggest that, at the first opportunity (perhaps this weekend) the Minister take this report home and read it. When people, whether they be members of Parliament or members of the public, ask about offences involving

juveniles' driving, or ask how many juveniles under the age of 18 have been caught drunken driving, and how many children under 16 are caught drunken driving and are dealt with by juvenile aid panels, he will not have to say that he does not believe it is worth collating material to prepare these figures because he does not think it is important enough.

He will say, "We have those figures available in my department because I am concerned about the situation in relation to drunken driving by juveniles." It is about time the Minister of Community Welfare lifted his game.

Yesterday, he said that I did not know what I was talking about as regards McNally. He said that there was no trouble regarding staff at McNally, but I suggest to him that he is completely out of touch with the workers in his department. He said that the staff members were not concerned or worried about their control over the boys they are looking after or about how they stood legally in the event of threats of assault by the inmates that are taking place almost daily. There is open defiance by the inmates at present, and it is about time the Minister got in touch with the workers at the grass-roots level, not with the eggheads, but those doing the manual work within the institutions.

He must, if nothing else, visit McNally without giving a fortnight's notice in advance. Whether or not he has trust in his workers, he should not do as they used to do in the Army, namely, send a dispatch rider to warn of an officer's impending visit, so that the place looks great when the visitor arrives. The Minister should visit McNally more regularly than at present, and I should be pleased to accompany him there at any time of the day or night. I visited there a couple of weeks ago, and I will go again, this time with the Minister, if there is a disturbance there and he is a bit afraid. The Minister should know what is going on within his department, and certainly within the institutions that he is supposed to be controlling.

Turning now to the new look that will occur in the area of juvenile offenders in this State, INC (intensive neighbourhood care) is reported to have been working well in England for the past two or three years. It is being implemented in Kent, which is probably one of the better areas of the United Kingdom, but if one had wanted to ascertain what was happening in the more difficult areas, one could have taken places such as London, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle and probably over the border in Scotland. It is reported that the system works well, and I have a copy of a report by Rosemary Cox, an English person, who has studied the situation in the United Kingdom.

It is not all a bed of roses. It seems that the Minister has taken the new scheme under his wing and thinks that it will work pretty well here. Even though these children may have bashed or thumped the people who control them we still call them children, even though they may be 17 or 18 years old, because it is the nice thing to do. Under the new scheme we will farm these young offenders, not the worst of them, out into the community. They will be placed in neighbourhood care, and they could live next to any one of us, but I suppose that that is all right. The hard-core offenders or recidivists—the young heavies, including boys at McNally and girls from Vaughan House—will all be retained in McNally Training Centre.

The neighbourhood care system is being introduced quietly, and the department is closing down Brookway Park in a couple of weeks. I asked the Minister what payments were made to people who foster children. Foster parents receive an allowance of \$22.70 a week plus wear and tear for clothing, and an allowance of \$3.20 a week for a child under 12, or \$4.50 a week for a child over 12. Let us

consider the foster scheme under the new system. What happens if one wishes to foster one of these little beauties from McNally? The payment for fostering a young person on remand for an alleged offence is \$12 a day or \$84 a week, compared to the \$22.70 a week to which I have just referred, and the allowance in respect of a young person who is to receive care and treatment under a contractual agreement is \$15 a day or \$105 a week.

The difference between fostering a child and taking one of these offenders from an institution is \$22.70 plus \$4.50 a week compared to \$105 a week plus hidden extras, whereby written into the contract will be a provision that the department will pay a full insurance cover for the people taking these children, as well as paying all medical, dental, and optical expenses not covered by the medical benefits fund. These people will also be helped by the district office and its professional consultants, who will visit people at any time they wish. The money received by a person fostering a child from McNally, although it is a matter of danger money to a certain extent, is five times the normal fostering fee, but it is hard on people in the community who are doing a tremendous job now by fostering children in the normal way. It is rather shocking that there is such a difference in the allowances paid to these people.

I recently asked about the cost of upgrading Vaughan House, which will be for some of the lesser lights, including both sexes. The capital cost will be \$150 000 next year, with salaries amounting to \$694 600. The running expenses will be another \$64 000, while Public Buildings Department costs and other costs will be another \$86 000.

McNally Training Centre will be given a nice name and will be upgraded at a capital cost of \$550 000, with salaries amounting to \$755 000 a year. The running expenses will be another \$209 000 a year, while Public Buildings Department costs and other costs will be another \$376 000. Upgrading security will cost \$10 000, and individual toilets and sleeping areas, will cost \$15 000. Carpeting the floor in the high security block will cost \$10 000. If they make it nice enough, we may all move in! Air-conditioning for the administration, sleeping, and dining areas will cost another \$8 000; a room for education programmes, \$3 000; rebuilding, \$4 000. That amounts to another \$50 000 for McNally Training Centre—a considerable cost. We can offset this by the cost of maintaining McNally Training Centre as it is now.

If we reduced the number of inmates, the cost would decrease considerably, although one must take into account the colossal amount we will pay these people. I use the term "colossal" in comparison with the ordinary fostering payment. The more children they farm out into the community the greater the cost of the system. In reply to a question I asked about the cost, the Minister said that it would be a further \$150 000. Even I would doubt whether that would be correct. I would think that it would be far greater than \$150 000. It might be \$150 000 in the first year but, since they are expecting to start the scheme early next year, we may be talking about only part of a financial year. I suspect that the total cost will be far greater than what I was told.

People will take these children into their houses. I make clear that my concern is not with first offenders who are young; these things happen to many people. My concern is with the hard-core recidivists who get away with it time and time again. I refer to those who thump residential care workers, abscond, steal cars and smash them up. Such offenders are put on a bond with no conviction. They break the bond, and the public pays for the lawyers, the courts, and the time of the police.

That is my main concern. It is not the kid who was led

astray now and again who is the problem: the hard-core recidivists are the problem, and they are a small proportion of juvenile offenders, getting away with it time and time again.

Mr. Hemmings: How would you do it?

Mr. MATHWIN: They should know they are there for punishment, after they have done their three rapes and 15 assaults. They should serve the period, which may be short. They ought to know that they cannot treat the people looking after them like dirt, openly defy them and get away with it. They should know they are being punished for an offence. In many cases in this State the victim suffers far more than the law breaker. The problem is perhaps more applicable to the young offender than the older. They are the heavyweights, and I could name them. There is a number of them in the high security block at McNally.

I asked the Minister, in relation to the neighbourhood care system, whether the records of the children would be given to the people willing to foster them. Would they know of the offences committed? He said, "Yes, in a way, I suppose this information could be given, but having regard to confidentiality and the treatment requirements." That is a good let-out. They do not have to be told about it. Parliament and the public of South Australia should know about that, because there is concern about the problem. It is about time the Minister got down to brass tacks and found out what was ticking in his department. I mean in his institutions, not in the office block down the road.

I want to deal with the international industrial democracy conference, in Adelaide, which I attended. I tried to get a ticket and asked the Minister of Community Welfare if I could go. He said I could if I paid \$175.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What did it have to do with the Minister of Community Welfare?

Mr. MATHWIN: I said the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You said the Minister of Community Welfare.

Mr. MATHWIN: In that case I apologise. I would not hurt the Minister's feelings and have him associated with the Minister of Community Welfare after the naughty things I have said about him.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): I think the honourable member is getting close to reflecting on one of the two Ministers. While I have been very tolerant in my interpretation of Standing Orders, I hope he will not continue in that vein.

