

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 21 August 1980

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cut-back in funding for the Education Department was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 703 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Licensing Act to restrict trading hours of licensed premises within areas zoned for residential purposes was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: HUGH CULLEN

A petition signed by 3 705 residents of South Australia praying that the House will release Hugh Cullen without further delay was presented by Mr. Millhouse.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location were presented by Mr. Max Brown and Mr. Hemmings.

Petitions received.

QUESTION TIME

REMAND CENTRE

Mr. BANNON: In the light of the answer yesterday to a question from the member for Spence in which the Chief Secretary indicated that the new remand centre would now no longer be built at Regency Park, will the Premier say whether the alternative sites rejected by the former Government are now being actively considered? It has been clear for many years that the Adelaide Gaol is no longer suitable as a site for a remand centre. In fact, it has been listed by the National Trust as one of the heritage areas of the State. There has been major criticism of that centre and, in fact, the former Government over a number of years undertook a considerable search for an appropriate site for the remand centre.

One of the criteria for locating the new remand centre that has caused such large problems in finding a suitable site is that it must be within a certain distance from the city of Adelaide to facilitate the movement of prisoners to the courts. The former Government decided to site the centre at Regency Park, made a firm decision, and embarked

upon plans to build it. Before the former Government had decided on that site it rejected alternatives which included the Goodwood Orphanage, land at the Glenside Hospital, land belonging to Perry Engineering Company at Mile End, land belonging to the South Australian Brewing Company in the city, the former speedway at Rowley Park, and the Murray Hill Building in King William Street.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the Leader exactly what the state of the present study is. He certainly has given the House a very wide range of alternatives, and it could be that any one of those sites could ultimately be chosen, or indeed none of them. It may well be, as he so rightly pointed out, that a remand centre should be as close to the courts as possible and, obviously, that will be one of the factors which will be considered in the study which is currently being undertaken. We expect that there will be a decision on the site some time within the next month or so, and the House will be informed when that decision has been made.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether it is the intention of the Government to so alter the conditions applying to B class fishing licences as to prevent the use of nets and, if this is so, to whom can the affected licensees appeal? When the Liberal Party was in Opposition it was an unequivocal plank of that Party's policy that B class licences should not be interfered with. The traditional rights of these fishermen were to be protected, and such a promise was part of the Liberal Party's fishing policy prior to the September election. Since that Party has been in Government, this commitment does not seem to be anywhere near as firm. Depriving many B class fishermen of the right to net is tantamount to taking their licences away altogether.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member will be aware of the Jones scale fishery report which was presented to the Labor Government. The present Government has examined the Jones fishery report, and a decision has been taken to limit nets for A class fishermen to 600 metres and for B class fishermen to 450 metres. That is the situation at present. The matter of B class nets is under review, which is continuing, and a decision will be taken on the ultimate length of B class fishermen's nets later this year. Currently, they have a right to use a net 450 metres in length and, I think, 56 meshes in depth, with a mesh size less than 7 cm. but not less than 5 cm.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. OLSEN: Can the Minister of Environment say whether Cabinet has considered the draft environmental assessment on the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical project? Can the Minister inform the House what procedures have been followed by his department in assessing the Dow e.e.s., and when can it be expected that the final decision will be made?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I know that much interest is being shown by the public and by the House in matters relating to the proposed development at Redcliff. I make the point that Dow has always said that it would seek company approval for Redcliff from its board of directors in October. My department, the Department for the Environment, has worked closely with other departments to ensure that its time table of assessment fits in with the overall progress of the project. It has also been necessary

to co-ordinate this timing with the Federal Government, and I am sure that the House would appreciate that the Federal Government is also carrying out an assessment of the project under the Environmental Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act. I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member of the time table of events, as far as my department is concerned.

A thorough review of the Dow e.e.s. has been carried out by the review team, which is made up of senior officers of the Department for the Environment. The review team has also consulted with the Federal Department of Environment and Science, as well as with Dow itself. The final draft of the assessment report has been approved by the Director of the Projects and Assessments Division of the department and also by the Director-General of the department. I am soon to receive, as Minister, the final draft of the assessment report, and a copy of the report will at that stage be made available to the Redcliff Steering Committee. The final draft will go to Cabinet for consideration, and the final decision will then be made. The assessment report will be printed, and it is expected that a joint State-Federal assessment will be released early in September. That is the time table in relation to the activities of my department, and I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member and the House of that time table.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Education say what will be the impact on the operation and development of pre-school centres of the freezing of South Australia's pre-school allocation in the Fraser Budget at last year's level of \$3 700 000? In the face of the 10 per cent plus cost rise assumed in the Fraser Budget, does the allocation represent a 10 per cent real cut in pre-school grants for South Australia?

About 18 months ago, a person or persons involved in childhood services in South Australia produced a document known as the Diminishing Promise, which catalogued what the author or authors of that document called the gradual flight from responsibility on the part of the Liberal Government in Canberra, almost from the very beginning of its present existence, in relation to the funding of pre-schools—from the Whitlam days, when 75 per cent of salary costs in pre-schools was automatically met by the Commonwealth, to the present situation, where probably a little less than 25 per cent of the total costs is now being met from Commonwealth sources. It has been explained to me recently that there is likely to be a further rationalisation of staffing resources in pre-schools later in the year occasioned by the fact that, in a steady State funding situation, the only way in which the Minister and the bodies responsible to him are able to staff new pre-schools is by reducing staff at some of the older ones with static or declining enrolments.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: First, I address myself to one point that the honourable member raised, namely, that the Fraser Government's approach has been a flight from responsibility. I think that all members would recognise that the days of extremely heavy spending during the previous Federal Administration were a flight from economic reality.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That was steadily increasing. We recognise that the State has had increasing problems in meeting commitments regarding the allocation of pre-schools, but I can assure the honourable member, without

giving any specific financial commitment from the imminent Budget figures, that provision has been made during the present financial year for the allocation of funds to meet the ongoing commitments of the Childhood Services and the Kindergarten Union. There has been some provision also for the introduction of a 3½-year old programme. The extent to which new programmes will be able to be met to the satisfaction of the Government, the Kindergarten Union, and Childhood Services is questionable, but the present Government has acknowledged its own responsibilities by increasing its own funding towards the programme.

PORTUS HOUSE

Mr. RUSSACK: Is the Minister of Environment aware of a report in today's *Advertiser* under the heading "Heritage threatened"? In this report, the writer referred to a property at Gilberton, known as Portus House, which he considers to be the landmark of the Buckingham Arms intersection. After several columns of historical data, the writer asks whether Portus House should be saved. As there has been some public debate about this residence, is the Minister able to give details of the present situation?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As Minister of Environment, I am sensitive to ensuring the promotion of the environmentally sound development of South Australia and, of course, the conservation of its natural resources. Also as Minister of Environment, as I am sure members would appreciate, I have the South Australian Heritage Committee to advise me on matters such as that brought forward by the member for Goyder. The type of question which we need to ask and on which the Heritage Committee advises me relates to whether such buildings are of heritage significance to our State and community and whether or not they should be preserved for the future.

I can inform the House that, at its meeting yesterday, the South Australian Heritage Committee considered whether to include Portus House on the register of State heritage items. I have with me a letter from the Chairman of the Heritage Committee and a minute from the Director-General of my department informing me that Portus House does not warrant registration. I am informed by the Chairman that, following requests from the public, and accompanied by officers of the Heritage Committee and the Department for the Environment, several members of the committee inspected Portus House at Walkerville.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Who is the Chairman?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Justice Roma Mitchell. The heritage significance of the house was carefully considered by the committee at its meeting yesterday. The committee has informed me that it is of the opinion that the interest of Portus House is mainly centred on the 1880 wing rather than on the remnants of the 1850 house, which can no longer be regarded as a house in its own right. Portus House today is predominantly a building of the 1890's, and it is the individual fittings and the interior rather than the fabric of the house itself which the committee regards as impressive. The house is of little historic significance, and the committee has further advised me and recommends that Portus House should not be included in the register of State heritage items. However, the committee does favour the preservation and reuse of the internal fittings of the house, if possible, and I certainly support that. Following the committee's meeting yesterday, I am able to bring the House up to date.

HILLS FIRE

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Premier say whether the Government will reimburse the district councils of Meadows and Stirling for moneys expended by those councils in clean-up operations after the Ash Wednesday holocaust, which originated from the Heathfield dump, particularly as a precedent has been set in that financial assistance was given to local councils after the floods in Port Pirie and the wind damage in Port Broughton?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter raised by the member for Napier has been the subject of considerable concern expressed to me by other honourable members, in particular the members for Mawson and Fisher, whose districts encompass the area involved. Very weighty consideration has been given to the costs that have been incurred by those councils, but in assessing the sum that the Government was obliged to find not only for the Bushfire Relief Fund initial donation but for successive donations (because there has been another donation) and the sum that was expended in actual emergency operations and immediate clean-up operations by the Government, it was considered appropriate that the councils bear the cost of general cleaning up. This has also been the position in relation to other disasters at other times.

It has been made quite clear to those councils, however, that such circumstances as these are properly matters that should be taken into account by the State Grants Commission, and I believe that the honourable member and the members for the districts concerned, the members for Mawson and Fisher, and also the member for Brighton, will be very pleased to know from the list that has been issued that the grants to those councils have been increased. I would imagine, although I am not party to those discussions, that this would have been in recognition of the additional expense incurred by those councils because of the tragedy.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

Mr. OSWALD: Has the Premier consulted with the Chairman of the Public Service Board regarding consultations between the board and the Public Service Association about the proposed guidelines for public servants who appear before Parliamentary committees?

The SPEAKER: I regret that I am unable to accept the question because it anticipates a motion that is already on the Notice Paper, and it is in a form that is not as important as the manner in which the matter appears before the House.

SPECIAL BRANCH

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Chief Secretary say what is the function, role and composition of the Police Special Branch, and will he explain to the House the nature and scope of its activities? As one who almost certainly would have been listed, along with many other innocuous individuals, in the files of Special Branch, I am particularly interested in its current role. In answer to a Question on Notice last November, the Chief Secretary confirmed that discussions had been held with the Commissioner of Police and other senior officers in regard to the role of the Special Branch and its functions. Can the Minister now, nine months later, tell the House what was decided?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: This matter was one of auditing by Mr. Justice White of the Supreme Court, and up until a couple of weeks ago I was informed that there was some minor auditing to do. Until that auditing is

completed, there will be no announcement by the Government as to the future functioning of Special Branch.