Mr. MATHWIN: It was not my intention to flout the authority of the Chair or contravene regarding the Ministers. I attended the industrial democracy conference. One of my biggest achievements was getting a ticket to get in. After two refusals by the Minister of Labour and Industry I used the ticket of the Leader of the Opposition and attended every session.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You could have got there easily, but you were not prepared to pay.

Mr. MATHWIN: There were a lot of free-loaders there. I am tempted to put a Question on Notice if I thought I could get an answer to ask how many free-loaders were there. I am a member of the Opposition who is reasonably close to the Minister of Labour and Industry and we get on reasonably well.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You ask the question any time you like and I'll answer it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thought that, as I was reasonably close to the Minister, and as he knew my interest in industrial matters, he would give me a ticket. However, I attended most of the sessions. The Premier opened the

conference, and an excellent programme was published. Many good speeches were made. Perhaps the two most outstanding speakers were Clive Jenkins and Sir Leonard Neal, and the matching of those two gentlemen was entertaining, if nothing else.

What came out of the conference was the information that worker participation has been operating for years. Although the Premier has latched on to it as something new, it has been operating for years in works and factories. All the socialist countries were represented at the conference, but we did not have anyone from America or the other capitalist countries. If honourable members want to know what socialism is (and the member for Morphet often asks) I point out that it is a philosophy of failure, a creed of ignorance, and a gospel of envy.

The main thrust of the conference related to worker control, as is operating in Yugoslavia and in Sweden, which has been a socialist country for 40 years. The socialists were kept in office for many years by the communists. The people in Sweden believe that they have a good system. They work under 20 Acts of Parliament relating to industrial democracy, and even the Swedes cannot keep up with the situation, with all the legislation involved.

Sweden has no closed shops; there is no closed shop agreement. Ted Gnatenko told us that Australia is 30 years behind the times in relation to industrial democracy. In the factory where he worked, 61 groups of workers councils operated and the factory had 2 700 workers. The workers councils hire and fire. The boss cannot fire anyone. If someone has misbehaved or has done something wrong, the boss must go before the workers council to get permission to deal with the situation, and the council must be given 14 days notice before it meets.

If an employee is to be dismissed, the council must have 14 days notice of meeting before the manager can find out whether he can dismiss the employee. If the manager says who is to be dismissed, as the workers councils employ the manager, the manager may get the sack, not the naughty worker.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support the motion. I do not often speak in an Address in Reply debate, but I should like to comment on a few matters and this debate allows me to do that.

I should like to express my condolences to Mrs. Potter and her family. The Hon. Frank Potter, the late President of the Legislative Council, was a most compassionate man and a great family man. He will be sadly missed inside Parliament and out.

The late Frank Potter was one of a group of members who entered Parliament in 1959 and it is interesting to comment about the personalities who comprised that group. Among that number they provided for Parliament a President (the late Frank Potter), a Speaker (Hon. J. R. Ryan), a Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. D. H. McKee), and a Premier for a short time who was later a Senator (Steele Hall). The group also provided the first two women members of Parliament in South Australia, one in this House (Mrs. Steele) and one in another place (Mrs. Cooper). Mrs. Steele was the first woman Minister of the Crown in South Australia. The group also provided me. I can claim that, next to the illustrious and learned and gallant member for Mitcham, I am the most experienced back-bencher in this House. The member for Mitcham has had an interrupted experience, in that he did have two short years in the Ministry.

It is because of my experience as a back-bencher that I would like to make a few brief comments today. In my time here there have been six separate Speakers of this

House, and it has been interesting to study the actions, mannerisms, behaviour and decisions of Speakers. We had one Speaker, whom I shall call an instant Speaker. In saying that, I do not reflect on the Chair, Sir, but I refer to Mr. Connelly, who was an instant Speaker. We also had one instant Minister, who is now Mr. Justice King. He went straight into Cabinet on his first day in Parliament. Now we seem to have acquired a couple of instant back-benchers, and I want to make some comments on the statements of one of these.

All these people were very able. I believe that they have done, and are doing, their own work efficiently and effectively. Mr. Speaker Connelly certainly was a most effective person in this House, as was Mr. Justice King. However, all these people lacked one simple element: they lacked experience and they lacked understanding. They lacked the experience and understanding that can be gained only by having had the fortune or misfortune of having been in Opposition and having been in Government, or having been in office in Government, making policy in Government, and being in Opposition criticising Government policy, as an Opposition.

Unless one has been on both sides and understands the frustrations of not being able to speak from a Government back-bench, yet being fully informed, and of having to speak from an Opposition back-bench and having to search for facts, one does not understand the problems confronting a member of Parliament in carrying out his duties in this House.

This is why I want to make some specific comments on what was said by the member for Ross Smith. He showed a lack of appreciation of some of these problems when he stated that he believed this debate was a waste of time. Other people have also said that. Unlike you, Mr. Acting Speaker, those people have not taken the opportunity to use the debate to express a philosophy or a point of view, or to talk about something other than specific legislation before this House.

I very much appreciated your contribution, Mr. Acting Speaker, and also that of the member for Stuart. Such contributions would never come to this House except through the *milieu* of this debate, which enables members to explain their philosophy in that way that you, Sir, did. I was concerned about the way in which the debate started. Indeed, I make no apology for saying that whilst there is a problem named unemployment and that it is proper to discuss it, I was disappointed that, in their two excellent speeches, the members moving and seconding the motion talked of nothing other than that subject.

One would have thought that members had no electoral matters or issues to raise in this debate, one of the few opportunities that members have to raise such points. This is significant and something that is lost to people who do not realise what opportunities this debate can provide to enable those sorts of matter to be aired.

Members of Parliament are not in this place merely to represent Parties and to uphold Party philosophies. True, we represent them in the political sense, but we are also members of this place as representatives of the people. Those people have problems and, if necessary, they expect those problems to be raised and debated in Parliament, so that they know that members are performing their proper functions in this place as representatives of the people.

We must not overlook the fact that many of the opportunities that members have had in the past to raise certain matters no longer exist. It is no good our saying, "In other Parliaments they do this, that, or something else." The simple fact is that in South Australia we run our own Parliament. This is a constitutional and an independent Government, and it does not have to depend

on the procedures and philosophies that any other Parliament or Parliamentary system might adopt.

In this regard, and following from my comments regarding the Address in Reply debate, I should like to refer to the matter of Question Time. The present system was one of the great ideas of former Attorney-General King, who did not like answering questions or, indeed, being a member of Parliament. He enjoyed being a Minister, and he was a very capable Minister. I believe that Mr. King came into this place to do a specific job, and he did it most effectively. Then, he did not want to be a member of this place any longer. That was illustrated by his no longer seeking to continue as a member of Parliament. What he did he did effectively. However, he did not like Question Time, saying (like other people were saying) that it was a waste of time, that it was sheer humbug.

We did some sort of a deal (I suppose one would call it that) between the Parties. Through the Standing Orders Committee, we changed the system in this place to reduce the time for questions without notice. As my honourable colleague, the member for Chaffey, said, it was done not with the Opposition's support. However, this change was carried by the Standing Orders Committee with the weight of Government numbers. Under the change, we reduced the time allocated in this House for questions without notice and, instead, had a grievance debate at the end of each day's sitting.

Mr. Evans: Also, it was agreed that questions would be answered in the shortest possible form.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will not question the procedures in relation to the activities within that period of time. I am merely saying that it was agreed there was to be a reduced Question Time and, instead of members raising what were considered to be grievance matters during Question Time, they would have an opportunity, when rostered, to air their grievance in the grievance debate.

Dr. Eastick: For up to half an hour at a time.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Light has raised another point in addition to that raised by the member for Fisher, who said that there was an agreement regarding the manner in which questions would be answered: that no time be wasted. The member for Light has said that up to half an hour would be allocated for each grievance debate.

Dr. Eastick: A half an hour for each member.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Very well; that is a procedural detail. That was the alternative that we were offered to two hours of questions without notice. I know that it was humbug for Ministers to have to sit in this Chamber for two hours at Question Time. They are busy people and do not want to be held here answering questions, which can be embarrassing. However, they are now complaining about what has happened as a result of that change in policy. They are complaining about the considerable number of questions that are being placed on notice. This is a reaction to the change to Standing Orders to which I have referred.

Dr. Eastick: In fact, they were invited.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is correct. That was the alternative that was offered: if we did not have two hours of questions without notice, we could put questions on notice. That was the place in which to put parish pump questions. The idea was that members should ask questions in this House relating to matters of policy, to specific matters of importance that are current, and should put on notice all those questions that they wanted answered in detail.

We are now bogged down with these Questions on Notice; we are getting complaints about the cost of extracting information. None of this sort of problem

occurred when Question Time was extended by the extra hour. In many cases we did not use that extra hour, although it was abused by some members towards the end, I think deliberately to create a case. But we seldom used that time; it did not delay the procedures of the House. As a procedure, it also took off steam for members and that is why the Playford Government maintained and encouraged it. It enabled members to get parish-pump issues off their chest. They asked a question in the House, and they could say: "Here I have asked a question in the House and here is the answer that the Minister gave me." It could be done currently while it was still an issue. It could go to the people and to the local press almost immediately so that the people felt as though they were being represented. Now, we are waiting for a month for some replies. I am writing letters and it is taking up to four or five months to get replies on simple questions from Ministers. The procedure that we had of close, quick co-operation and information has been lost as a result of this change in procedure.

Mr. Mathwin: The Attorney said that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is interjecting while out of his seat.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This is a very valuable debate, even though it may appear to be humbug and time-consuming to some people, people who do not really know; also, some members have not yet realised that in Opposition it has a very valuable function to play in allowing members to raise issues, and it allows members including Government members of the back bench, the opportunity to raise matters other than those relating specifically to Government legislation.

Regarding Question Time, I believe that the present situation would not have occurred if we had continued with the old procedures. If they were reinstated, we would get rid of a lot of this backlog of Questions on Notice and it would at the same time allow members of Parliament to get immediate information from the Government. The Government says it wants to give information to people. We represent the people in this Parliament, and the information should come through us, as their representatives, and not through the back door.

One of the reasons for this change taking place was that Parliament was said to be dull. Only last Saturday I read in the paper an article stating how dull this debate was; and that matter was picked up by that instant back-bencher, the member for Ross Smith. The debate may be dull but it serves a certain function. This Parliament is the place in which people communicate and express ideas, and there should be a freer interchange and acceptance of ideas between each side of the House; there should be an interplay and, if reasonable proposals are put forward from this side of the House, they should be accepted and not ignored.

Some members of the press seem to think that this place should be an arena for spectacle sport and that, unless at the beginning of the day we have a lead question and a whole lot of questions lined up with which to attack the Government to get some hot press, then Parliament is deadly dull and we are not doing our duty. I am inclined to believe that the press, because of its attitude towards Parliament in this regard, is doing Parliament a disservice. If people are bored sitting up there and listening, I am sorry they have to listen but there are people outside who want to read what is said in Parliament, and want to have in print what a Minister has said in answer to a question, so that they have confirmation of an answer, and they like to have it now and not in several months time. That is the alternative that they have now compared with what they originally enjoyed.

I have a few suggestions as to how the procedures of Parliament in this House could be improved. I listened to the Premier's speech when opening the Presiding Officers Conference. He did not spell out clearly what changes he thought should be made. I do not think I agreed with the sort of changes he was suggesting then. I believe we have reached a stage where we can change some of the systems we have followed. I say this because, unless we are going to denigrate ourselves, we have in this Parliament many competent people whose talents are being wasted and who sit on the back benches bored stiff because there is no means of using them effectively in the process of government. They are denied an opportunity of being involved because we have got to the stage where we have an Executive which counts the heads behind it, and an Opposition which keeps running its head up against the wall of the Government.

There is no collective effort, except in some of the Standing Committees and Select Committees, to bring that talent together, to use it effectively for the betterment of this Parliament, the State and the legislation of the State.

Mr. Evans: And the people.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Ultimately, as the member for Fisher has said, the people must benefit. If we are talking about value for money and people do not think members earn their money, this is a way to show them that they are getting value for money from the input of effort on the part of members to be constructive and effective in the interests of the people.

Dr. Eastick: Members could even get copies of draft Bills that are sent out to industry.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This is one of the matters I was coming to. I suggest that perhaps the Pacific Island Parliaments have something to show us about how to deal with Budgets. They have estimates committees which meet and consider the Budget. Those committees have the power to inquire of heads of departments and to interrogate in much the same way as the Senate estimates committee can do. Instead of wasting time in this House with people asking reams of questions from Ministers who have prepared answers to items that appear on lines and who try to get an answer for a member, the result can be effectively achieved by having a Budget or estimates committee made up of members from each side of the House, who meet and have an opportunity to discuss these matters, and to ask critical questions about how the Budget has been prepared.

From my experience on one committee, I was appalled at the manner in which Budgets were prepared. There was no accountability down to the sections within a department. That situation may have changed slightly; I do not know, because I am not now able to get that information. At the time I was last able to establish it, the procedure was that a department would ask, "How much is the Budget inflated?" The answer would be "Oh, the Budget is inflated 15 per cent." The remark would then be, "All right, we will ask for 15 per cent more than we got last time." The procedure was not as it should have been whereby a department would say that it had a project that it believed was absolutely essential, and that it would cost so much. The department would then get it approved and have a budget applied to it for which those at the level the project was introduced would be responsible.

That is what happens outside in commercial enterprises. The sort of situation in which the Deputy Premier found himself this afternoon does not occur in private enterprise, simply because the records that were not kept by the Public Buildings Department would have had to be kept, and there would have been an internal audit check to

make sure that they had been checked, were known and could be given.

We have no internal audit checks in Public Service departments. There is a public auditor, the Auditor-General's Department, which is understaffed by commercial standards to such a degree that I believe it does a phenomenal job with the resources available. That department does not have adequate resources to do the sort of audit required for a business the size of the State Government. Yet, the Premier said that the Public Accounts Committee can get assistance and advice from the Auditor-General's department.

Those people do not have the surplus resources with which to provide this kind of information. I believe that, if we had an Estimates committee at which we could question the people concerned, establish that the Budget was prepared on proper lines, and that the money being appropriated was ultimately spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated, we could go to the people and say, "We're honestly giving you value for your dollar in taxes." I do not think that we can honestly say that at present, because we do not know. There is no machinery in the Government to provide this efficiency. The Public Service Board has a responsibility, but has only an advisory capacity. The Treasury does not have the people or resources to set up the necessary financial machinery in the department. Consequently, it is left to the department as to whether it does or does not implement a system of financial control in order to be properly accountable.