SUPPLY TENDERS

Dr. BILLARD: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier. In assessing tenders for supply, what account does the Government take of the proportion of local manufacture and/or the proportion of the total outlay that will ultimately be repatriated by the tenderer (a) out of the State and (b) out of the country? I note that the Federal Parliament has recently passed a Bill that regulates a procedure for giving preference to goods of Australian origin or goods having Australian content. The preference margin to be applied in the case of purchases is 20 per cent of the value of the Australian content of each tender, the resultant figure being subtracted from each tender price. The level of Australian content must be submitted with each tender, and is subject to safeguards to ensure that estimates are correct, within reason. Such a technique, if applied to South Australia, could well assist in developing employment opportunities within private industry in this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is an interesting question. The position in South Australia is similar to that in other States in that State preference applies in relation to the supply of goods and equipment, as controlled by the Supply and Tender Board. I cannot speak for statutory authorities; I am not aware of their policies. I do not think the degree of preference indicated by the honourable member is observed by any of the State Governments. I will be most interested to get hold of the recent Federal legislation relating to this matter to ascertain how it might be applied at the State level. There is a State preference applying. I am not entirely convinced that, if we eliminated State preferences throughout Australia, we would be disadvantaged. A 10 per cent preference applies between South Australia and the other States, and vice versa. It is possible that, if that was wiped out on the Australian scene (and I am not for a moment suggesting that South Australia should do that in isolation, but it is a matter I think should be discussed by the relevant Ministers), it could well be to the advantage of South Australia and the other States. There has been some discussion between this State and Victoria about this matter, but we certainly would not act unilaterally.

The question is concerned with preference for Australian goods. I think we should do all we can to encourage that preference. There is a 15 per cent preference for local goods, against overseas goods. There is no mechanism that I am aware of for calculating what is repatriated out of this State and out of this country. In other words, even if a company is Australian or South Australian-owned, there could well be overseas interests involved in that company, and no mechanism has been established, certainly at State level, to ascertain what is repatriated out of this country. Cabinet reviewed a case recently and made a deliberate decision to give preference to Australian-manufactured goods to protect employment in this country. I will take up the member's question and get further detail for him relating to the interesting points he has raised to ascertain whether there is some application that is suitable for South Australia.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs ask the Treasury to extend the provisions of the

Department of Trade and Industry's decentralisation pay-roll tax incentive scheme into new areas of South Australia to promote industrial development and employment?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am surprised at the nature of this question. The question is whether the Government will extend the pay-roll tax decentralisation scheme, which also includes a rebate of land tax, into new areas to promote industrial development. The previous Government applied restrictions as to where this scheme applied. It selected key growth areas (I think Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge were some of those areas) to which it applied. One of the first acts this Government performed was to extend that scheme to cover the whole State, outside of a reasonable distance from Adelaide. I am not sure which area the honourable member is referring to.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I don't think he is referring to geographical areas at all.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: He asked for the scheme to be extended, yet already there is 100 per cent rebate of pay-roll tax. How can we extend it further? A 100 per cent rebate of land tax applies; how can we extend that further? If the honourable member has any particular aspect he would like to discuss with me, I shall be willing to do so. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding as to what the policy is in relation to rebates. In terms of areas and in terms of rebate of the two taxes involved, we can extend it no further. I think the honourable member would know that there is a radius drawn around Adelaide in which the scheme does not apply. We would not expect it to apply in that area, because we do not regard the metropolitan area of Adelaide as being decentralised.

HEALTH COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Health announce the findings of the Central Northern CURB regions study into hospital services in the northern suburbs, and indicate what action will be taken by the Government in response to the study, which was released by the South Australian Health Commission this week?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I know how interested the member for Fisher is in health matters, so I am pleased to tell him that the findings of this study include information that the present number of in-patient beds in the region is generally sufficient and it is not envisaged that any additional beds should be provided soon. One factor which was not taken into account by the Public Works Standing Committee when it previously recommended the building of new hospital facilities in the area was that the new Central Districts Private Hospital was opened. At this stage it is not possible to tell what effect that will have on general planning of public services, and the Health Commission would want to wait until the impact of that hospital is known before it makes further planning for the provision of hospital beds. In addition, the findings of the Royal Commission into hospital efficiency and administration in Australia will no doubt have a bearing on the provision of hospital beds in that area, as would any Federal Government health insurance initiatives.

The extension of the bed complement at Modbury Hospital that was at one stage considered desirable in order to serve those central northern areas is considered to be not warranted, but the out-patient services for people living in the area should be centrally located and easily accessible to public transport. I believe that that is the matter which will arouse most public comment and, indeed, public support from that area, which embraces the

Districts of Napier and Elizabeth, and I hope that that public comment will be forthcoming by the end of September, the closing date set by the Health Commission for comment. Following that, the commission and then the Government will consider the recommendations.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable member for Morphett, I wish to announce to members on both sides of the House that, where I believe a question is out of order, I will immediately call the member to order, and if, after consultation with the Chair, the question that he is putting can be put in order, he will be given the opportunity later in Question Time to put that question. This is something of a departure from normal practice, but I believe that it has been used adequately in the Federal Parliament for a long time and that it will be advantageous to members on both sides of the House.

Mr. OSWALD: Has the Premier consulted with the Chairman of the Public Service Board regarding consultation between the Public Service Board and members of the Public Service Association in respect of the statements made in the press this morning?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. Following the events of yesterday and the statement in the press this morning I did speak to the Chairman of the Public Service Board who, indeed, had already taken action himself. He has made available to me a letter, which is headed "Private and Confidential", from the General Secretary of the Public Service Association. He has taken the step of informing the secretary that he intended to release this letter to me for use as I saw fit.

In view of the statements that have been made, I believe it is important that I read this letter into the record in answer to the honourable member. Dated 3 June 1980 and addressed to the Chairman of the Public Service Board, it states:

Dear Mr. Mercer, I refer to the confidential document discussed between us dealing with "Guidelines for Public Servants appearing before Parliamentary Committees." The matter has been the subject of intense but confidential discussions within the Association Senior Staff group and Executive and as a result of those discussions, the following views are put:

1. The document is generally regarded as being "acceptable" subject to two comments.
2. The two comments we have relate to Item 5 of the Guidelines:—
 - (i) re Item 5 (2)—It is suggested that to this item the following words should be added "provided that where questions are asked in camera, the public servant may give answers as to issues of fact."
 - (ii) re Item 5 (3)—It is suggested that to this item the following words should be added "provided that where the Minister or Ministers concerned have already made public the advice they have received, or where the Minister or Ministers concerned have implied in a public forum what advice they have received, then the public servant should be free to disclose or comment as to the information and advice given."

The following is a most significant part of the letter:

May we say how much we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this matter prior to it being pursued by the Government in the House. We believe that the amendments we propose, not only allow the public servant to discharge his functions with greater frankness, but will also allow for the general principle in favour of the primacy of Parliament over

the Executive. We would be interested to hear as to the outcome of these proposals.

There is further matter which, in view of the Notice Paper, it would be improper of me to canvass at this stage. I shall canvass that matter at the appropriate time, but I thought that, in view of the statements that were made in this House yesterday and in the press this morning, the member for Morphett, together with every other member in this Chamber, would be interested to hear of the correspondence from the Public Service Association.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. SLATER: Can the Premier say whether it is true that Mr. Max Scriven, who is being replaced by Mr. John Rundle as Agent-General in London, will shortly be appointed permanent head of a reorganised Premier's Department, and that moves have already been taken to transfer officers from the Department of Trade and Industry to a Department of State Development to be headed by Mr. Tiddy under the Premier's Ministerial responsibility? If this is so, what will be the future position and role of Mr. G. J. Inns, the Director-General of the existing Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In reply to the succession of questions asked by the honourable member, no decision has been made as to Mr. Scriven's future.

IMMUNISATION

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Health advise who is responsible for immunisation programmes in schools? If the primary responsibility lies with local government, will the Minister say what action is taken if local councils do not implement programmes in local schools? Concern arose in my mind when it was pointed out to me that some local councils are not taking up the responsibility of ensuring that local immunisation programmes are carried out in schools. It has been pointed out to me that some children may miss out on immunisation programmes because of this lack of responsibility.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The primary responsibility for immunisation of children rests with their parents, and parents have various means by which they can choose to have their children immunised, either through their family doctor or through the local board of health. As far as the immunisation programme and responsibilities of local boards of health are concerned, it is part of their statutory responsibility to control infectious diseases. Therefore, the local boards of health need to ensure that schools within their areas are covered by immunisation programmes.

The Health Commission provides immunisation on a continuing basis for rubella only, but it provides the vaccine to the local boards for all other forms of immunisation—that is to say, diphtheria, tetanus, poliomyelitis, and the other immunisation programmes necessary in schools.

If the honourable member is concerned that any school in his area is not being covered by an immunisation programme, I should be pleased to take up the matter through the South Australian Health Commission and ensure that that school is aware of the avenues open to it to conduct immunisation programmes. I stress again (as I have recently done) the extreme importance of every child being immunised, I also stress that, although the responsibility rests with the parents, it is important that there be no lack of resources through the local boards, the

medical profession, the schools, and other programmes to ensure that every child in the State is covered and that the possibility of infectious disease is reduced to the minimum.

SCHOOL BUS FARES

Mr. CRAFTER: What discussions has the Minister of Education engaged in or have his officers engaged in within the Education Department and/or with others with a view to introducing fares for children using school buses?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have not entered into discussion with anyone. I am assuming that the honourable member is referring to school buses, as opposed to public transport.

Mr. Crafter: Yes.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have not engaged in any discussions regarding school buses owned by the Education Department.

WATER MAINS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether the Government has determined a policy on the replacement of existing Engineering and Water Supply Department supply mains that have, because of age, become inadequate and, in some cases, beyond the stage of economic repair? The Minister will be aware that, when any extension to a main is laid, a capital contribution is expected from the expected user. However, when I inquired last year from the former Government about the then Government's policy on the replacement of existing mains, I found that there was no such policy, but that the matter was then under discussion. The situation prevails on Eyre Peninsula, and no doubt in many other parts of the State, where the service mains are sometimes 50 years old, and beyond their economic and practical life.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The situation is being actively pursued at present. It was largely a subject of the tour of South Australia that I have undertaken in various sections, particularly the West Coast, where we examined a number of mains that were laid many years ago. In many of the steel cast-iron mains (cement lined, in many instances) the cast-iron has corroded away, and the only part left is the cement lining. Such mains in this condition are causing numerous breakdowns, and are extremely expensive to maintain. It is clearly recognised by the Government and the department that that programme must be entered into, and it is an expensive programme because we would be re-laying existing mains for which no increased rate revenue would be derived. This is an issue of which the Government is well aware. It is determining the priorities for the replacement of those mains, and I hope to be able to announce a commencement soon, particularly as some of the mains on the West Coast are in a very poor condition.