Another type of committee to which I refer, and which was alluded to by the member for Light, is a committee or committees to deal with Bills. I am concerned, because I find that legislation has been canvassed throughout the community, with members having no knowledge of these discussions or of the legislation before it is presented to the House. If that is open government, it is not the sort of open government that I believe to be proper. It really sets aside the House as being a waste of time: the only thing you need to do is to square off with people outside, because the heads are counted here, and anything can go through. That is not good enough.

Mr. McRae: Do you have any specific ones in mind?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Although I do not have them listed, I should like to discuss this matter with the member for Playford. From memory, this happened with the Local Government Act Amendment Bill and with other legislation.

Mr. Evans: The land and business agents legislation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and that has happened with all major legislation. People who come to discuss the legislation with us are appalled that we have no knowledge of the detail of it. We are not even certain that it is the legislation that will ultimately be submitted to Parliament. I believe that there is a function that members could perform in this area. If there are discussions to be had with people outside, and if the Government has a legislative programme about which it knows in advance, committees could interview people concerned, and Parliament could be told that those people were satisfied with what was in the legislation, not Parliament having to accept from the Minister introducing the Bill that he has canvassed the matter and everyone agrees: how do we know?

This is an argument the Opposition can put up specifically in defence of a second House, on which we all too frequently have to rely for this kind of system to be effective. It is not until a committee of the whole in this House has inspected the legislation that Parliament knows what is all about. No sounding board of public opinion can be effectively registered unless the issues involved are considered and debated, and the Bill amended accord-

ingly. Much of the conflict we have with the Upper House over legislation could be ironed out by our being satisfied with the legislation in the form in which it is introduced in the House, that is, Parliament's being satisfied as the result of investigation by a committee or committees.

There is another method we sometimes use which we are starting to use a little more and which I think proves the effectiveness of the argument I am making—the use of Select Committees in matters in which there is a community involvement or a controversial issue on which the public needs to be properly informed. It is not wasting the time of members or of the House by delaying legislation. We do not use this system enough. That is another way members could participate in the democratic process of government, as I believe it should become in future.

I agree that many of the things we do now are not in keeping with our times, but I do not believe that what we do is necessarily to be condemned. We might even have, as I said earlier when I spoke about an estimates committee (and I perhaps talked ahead of where I was), the need for an internal audit. If the estimates committee were to consider the Budget, we would need another committee, like the audit committee, with the Public Accounts Committee as a back-up in the same way as is done in business. As in business, where auditors raise an issue and an inquiry is necessary, that is the function of the Public Accounts Committee on behalf of Parliament to investigate the matter. It is a committee looking into the past, even a long way into the past in some instances.

I believe that we could be more actively involved at the end of the financial year in looking quickly at the end of year results and not just at the Supplementary Estimates, about which no-one really understands or can be satisfied. People could be satisfied and Parliament could be satisfied through such a committee, that lines must be increased if the request is reasonable and there is a reasonable explanation for that happening.

I make some comments about the Public Accounts Committee. I do not wish to be controversial, but just to make some simple statements. About 6 September last year I resigned from that committee. I do not intend to canvass the reasons for so doing, but it was a decision that was made and I accepted it. I have some regrets that I took that course of action at the time. That committee was engaged in an important inquiry, which had taken a long time, because it is not easy for a Parliamentary committee that cannot sit during sessions of the House to find time on the off days and mornings of sitting days when members are free to give the necessary time required to consider all the details involved.

The Public Accounts Committee had never concentrated on one project: it always had two or three together, so that it issued a minor report as well as a major report. That was done to enable Parliament to be satisfied that the committee was performing its function, because if Parliament did not see a report from the committee for two or three years, it may well have questioned whether the committee was doing its job. That was the way in which the committee functioned. It was a good committee that had a tremendous staff.

I have great admiration for the way in which the first Chairman commenced the activities of that committee. I have no disrespect for those people who succeeded him. The simple facts were that I resigned. My resignation and that of another member has been the subject of considerable comment in the House. The present Chairman of the committee has accused me of defection. I defected four weeks before my time on the committee would have expired, but that committee would not have

met in that four weeks so my absence from the committee would have had no bearing on the completion of any report.

The member for Stuart also defected. He did not accept reappointment: he accepted another appointment. That left three people on the original committee, even if the member for Alexandra had continued on it.

That would not have been enough to form the necessary quorum to pass the report under discussion. So, it became essential that the whole matter be reinvestigated. I do not blame the new committee members for wanting to look back into the history of what was going on, but I object to being called a defector and to having the House told that it was because I resigned from the committee at that time that it was not possible to produce that report to Parliament.

I resent that comment as much as I believe that the present Chairman, the member for Florey, will resent my saying that I believe he was derelict in his duty. I will qualify that by saying that he was derelict in his duty only because he was most unwell. Because of ill health, he was unable to be Chairman of the committee. Because he was not there as Chairman many times, the committee was prevented from making decisions. The committee could not reach decisions under an Acting Chairman. More often than not I was Acting Chairman. The committee could not come up with a report and a decision without the officially appointed Chairman being present. The member for Florey, through ill health, attended only four meetings out of the 13 meetings in the first part of last year. I did not, in this House, accuse him of dereliction of duty, but in this House he accused me of defecting.

I warn the Premier. I do not know what has come over him that caused him to be so stupid as to leave himself open to an action for defamation, but he made the following statement in the *Advertiser* of 5 August:

At the time of the last election, two Liberal Party members of the committee broke the rules by releasing confidential information. They then resigned.

I defy the Premier to prove any word of that. The only correct point is that I resigned. I broke no rules. I disclosed no information. I made no statements to the press. I did not take any records from the room, and I have not been back there since. My file is still there. I have received legal advice that that is grossly defamatory, but I will not take any action on it unless something comes of it in future. However, I warn the Premier not to make defamatory statements against me or any other person outside this House, which he calls "coward's castle".

The charges against me are to be proven. I am not answering for other people. The charge is to be proven against me that I did that. I categorically deny it here and outside the House. I am prepared to take action if necessary to prove that. I did not do that sort of thing. I have a position of trust in other places, and I do not like my trust being challenged in that way. Having said that, I will not say anything more about this matter, except to ask this House to give the committee a go and to leave it alone. The committee is undertaking a very important inquiry and it is doing it without influence or prejudice. I do not for one minute believe that it would have changed its pattern since the time I was a member of it. It is answerable to you, Mr. Speaker, and its officers are answerable to you—not to the Public Service or anyone else. It is a committee of this House, and I ask this House to give it a go so that it can bring up a report to this House as soon as reasonably possible.

Regarding unemployment, in which we are not supposed to be interested and about which we are supposed to know nothing, I can recall the 1930's. A few

members opposite would be able to recall the 1930's.

My father was a Minister of religion. He had a church in a working-class district at Mile End. No-one can tell me about the depression. I saw poverty; I knew what ration coupons looked like. I knew the despair of people; I saw people without shoes, without bedclothes; I saw people going bankrupt. I do not see that at the present time, so I think the analogy between the 1930's and now is quite erroneous. I do not apologise for being emotional because it was an emotional time.

I have very real concern for the young school-leavers. It is no good saying that doles or things like that are going to satisfy their requirements. People who have had jobs have a capacity to be employed. If they have skills and trades and are temporarily unemployed, at least they have something to offer, whereas the young people leaving school are not getting the opportunity to have anything to offer. This is a very real problem. It is not something that one can blame the Whitlam Government or the Fraser Government for. I think the Fraser Government believed at the time what was being said, that the situation would improve and that the economic structures of the Western democracies would be stimulated in such a way that those countries would come out of a depression. We know that they have not come out of that depressed state and that there is a very high rate of unemployment in those countries. We are not the only country suffering from that malaise.