AMDEL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Health tell the House what is being done at the Thebarton premises of Amdel to comply with the recommendations contained in the report of Mr. D. J. Hamilton, a scientific officer with the Health Commission, that Amdel should monitor radiation levels around the tailing pits at Thebarton to determine (1) the level of residual contamination in and around the pits; (2) the possibility of groundwater contamination; and (3) the direction of groundwater

movement through the Thebarton site?

The Minister will be aware that Mr. D. J. Hamilton's report found that the uranium tailing ponds at Thebarton were just holes dug into the clay soil and were very "inadequately lined with corrugated iron". Mr. Hamilton reported that the area around the tailing pits "was a mess, with a fine dry black powder on the adjacent roadways". The report quoted Amdel's Operations Manager at Thebarton, Mr. Bruce Ashton, who admitted that environmental monitoring, including the monitoring of radium in ground water, had not been done. Mr. Ashton was also quoted as saying that water from the pits was probably migrating into the ground water. Mr. Hamilton found that Amdel showed no evidence of displaying a positive attitude towards minimising the risks associated with the handling of uranium ore, and pointed out that Amdel's responsibilities in the environmental area are particularly important, as both of its sites are situated in the metropolitan area. Two weeks ago, the Deputy Premier would not answer—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. Factual as it may be, it is a comment in the manner in which it is put.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe it would be fair—and I request your ruling, Sir—in order to explain fully that the reason for my now having to direct this question to the Minister of Health is that, on a previous occasion, information sought was not provided by the Minister who was then asked a related question. I would appreciate your ruling on that.

The SPEAKER: There is no direct point of order, but I make the same comment to the honourable member as I have made to all other members in this House: the manner in which Ministers to whom questions are directed answer those questions is of their own making. I am not, however, going to accept a situation where a previous question, which is unsuitable to the member, then is the base for an attack upon the person who gave the answer. It is my distinct understanding of the statement made by the honourable member for Mitchell in relation to the Deputy Premier that that was the situation which was developing.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I will adhere to it, as every member is required to do. Will the Minister of Health tell us what has been done and, if nothing has been done yet, will the Minister inform the House whether Amdel has stopped using the tailing pits?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am very pleased to inform the House of the action that has been taken. I should say, however, that the member for Mitchell is very much out of date with his allegations. Obviously, he has obtained from the union concerned which sought the information in the first place a copy of Mr. Hamilton's report, which is, of course, a public document; once a union seeks such information from the Occupational Health Branch of the Health Commission, that information is made available to it and, having been made available, it is obviously, if the union wishes, freely available to anyone else. Unfortunately, the honourable member has not bothered to pursue the matter with the union. Had he done so, he would have known that the report which Mr. Hamilton made has been acted on by Amdel in accordance with the recommendations of the Occupational Health Branch.

The principal recommendations were, first, that a monitoring programme should be prepared for approval by the Occupational Health Branch. Action taken in respect of that recommendation shows that a monitoring programme has been prepared, it has been approved, and it is in action to the extent that the equipment is available.

Additional equipment required is on order. If my recollection is correct, that is precisely the answer which the Deputy Premier gave in response to this similar question earlier in the session.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You might be out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I doubt whether I am doing more than reiterate what the Deputy Premier said on that occasion. The second recommendation was that a radiation manual should be prepared for issue to staff. The action taken in regard to that recommendation is that a draft of the manual has been prepared, it has been submitted to the Occupational Health Branch in draft, and it has been approved. It is being prepared for printing and publication shortly, and portions of it are already being used.

The third recommendation was that the possible effects of the tailing pits on ground waters be assessed. The action taken in regard to that recommendation is that the Department of Mines and Energy has prepared a report which advises that contamination is most unlikely.

The report recommended that its findings be confirmed by drilling; one drill hole has been completed, and two further holes are planned shortly. However, no radiation is detectable one metre from the pit. I also point out, in response to the honourable member's gratuitous remarks about Amdel, that the Occupational Health Branch reported to me that it had received full co-operation from the management of Amdel and that it was satisfied that the recommendations that had made by the Occupational Health Branch have been met with a willing, co-operative and responsible response by Amdel. I suggest that, if the honourable member is trying to imply that Amdel is not fulfilling its responsibilities in response to advice, he is making a very grave mistake.

I should be very happy to supply any further information that the honourable member may wish by way of specific detail that has not been included in my reply in the House. When he receives that, I believe that he will be reassured and satisfied that all action that should be taken in accordance with the Occupational Health Branch's recommendations either has been or is being taken.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of installing a bleeper system to work in conjunction with pedestrian crossing lights? In the United Kingdom and some countries of Europe some pedestrian lights have a safety device so that, when the lights are showing green, a bleeper indicates to a pedestrian that it is safe to cross the road. This makes it much safer for the partially blind, the blind and aged people to determine that the way is clear and that the light, if they cannot see it properly, is green. This system has been of great advantage and has been successful, particularly in the United Kingdom, where I saw it operating. Will the Minister investigate the possibility of installing this system at some of our pedestrian crossings?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government is concerned with providing facilities for the elderly and the handicapped, and it believes that, in the past (and this applies to all Governments), in some instances, only lip service has been paid to facilities for the handicapped and the elderly. In regard to public transport, we are investigating the whole question of facilities. The honourable member has asked a question about a system of which I was not aware. His suggestion sounds very good, and I will investigate the matter and give the honourable member a report in due course.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

Mr. McRAE: I direct a question to the Premier, supplementary to a question asked by the member for Morphett. Does the Premier undertake that the document to which he referred as being provided by officials of the Public Service Board to members or officers of the Public Service Association was the same document tabled in this House on 6 August 1980: that is, did that document (the document handed by the Public Service Board to the P.S.A.) specifically refer to Public Service Board advisers accompanying public servants to Parliamentary committees?

The situation as it has been put to the Opposition and the press is that at no time did officers of the P.S.A. ever have in their possession the document that was tabled in this House on 6 August. Furthermore, it is stated that there were no discussions at all about that document. I notice the jocularity of those on the front bench in regard to this rather serious matter, as was displayed yesterday. That is rather sad.

Rather, it is stated that, in the midst of other discussions a document, not the one tabled in this House, was shown to two officers of the association for unofficial comment. I further ask, for the protection of the good reputation of the officers of the union, that the Premier table the letter to which he referred.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to table the letter. It is perfectly genuine. It is on the Public Service Association letterhead, so there can be no possible doubt about it. The honourable member for Playford can do his very most and act all he wants; it will not help him to be Attorney-General, or anything else.

Mr. McRae: What about answering the question?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will get down to answering the question. I have already read the letter that I will now table, and it answers a great deal of what has been said in this House. I am conscious of the strictures placed upon me by Standing Orders in this matter.

Mr. Bannon: You're allowed to take refuge in them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, I will deal with them very thoroughly indeed when this matter comes before the House in the proper time. In response to the letter I have already read to the House, the Chairman of the Public Service Board replied as follows:

Dear Mr. Fraser, Thank you for your association's comments on the proposed "Guidelines for Public Servants appearing before Parliamentary Committees". Your suggestions have been brought to the Premier's attention and I am sure they will be carefully considered by the Government in reaching its decision. Thank you, in particular, for respecting the confidentiality of the consultation process.

That was the acknowledging letter. No; of course, the guidelines as finally decided upon were not the same as the guidelines suggested to the P.S.A. There had been a great deal of consideration given to various points of view, including a statement which had been made by the former Premier when he criticised the Public Accounts Committee's report into the Hospitals Department last year, and a number of other matters. It was quite obvious at that time that there needed to be some form of protection. The former Premier said that steps would be taken to provide that protection for public servants. All that has been done now is that that protection has been supplied in guidelines (not binding, but in guidelines), guidelines which can be taken for the guidance, literally, of committees and public servants.

The attitude that the Opposition has shown in recent days is a total reversal of the attitude which was quite clearly summed up by the former Premier. I cannot

understand this about-face, if it is not entirely a matter of playing politics. When we get back to the letter, which was suddenly produced by the Secretary of the Public Service Association and which is dated 12 August 1980 (and of which I have only a copy here), we see that there has been a sudden and dramatic turn-about in the attitude of that association, as evidenced in its letter of 12 August also. I shall deal with this matter far more thoroughly at the appropriate time when a motion for its discussion comes before the House.

DRY-LAND FARMING

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the arrangements for the international dry-land farming conference are proceeding in accordance with details that he outlined in March this year? How many delegates are expected to attend the function, which is to commence in Adelaide next week?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the question asked by the honourable member, as I am sure members opposite understand. I am pleased also to have the opportunity to remind the member for Hanson, and all other honourable members, of the importance of this congress, which is starting next Monday. Members may have noted the recent publicity about a threatened world food shortage, and it is really to that subject that the congress is to address itself.

There is an extremely important issue as the basis of this programme. In fact, the United States Presidential Commission recently predicted that the world food crisis could be more serious, indeed, than the present energy troubles and could erupt in the next 20 years. The commission has warned that, unless bold solutions are found quickly, famine will create major threats to world peace by the year 2000. I believe the subject is indeed very serious, and we ought to be addressing ourselves to it both in the world sense and within our own State, and we ought to be demonstrating wherever possible our interest in maximising our land use for the purposes of producing food.

Recent figures show that food shortage in some nations is expected to increase by almost 300 per cent within 10 years and, with the world population increasing by 100 000 000 a year (that is, in round figures, 2 000 000 a week), there are grave problems ahead unless we can make more efficient use of our total land resources. In South Australia, we have already taken some steps along this road to transfer our dry-land farming technology to other nations of the world, particularly in the Mediterranean and Middle East areas. Members opposite will be aware of not only my personal interest in this regard but of course of the interest of my predecessor on behalf of their own Party when in Government. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor for his contribution.

The International Dry-land Farming Congress referred to by the member for Hanson is indeed to start on Monday next week in the Festival Theatre, and it will run until 5 September.

An honourable member: Are you going?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes, indeed I am, and so, too, I would hope, will be some representatives from the Opposition to show an interest in a subject of significance not only to South Australia but also to Australia and the rest of the world.