Our capitalist system, which is condemned by some members opposite, requires that one make a profit in order to be able to create the necessary wealth to provide the means of employment. Even a Government business has to make a profit. If anyone thinks a Government instrumentality can be run without making a profit, he wants his bumps read. Who is going to foot the bill and make up the difference if the consumer is not charged for the goods being supplied? The taxpayer. It is just incredible. From the late 1940's to the end of the 1960's Australia enjoyed an unprecedented era of expansion. It was based upon the development of important replacement industries following the 1939-45 war. We were able to keep our costs low. We were certainly competitive with American and European prices; we were exporting manufactured goods. We had an assembly plant for Chrysler in South Africa with a big outlet market. We were selling Holdens in Singapore, Indonesia and the East. I even saw Holdens in Jamaica, because it was cheaper for the Americans to import them from here than it was to put in a small conversion to right-hand drive assembly plant somewhere in America to supply that small market. We were exporting that sort of goods.

It took Australia 70 years to get into the position of having an export-oriented manufacturing industry. We must not forget that Taiwan, Korea and Hong Kong, and these places, have got to the same point in 15 to 20 years. In fact, they are leap-frogging past us. I suggest that we cannot create or maintain the necessary job opportunities for Australians unless we expand our export market. We cannot shut the door and be completely protectionist and say we will only supply our own needs. Our work force has the capacity to produce more than that.

We need a shift in thinking to export-oriented industries, sufficiently diversified and specialised to enable us to have an advantage and to market their products, in competition with any other country, in a reasonable marketing situation. We cannot expect to continue this protectionism for which everyone is asking, otherwise the rural industry which, with the mining industries, is providing more than 77 per cent of the external wealth of Australia will not be able to survive.

There is a misconception that, if we have a profit, something is wrong, that the labourer has earned the profit and that therefore he should get most of it back again. The cost of labour is and will continue to be one of the big problems we have to accept. It is inevitable that we will have automation and higher degrees of mechanisation. That is the only way in which people can be paid high wages for the production they achieve in the present situation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'd better send this speech to Telecom.

Mr. NANKIVELL: When a company makes a profit, as Telecom has done, it needs to make that profit. I was absolutely staggered to hear the Secretary of one of the Telecom groups the other night complaining that Telecom, which did not have to pay taxation, had made provision for depreciation. How can anyone run a business without making provision for depreciation? It is not just a taxation ploy. It is allowable in taxation, but it is an essential part of running a business.

If one wants to see what companies such as B.H.P. and General-Motors Holden's are doing, one should not just look at their profits without relating them to the amount of capital invested to provide the profit and to provide work for the people employed. The earnings on capital are small indeed. Members should look at this aspect of a company before criticising unjustly any profit that it makes.

If we are to develop these replacement industries, we will need to maximise the productivity of labour. We will need to continue to keep our interest rates down and to reduce inflation. If members look at what has happened to job opportunities in Australia, they will find that, since 1973, the number of job opportunities has been reduced by 300 000. To get this economy going, we have to recover those jobs and create others, and we will not do that by spending taxpayers' money and saying that we will get ourselves out of the mess by Government spending.

The evidence on that is to be seen in what has happened in the United Kingdom, and in the efforts of the Whitlam Government. We should learn from those things, and recognise that printing money and Government spending through heavy taxation are at best only short-term solutions. If one looks at the \$22 000 000 we spent in this State on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and realises that it employed only 9 000 people, the point is obvious: it is impossible to tax the people, and it is not proper to try to print enough money to provide those jobs. They have to be provided by industries that can sell and earn money and, in so doing, provide the jobs.

I go along with what Bob Hawke has said: it is time we stopped this bickering between employer and employee, between management and union, and got down to the business of trying to sort things out so that everyone is getting a fair go. Until people are satisfied that they are getting a fair go, we may have to change our standards, as suggested by the member for Stuart, and we may have to put our shoulders to the wheel and make a number of changes in our way of living, at least temporarily. Unless we are prepared to accept that, I am afraid the term "the lucky country" is fast running out for Australia.

I do not believe that at present we have any fear of military action from our north, but I do believe that we are greatly in danger of being completely overwhelmed commercially and industrially by the people to the north of this country. This is merely a different form of invasion, but it is just as effective in conquering a country. Those people are willing to work, and they have an objective to work for. It is high time that we got down to the business of running Australia on sound business lines with opportunities for all. I wish to say something now,

following an interjection I made which the member for Newland did not understand.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr. NANKIVELL: He is a highly intelligent man, but he misunderstood what I said. I suggested to him that, if we wanted additional money, we should do what is done in Canada. The honourable member misunderstood me, thinking I was referring to the unemployment situation in Canada. This has been a matter of some comment but of no direct action. In Canada, the Provinces have an arrangement with the Federal Government to collect a tax for them and, if honourable members refer to the *Year Book*, they will find that the range of the surcharge imposed on behalf of the States by the Federal Government in Canada is from about 37 per cent to 47 per cent of the base tax, which is money collected for running the Federal centre.

While we may talk about federalism being a double tax situation it is not in the true sense a double tax. If we are to accept responsibility in South Australia for our Budget and the actions that we believe are proper and in the interests of the people, and if we believe that the people want the things that we believe they want, for which the money is unavailable through the resources of the central Government, which may have a different policy on such matters, there is a resource that we can use, namely, a personal taxation surcharge.

I wish that we would hear someone talking more positively about taking advantage of the offer that is made. That is what I said to the honourable member. If what he said was correct and he believed it, he should agree to promoting a tax on the people of the State in order to provide them with these additional education and other facilities that he believes they want. He should test them, apply the surcharge, and act responsibly in providing these things, accepting any acrimony or credit from the people as a consequence.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): Along with other honourable members I should like to convey my sincere sympathy to the wife and family of the late Hon. Frank Potter, who unfortunately passed away last February.

I should like to congratulate the member for Mallee on the speech he has just made, in which he displayed in that thought-provoking contribution a maturity that can be acquired only by experience in this House. The criticism made by the member for Ross Smith has been more than adequately answered.

I should like to comment on three points, the first concerning unemployment. The challenge has been levelled from the Government benches that no speaker from this side wished to speak on this subject. Unemployment presents a real problem, which cannot be ignored. The problem must be solved and, indeed, several members on this side of the House have referred to this matter.

I assure Government members that the Opposition is conversant with and concerned about this serious problem. Perhaps I could refer to my own experience, which was perhaps in a different sphere from that of the member for Mallee when he was younger. I left school unexpectedly because a job was offering in what was then known as the Postmaster-General's Department, in which I became a telegram messenger. A condition of my employment was that, at the expiration of six months or

when one attained a certain age, whichever occurred first, the employment terminated. I took the job hoping that an opportunity would arise whereby my position would be made permanent. However, that did not happen, and I therefore went into my father's employment for what would be now, by comparison, 50c a week. Therefore, I know the effects and side-effects of unemployment when the economic circumstances of the State and country are not as they should be.

Mr. Abbott: How can we improve them?

Mr. RUSSACK: Perhaps I could expand on that. I have said previously that I realise that many Government members have been directly involved with the union movement, and I commend the work that they have done conscientiously in that regard. However, I do not appreciate Government members saying, "You people on the other side know nothing about unions because you have not been involved with them."

By the same principle, I have been involved in management and, admittedly, small business, which I regard as one of the important aspects of business life today. Opposition members could ask, in response to the challenge put up to us about not knowing about unions, "Do Government members know anything about business management?"

Yesterday, when I said that there were several thousand small businesses in the city, I got from the Minister of Mines and Energy the irresponsible reply, "There are millions of people in China, too." I meant that small business can have a large bearing on employment not only in South Australia but in the Commonwealth and, if certain conditions were a little easier for small business and if the several thousand small businesses in this State were given some consideration and could each employ one more person, thousands more people would be employed.

Regarding what can be done to overcome unemployment, there seem to be two major schools of thought. I suppose many people (indeed many members) saw a recent television broadcast of a seminar involving a bank executive and an academic from England. The banker said (in simple terms) that, to overcome unemployment, we must reduce inflation.

Dr. Eastick: That's what the British Prime Minister said.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, and he is a Labour Prime Minister. In that programme the academic said that we should inject money into the public sector.

Mr. Chapman: That's what Mr. Wran said. He has supported Mr. Fraser on that, too. In fact, he complimented him.

Mr. RUSSACK: If that is so, I should like to refer to a report in the 20 June issue of the *News*, in which Mr. Wran is reported as saying that New South Wales had the lowest percentage rise of unemployment of any State.

If Mr. Wran agrees with what the Federal Government is doing, it may prove that the Federal Government is on the right track. He says that in New South Wales unemployment went up 4.3 per cent; in Queensland, 20.2 per cent; in Victoria, 30.2 per cent; in Western Australia, 39.1 per cent; in Tasmania, 48 per cent; and in South Australia, the top of the list, 56 per cent. That is a statement by Mr. Wran.

I have merely referred to two philosophies, but I have recently had the privilege of being in Sweden, where they have injected not millions but billions into the public sector to overcome the unemployment problem, and I should like to read just a few paragraphs from a recent report from Sweden, as follows:

Meanwhile the opening of 1978 finds the Swedish economy in stormy waters . . . There have been three devaluations of the currency since Falldin came to power. The rate of Value

Added Tax has been jacked up by three per cent to a new high level of 20 per cent. Strenuous efforts have been made to keep the level of unemployment down, and at two per cent it may seem to the outside observer as if they have been successful. But this is a high figure by Swedish standards, and the total is probably greater when account is taken of concealed unemployment among those on retraining schemes, etc. Most of the key sectors of the economy have been hard hit. The government has been compelled to selective interventions, contrary to its general philosophy, in order to help the steel industry, shipyards, textiles, glassware and the clothing industry. Inflation, at approximately 10 per cent for 1977, has been rising above the usual norm for Sweden, and the balance of payments position has been deteriorating dramatically . . .

In 1978, inflation is estimated to be 9 per cent, which is substantially lower than in 1977—but many observers noted that in 1977 Mr. Bohman predicted an inflation rate of 6-7 per cent. In reality, it was twice as much. During the coming year industrial investment is predicted to decline by 15 per cent, the same as in 1977. Thus, industry will be ill-equipped to deal with an eventual economic upturn. Swedes will be burdened with yet another form of taxation—this time on charter trips. It will yield the State \$200 000 000 per annum. In addition, the price of gasoline was hiked by 25 öre per litre, which means that more and more Swedes will discover they cannot afford to run cars.

Industrial employment will decline, which will mean that Sweden, in common with other countries, may soon be forced to report a large degree of unemployment, which has hitherto been concealed—for example, by shifting it into companies, which have received large grants to enable them to maintain employment through training workers for new jobs, etc.

Mr. Slater: The social democrats will be re-elected?

Mr. RUSSACK: This is a result of 43 years of socialism in Sweden; it is the legacy of 43 years of socialism. Under the heading "Government aid to industry provokes debate", the report continues:

Swedish exports are selling a bit better this year than in 1977—but the thing Sweden is best at exporting is unemployment. This charge was made by the Common Market Parliament in Luxemburg, which among other things criticised Swedish Government aid to the particle board industry. . .

But even in Sweden itself there is some criticism at the Government's generosity when it comes to "propping up crisis companies and crisis industries." Small shipyards, for instance, are complaining that the bigger yards, thanks to State subsidies, can dump their prices and thereby eliminate the small yards from the market. Similar criticism has been heard regarding subsidies to the textile and garment industry.

The Swedish Government has made large commitments—a matter of roughly 28 billion kronor (more than \$6 billion) in loans, grants and credit guarantees—to keep the official unemployment rate down. It is now about 2 per cent, just about the lowest in Europe. But everyone, and not least the Government, is aware that this is a temporary solution.

In the future, industry will have to pull its own weight.

In other words, as a cure, they will have to return to private enterprise, and industry will have to pull its own weight. I mention those facts because there are two schools of thought about this matter. I do not want to give the impression that I am closing the door on Governments being approached for assistance, but I say that there must be a balance. Governments cannot infuse money into the public sector, as Sweden has done, and expect that to solve the problem.

Perhaps the present policy is not the answer either. When I was in Stockholm recently I was assured by those

who I think would know that the rate of taxation in Sweden has reached its absolute maximum. The member for Mallee spoke about double taxation. Sweden has a value added tax, and if that is not double taxation I do not know what is.

Mr. Slater: They have a value added tax all over the world, not only in Sweden.

Mr. RUSSACK: It has reached 20 per cent in Sweden. I spoke to a woman involved in what is the equivalent in Sweden to the local government secretariat in Canberra. She told me that she had to pay in tax 80 per cent of an increase in her wages. She pays local government 28 per cent tax, because local government in other countries is responsible for services similar to those our State Government is responsible for, such as education, police services, fire services, transportation and water reticulation.

Local government in South Australia is considering the problem of unemployment, and in its publication *Council and Community* says the following about South Australia's unemployment relief grants:

This State Government programme is the most direct employment-creating programme. There is a tendency for skilled and experienced labour to be employed first for these projects and this does not help the unemployed inexperienced youth population.

Last Sunday afternoon my wife and I attended the opening by the Minister of Labour and Industry of a new community centre in Ardrossan, which is situated in my district on Yorke Peninsula. The building cost \$100 000, of which local input was \$60 000, the SURS scheme providing \$40 000. The community is pleased with the centre. I do not want to appear to contradict myself, because I am not; I said that there should be balance. I believe that some of these constructive programmes will be readily accepted by the community and will create work while at the same time establishing something of a permanent nature. The local government publication also states:

Mayor Edwards' (Henley and Grange) submission to the association was subsequently made to the executive committee meeting of 27 April 1978 with the recommendation that the association should make representations to both State and Federal Governments.

That is what I believe should continue. I believe that, if this continual discussion among local government, State Government and Federal Government continues, some balance and conclusion will be reached.

One factor relating to SURS is unsatisfactory. I cite the case of a mother who told me that her daughter, who is 16 years of age, had been employed in the Education Department temporarily under the SURS scheme. She commenced employment on a basis of 20 hours a week. She was receiving \$94 a week but, after a short period, she was advised that she had to work 30 hours a week, for which she received \$141 weekly. The mother said that, while being grateful indeed for the opportunity her daughter had been given to gain experience and confidence (and she said that her daughter in that short period had developed tremendously and had gained much self-confidence), she felt that the rate of pay was far too high for the age. Had a more reasonable pay been given, the grant would have lasted longer. As it is, the daughter will have to apply for unemployment benefits after nine weeks of temporary employment. If these factors are right (as I believe they are), they should be considered, so that a person could work longer and be given a more reasonable wage commensurate with the job.