Mr. Slater: I'm hoping to get an invitation.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The invitations have been sent out. My statement in March this year was clearly an invitation to members opposite and to the public in

general to show interest and to be represented. It is the object of the congress to show our overseas delegates the techniques which are available to us within this State and which we are prepared to share, that is, our dry-land farming techniques which have seen cereal yields double since the 1930's and livestock production treble in the same period. It is believed that dry-land farming, or rain-fed farming as the practice is internationally known, can largely make up the predicted short-fall in the world food production.

The congress has attracted more than 450 delegates from 40 countries, as well as people from other States, and it is recognised that if each of these were to adapt the South Australian system of dry-land farming the benefits to themselves and, of course, to the whole world would be profound. Speakers of international repute in the realm on dry-land farming will present papers, and delegates will visit not only research institutions such as Waite, Roseworthy and Turretfield, but also farms to study our integrated livestock and cereal methods. In fact, they will visit properties at Balaklava, Snowtown, Bute, Kadina, Wallaroo, and Port Wakefield, and farming properties near Gawler.

The congress will be opened on Monday evening by the Premier, with a key speaker on the opening night being Dr. D. F. R. Bommer, the Assistant Director-General of Agriculture, of the Agriculture Department of the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations, who will speak on rain-fed agricultural and world food production in an address which will set the scene for the rest of the congress. As well as overseas speakers and those from other Australian States, our own State will be represented by agricultural scientists, technologists and producers, including Dr. Puckridge of the Department of Agronomy at Waite, Mr. Farnan, General Manager of the South Australian Seedgrowers' Co-operative, Dr. Williams, Director of Roseworthy Agricultural College, Mr. Thomas from John Shearer Proprietary Limited, and Mr. Peter Barrow, a Director with the South Australian Department of Agriculture.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Have you organised a band for it?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: No, but it deserves it. Why, do you want a job?

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Yes.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Not with that thing that you blast around these premises from time to time, I hope. The congress is a joint venture of the Agricultural Technologists of Australasia and the South Australian Department of Agriculture under the directorship of Ray Taylor. Dr. Bommer and other delegates will be arriving over the weekend and the official programme will start on Monday evening, with a welcoming function, not a band led by the member for Baudin, but a function in the Adelaide Festival Centre. Finally, I can predict with assurance that, with the number of delegates attending, the range of countries represented and the breadth of topics which will be considered, the congress will undoubtedly be a success. It will focus world attention on South Australia as a leader in the dry-land farming practice.

Members of the Opposition have indicated a degree of mirth about this subject. I am disappointed that that attitude prevails because, as I indicated earlier, it is extremely important, not just for us, but for starving millions, to have their respective countries informed, advised and assisted in developing higher yields of food within their respective countries. I am proud to conclude by saying that, from South Australia, we are able, not in the aid or benevolence sense so much, but surely, in the

commercial sense, to provide that sort of guidance and assistance.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Are you trying to break a record?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Have you got another question?

The SPEAKER: Order! It was an unnecessary interjection.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: On that note, I am pleased that we are able to continue to uphold the commitments to other countries in this respect in line with those inherited from our predecessors.

At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CRIMES (OFFENCES AT SEA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS SUBSIDY BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to subsidise the cost of liquefied petroleum gas and naphtha that is sold or purchased for certain purposes; and to provide for other related matters. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In April 1980, as part of its revised policy with respect of liquefied petroleum gas pricing and utilisation, the Commonwealth Government announced that it would subsidise the cost of domestic liquefied petroleum gas for a three-year period from 28 March 1980. This Bill is required to allow the payment of the Commonwealth subsidy to South Australian distributors of liquefied petroleum gas for passing on to consumers.

In this three-year period, the use of liquefied petroleum gas by householders and by certain hospitals, nursing homes and schools that are non-profit making will be subsidised to allow them time to adjust to the rising prices of liquefied petroleum gas and, where possible, to convert from liquefied petroleum gas to more readily available alternative fuels. Commercial and industrial liquefied petroleum gas users will be encouraged to convert out of liquefied petroleum gas by extension of the taxation concessions and allowances which apply to conversion of oil-fired equipment.

The Commonwealth Act provided for grants to be made to the States to enable the States to pay to registered distributors of liquefied petroleum gas the subsidy of \$80 a tonne on liquefied petroleum gas sold to consumers. The subsidy will also apply to distributors of reticulated gas derived from liquefied petroleum gas or naphtha, as currently applies with the South Australian Gas Company at Whyalla and Mount Gambier.

Liquefied petroleum gas has played an important role as a source of heat in country areas not connected to the natural gas pipeline system. Increases in the price of liquefied petroleum gas associated with significant demand from overseas, parity price relationships and motor spirit prices have caused some hardship to domestic users of liquefied petroleum gas committed to this fuel. Most of

these users have few alternatives in the short term to the use of liquefied petroleum gas for heating purposes, and it is therefore important that a short-term subsidy be given whilst alternative energy forms are developed. The subsidy is likely to amount to over \$1 000 000 a year in South Australia, and arrangements are already in operation to allow payment to distributors from the commencement date of 28 March 1980.

Commonwealth officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs will be vested with powers in relation to administration of the scheme. These powers will be similar to those which apply to the petroleum products subsidy legislation, and will ensure smooth and efficient operation of the subsidy scheme. Whilst liquefied petroleum gas is an important source of energy for heating purposes in country areas, it is also an important fuel for automobiles, and this Government recognises the need for positive action both to encourage the rational use of our energy resources and to assist the development of new energy supplies.