I looked at the shop assistants award rate for the same age (there is no difference between the male wage and the

female wage) and, including the 25 per cent differential for 2½ hours on Saturday morning, it is \$74.35 a week.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The person must join a union to get a job, and it dictates the terms.

Mr. RUSSACK: That is the whole crux of the problem. The Government would probably be only too pleased for the mother's wish to be granted but, because of union regulations and awards, the shorter time was made necessary.

Turning now to another matter, I was approached during the week by a gentleman who has become redundant because of the closure of the Whyalla shipyard. Being thrifty, he had saved a considerable sum, and he has purchased about 31 hectares of land in a cereal-growing area. He has partially built a home and has spent all his money. He wants to establish a piggery. I said to him, "Have you had any experience?" He said, "Yes, I had a piggery at Whyalla." He had it for two years and he made a profit out of it. I would therefore suggest that, if the gentleman could make a profit in the lower rainfall area adjacent to Whyalla, he should be able to make a go of a piggery in the area in which he is now, which is much farther south and not far from Adelaide. He owns the property freehold but, early this week, he could not obtain money to establish the piggery. For that purpose he tried the Premier's Department. As a matter of fact, I rang the Premier's Department and was told that that matter had nothing to do with the Premier's Department but was dealt with by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department.

I rang that department but, apparently, this gentleman does not meet the specific terms for assistance in any other Government department. This man wants to do whatever he can, and he wants the help of a few thousand dollars, but that seems impossible. I could say many things about unemployment. Certainly, we must do something about it, and members on this side are concerned about it. I suggest that we continue our discussions on the matter.

Local government is progressing in this State; in particular, it has made its presence felt this year. An excellent Local Government Week was held in March and it was a resounding success. However, a problem became apparent during polling day on 1 July this year. We all know that in the 1977 council polls considerable confusion existed about the rolls. This year, there were two major faults with the system. One of those points is referred to in the following letter, which deals with rolls for a mayoral election and a ward election:

This council had elections in three of its four wards and the State Electoral Commission prepared a roll for the whole of the area. However, in this particular instance no problem was caused as the ward with no election was the smallest with only 160 on the roll, but the situation would have been different had it been one of the larger wards with over a thousand electors. There was no mayoral election. A supplementary election is to be held on 5 August, and for this the State Electoral Commission has supplied details of only those electors qualified for that ward.

Generally, the rolls were a vast improvement on last years, the main problem being caused by electors either not notifying changes of address or giving insufficient information to enable them to be enrolled in the correct ward.

Another letter I quote is as follows:

We have recently been advised that a council conducting a mayoral election and two ward elections was unable to obtain area voters' rolls only. They were not able to obtain rolls for individual wards. This complicated the work of polling booth staff who were required to search through the names of more than 10 000 voters to find the names of the 300 or so entitled electors in a particular ward.

The only other problem is referred to in the following

letter from a council:

I point out that there are a number of problems experienced in near metropolitan areas with the current voters' roll supplied. This is created more by a weakness in the system rather than the fault of the Electoral Office or the council. Many electors simply have enrolled by the address of the country town that they collect their mails from, regardless of which council ward they live in. The Electoral Office has no other information as to their place of living and can only enrol them by the postal address. In many cases the council has no record of these people and they either rent a property or own a property in the other areas.

Where they are joint owners and no enrolment has been received by the council, no further information can be passed on to the Electoral Office.

Time does not allow me to finish reading that letter. This year there was a great improvement, but two fundamental problems now exist. I refer first to the situation where only one roll is supplied for the area in an election in two wards. Secondly, in many country areas a postal address is given, and the person's name is placed on the roll with that postal address, but the person actually lives in another ward. Senator Carrick issued the following press release:

The greatest benefits for local government will flow from reduced inflation and lower interest rates, a policy which the Fraser Government intends vigorously to pursue.

In the last year of the Labor Government, 1975-76, local government received \$79 900 000. In our first year of office, the supplement was increased by 75 per cent to \$140 000 000. The following year saw a 18 per cent increase to the current \$165 300 000. Next year there will be a further rise of 10 per cent.

That figure is now incorrect, because there was a miscalculation. Instead of \$183 000 000 being made available this year, \$179 000 000 will be made available, but there will still be an increase of 8.5 per cent. Naturally, local government is not happy with the fact that it did not get an allocation of 2 per cent in the first year. In this connection, Senator Carrick says:

The Government, of course, adheres to its undertaking to increase local government's share of tax collections to 2 per cent during the life of this Parliament. The timing of the introduction of this increase will be considered in the light of the prevailing budgetary situation.

I had intended to discuss matters concerning my district but, because another member wants to speak in this debate, I will do so in a future debate.

Mr. Millhouse: You are being good to the Government, aren't you.

Mr. RUSSACK: When I make an arrangement, I try to adhere to it. I agreed that I would limit my remarks to half an hour, and I intend to do so.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did you make such an agreement?

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Arrangements have been entered into to conclude this debate. I think I am the last—

Mr. Millhouse: Of the Mohicans.

Mr. RODDA:—member on this side to contribute to the debate. As with the member for Goyder, my word is my bond, and I assure you, Mr. Acting Speaker, that we will keep our promise with the arrangements.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did you make an agreement? What pressure did the Government put on you?

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member will never get into trouble if he honours his word. I join in the sentiments expressed by my colleagues who have paid their tribute to the late Mr. Frank Potter, the former President of the Legislative Council, and I express my condolences to his

wife Nan and her family.

I also want to join with my colleague, Harold Allison, member for Mount Gambier, in expressing my regret at the passing of the late Robert Page, a very great South Australian, a great citizen in the South-Eastern districts, and one of the pillars of the timber industry. He will be missed in that industry and in South Australia. I extend my condolences to Mrs. Potter and family.

His Excellency's Speech is vastly different from the one he delivered last year, consisting of only four paragraphs. This one does not really contain much more, as it has a fair bit of padding in it. On numerous occasions in the Speech, His Excellency—and I do not want to blame him, because he was performing his task—upbraided the Commonwealth Government for the position in which his Government found itself regarding the availability of funds. In paragraph 4, His Excellency spent a considerable time dealing with the shortcomings of the Commonwealth Government, and in paragraphs 5, 9, 13 and 22 of this lengthy address we find the Government led by the Hon. Malcolm Fraser coming in for further upbraiding.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you agree with the sacking of Withers?

Mr. RODDA: I have not had the privilege to see the report and, if the powers that be have seen it, and have decided to sack the Minister, it is not for me to comment on it.

Not all Government members have spoken in this debate. We have heard many and varied replies criticising members on this side of the House. Notwithstanding unkind things that the member for Ross Smith had to say about the Address in Reply in the paper before this session he took virtually the full time allowed to make his contribution. Perhaps he has now changed his attitude to this debate, which is very much a part of Parliament. For instance, one can raise matters such as that raised just now by the member for Mitcham, who asked what I thought about the sacking of Senator Withers. The Address in Reply debate gives an opportunity for members to raise in Parliament all sorts of matters, matters dear to their hearts. I presume that the sacking of Senator Withers is very dear to the heart of the honourable member.

The Government appears to be running in all directions, and one could say that it is polarised. Indeed, at the present time, it appears at least to be scattered, there being eight Government members in the House. It is the Government's job, Mr. Speaker, to hold the House, not that I want to test that matter in the short time left to me. Yesterday the polarisation in the Government became obvious with the question of the release of the interim report on the uranium question. The Attorney-General, with his following, has a big stick to wave over people like the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Premier. He obviously has the numbers. When one sees how this question is being treated throughout the world, one realises that the Government has its head in the sand on this issue.

We will not be surprised when the Government makes a change. It is excellent at selecting the time, and we will not be surprised if it changes direction overnight on the unanimous decision members opposite talk about that was made in this House last year.

Mr. Klunder: Do you think—

Mr. RODDA: It would not surprise me if the honourable member looks like a traffic light in the desert, turning somersaults, when this comes up. We have only to look at the sad Salisbury affair. The Premier is very astute. He had no less a person than Professor Neil Blewett, M.H.R., to make a speech. Dr. Blewett learnt when he was taking the rostrum that the subject matter was entirely different,

but I suppose no-one could do better than he in making an off-the-cuff speech going in a different direction.

His Excellency referred to the rural scene, saying that the Government looked forward confidently to a rapid increase in the profitability of primary industry following a long-awaited improvement in seasonal conditions. We were all pleased to see the bounteous rains across the agricultural areas of southern Australia. Bad seasons make for difficult times, regardless of which Party is in Government.

Notwithstanding its commercial and industrial development, Australia relies heavily on the products of the soil. I make no apology for being a member of the rural community. We are limited in numbers, representing only 6 per cent of the work force, but producing not quite 50 per cent of the overseas income of this country. However, there is still an enormous gap between rural and metropolitan communities.

Operation Farmlink is being organised by the *National Farmer*, a rural newspaper launched in Western Australia. The operation will be conducted in three phases. The first phase will be when a huge 1 500 000 to 2 000 000 print run of a special city consumer edition of the *National Farmer* will be distributed in all cities and major urban centres of Australia, explaining, simply and interestingly, the aspects of the rural sector that farmers believe are not understood.

The second phase will be a saturation media publicity campaign to bring to the attention of all Australians some of the opinions and problems of rural people, and this will include special briefing seminars for leading press and media representatives.

The third phase will be National Farm Sunday, a nationwide gala day, when farmers who wish to participate will open their farms to city people, who will be invited to pack their own picnic lunches, to bring the children down to the farm to see agriculture at first hand, and to meet the people involved. I hope that this project will receive the wholehearted support of city people, perhaps providing the mainspring for a far better understanding of the situation existing between farms and city communities.

I draw the attention of the Minister and Cabinet to the vexed question of capital taxation. I am sure the Minister is not unaware of it or the way in which it impinges on only a small section of the community each year. About \$20 000 000 to \$22 000 000 is collected annually. True, that is not a big amount in terms of the total State Budget, but it is an enormous sum when it is obtained from a small minority of the people.

A high capital structure is involved in the assets in the rural sector, but the tax is not confined to that sector. It also hits small companies, and anyone with a large house can fall within the scope of paying considerable succession duty. It has an undesirable effect on this State. The member for Coles was correct in saying that people were leaving South Australia. Indeed, they are leaving my district.

Mrs. Adamson: It's the capital that is leaving.

Mr. RODDA: We had the opposite situation when a wealthy Victorian decided for several reasons (he liked the golf course, he liked the bowling club, he liked the environs, and he liked the member) to settle in Naracoorte. However, he found (although his capital was in Victoria) that if anything happened to him the whole bang lot would come under the wicked impost of the Dunstan Government for succession duty. He scurried back to the Grampians as quickly as his feet could carry him. True, it will not affect my majority, and the Minister knows that, but the tax is an albatross around the Government's neck. The Government must come face to face with it as has been done in other areas. Indeed, we are

grateful to the member for Coles for bringing this matter to the notice of the House.

Mr. Groom: Where are you going to go to retire?

Mr. RODDA: It has never been my policy to run away. It never solves any problem by running away. It is better to live with the devil you know and stay and fight and drag him down. We will all die together. We will not hang alone in this situation. When I see the assets of members opposite (unless they take some friendly advice from the member for Morphett), they could find themselves in serious trouble, and it is too late, once that has happened. I am fast running out of time, and there are some matters about my district to which I wish to refer. Yesterday, in the debate on the no-confidence motion, the question arose about the shortcomings of the Government and its lack of open government. I am concerned about the cessation of the printing of the Agriculture Department annual report. The latest report was printed in 1971. From my research I can only surmise that the Government has sheltered behind the report that was made by Sir Allan Callaghan, who investigated the department and commented about the reams of publications available about various areas of the department.

Since then, we seem to have missed seeing this annual report on our files. These were not statutory reports; they have been made as a result of convention only. However, the Director, when reporting to his Minister, reported fully on all aspects of his department. Indeed, his reports gave a fairly full precis of the details of the activities of every branch of the Agriculture Department. For some reason, that practice was dispensed with in 1972, two years after the present Government assumed office. The member for Mitcham will recall only too well how the then Liberal Government was unceremoniously dumped out of office. It has become obvious since then—

Mr. Millhouse: It was because of an honest decision that turned out to be right. You would agree with that, wouldn't you?

Mr. RODDA: I can agree with that despite the fact that, on the issue involved at that time, the Labor Party would have nothing to do with it at the time, but the Labor Government could not get onto it quickly enough. Ever since then, we have been getting less and less information. I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Education, who is at present in charge of the House, the fact that rural people have wondered where the Agriculture Department's annual report has gone. Although the department is not set up by Statute, it is an important department, and since 1971 no report has been issued drawing attention to the important work that it is doing.

I am sure that even people interested in growing maize in all sorts of places would benefit if they had access to a report of this nature, which could cover the large volumes of publications referred to in the Callaghan Report. This is one area that the Government should examine. It would not involve a large expense but would round off an important aspect of public relations, which is important to rural people.

Of course, education is the portfolio of the only Minister who is now present in the Chamber, and in this regard I should like to refer to one or two matters concerning Victoria District. On the credit side, we are mindful that a high school will be erected at Millicent, and of the two fine assembly halls at Millicent and Kangarilla. However, I should like to refer to Lucindale. Ever since I have been a member I have been reminding the present Minister and his predecessors of the need for a new school there. Indeed, this is the only school that has not been upgraded during the 13½ years that I have been a member of this

place. The people of Lucindale have also drawn my attention to the need for a kindergarten, and in this respect they make the following points:

Being a small population, we rely on our three-year-old intake to give us a suitable number of children at each session. Many of our children are from isolated areas, and their only contact with other children is at kindergarten. Because of distances travelled, children only three years old rarely attend more than two sessions a week. Thus, they need earlier enrolment for their full development and school preparation. We believe there is to be another reassessment in September.

Of course, these people are asking that their plight be put before the Minister. They have only 5½ sessions a week, but this is indeed a valid service in the Lucindale district. The people of Lucindale presume that only a few kindergartens in South Australia will need three-year-olds to make up their numbers. I take this opportunity to draw to the Minister's attention the plight of the Lucindale people regarding a kindergarten. I am sure that what I have said will apply to many other areas throughout the State.

The time has passed, and I realise, this being a Thursday evening, that members will have made certain arrangements. The member for Mitcham is very good at being privy to his own arrangements. Like the member for Goyder, when I give my word, I stick to it. I hope that the member for Ross Smith will have second thoughts about what he thinks of the Address in Reply. It is a major part of the Parliamentary system. For that reason and other reasons, I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Question—"That the motion be agreed to"—declared carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one honourable member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 August at 2 p.m.