The Government's actions with respect to the development of the Cooper Basin liquids and liquefied petroleum gas resources are designed to assist in the supply of additional liquid fuels in the immediate future. Extensive studies are being undertaken in conjunction with the Cooper Basin producers on processing options for crude oil and condensate, and for the introduction of Cooper Basin liquefied petroleum gas into the South Australian market.

One particular concern of the Government is the maximisation of the use of Cooper Basin liquefied petroleum gas within the State, particularly with respect to automotive use as a replacement for motor spirit. The Government is taking the necessary steps to ensure that the liquefied petroleum gas market is developed in an orderly manner, with special consideration to the setting of adequate safety standards and procedures. This Bill will ensure that the benefits of the Commonwealth subsidy are passed on to South Australian consumers, and that the liquefied petroleum gas market is stabilised and developed in an efficient manner making use of our significant indigenous resources.

I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes the Act retrospective to the commencement of the Commonwealth Act on the twenty-eighth day of March 1980. Clause 3 provides all necessary definitions. The definitions of "eligible use" and "residential premises" are as found in the Commonwealth Act, thus doing away with the need to amend this Act should the Commonwealth Act be amended at any time. "Eligible use" means domestic use in residential premises, use in hospitals, nursing homes and health care institutions not conducted for the profit of a person, and use in schools that are not conducted for the profit of a person. "Residential premises" means a dwellinghouse and any place in which at least one person resides, but does not include a hotel, motel, boarding house, hospital, nursing home, boarding school or any premises excluded by the Commonwealth Minister by notice in the Commonwealth *Gazette*.

Clause 4 provides that subsidies are payable to registered distributors of eligible gas, and that those subsidies are payable in accordance with the Act and the scheme. Clause 5 empowers the Minister to authorise advances to be paid to registered distributors on account

of any subsidy. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of authorised officers by the Minister. The Minister will appoint authorised officers from a list of Commonwealth officers who have been approved by the Commonwealth Minister.

Clause 7 directs a registered distributor to make a claim for a subsidy to an authorised officer. The claim forms and the manner in which the claims must be made will be determined by the Minister. Clause 8 provides for the examination by authorised officers of all claims made under the Act. Authorised officers will then give certificates as to the amounts of eligible gas sold for eligible use by registered distributors. Where an overpayment has occurred, an authorised officer will certify accordingly. Clause 9 directs the Minister to cause payments of subsidies to be made in accordance with certificates given under clause 8. Clause 10 provides for the recovery by the Minister of the amount of any overpayment. A registered distributor to whom an overpayment has been made is given a month in which to pay the amount concerned.

Clause 11 empowers an authorised officer to require a registered distributor to give security before he receives any moneys under this Act. Clause 12 requires registered distributors of liquefied petroleum gas to keep for 12 months all accounts relating to any sale in respect of which a claim is made under the Act. Registered distributors of eligible reticulation gas are required to keep all accounts relating to gas in respect of which a claim is made for two years. Clause 13 empowers an authorised officer to enter at any reasonable time the premises or vehicle of any registered distributor or interstate registered distributor. Upon so entering, he may inspect all relevant papers and make copies of them. An authorised officer is also empowered by subclause (3) to enter any premises to which eligible gas has been supplied for eligible use, and to inspect those premises.

Clause 14 empowers an authorised officer to require persons to attend before him for the purpose of answering questions or producing papers in relation to any claim made under this Act or a corresponding interstate Act. Clause 15 empowers an authorised officer to examine on oath any person he has summoned before him. Clause 16 provides a penalty of \$1 000 for failure to attend before an authorised officer, or failure to answer questions or produce papers. Any person who falsely obtains a payment under the Act or makes a false or misleading statement for the purpose of obtaining such a payment incurs a penalty of \$2 000 or 12 months imprisonment. A penalty of \$1 000 is provided in respect of other false or misleading statements. Where a payment has been falsely obtained, the trial court may order that the money be refunded to the Minister.

Clause 17 provides that proceedings for offences under the Act must be commenced within a year, and are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 18 gives the Minister the power to delegate any of his powers or duties under the Act. Clause 19 provides for the keeping of a separate account at Treasury into which must be paid all moneys received from the Commonwealth and all other moneys received under the Act. The Treasurer is authorised to pay out all subsidies from that account. The Treasurer may advance moneys to the account pending receipt of the Commonwealth grant moneys, but the total amount so advanced must not at any time exceed \$50 000. Clause 20 provides for the making of such regulations as may be necessary. Offences under the regulations may incur penalties not exceeding \$200.

The schedule contains the scheme formulated by the Commonwealth Minister pursuant to the Commonwealth

Act for the purposes of this State. If the Commonwealth Minister amends the scheme at any time, or substitutes another one, the schedule will not require amendment, as the definition of "scheme" in clause 3 provides for this eventuality.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this small amending Bill is to facilitate the presentation of one annual report to the Minister by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs relating to his administration of the Consumer Transactions Act, 1972-1980, the Consumer Credit Act, 1972-1980, the Residential Tenancies Act, 1978, and the Prices Act, 1948-1980. At present, the Commissioner is required to submit reports under the first three Acts as soon as is practicable after 30 June in each year; however, section 18b of the Prices Act requires him to report as soon as is practicable after 31 December. The Government is of the view that it would be convenient to have all four reports submitted at the one time, so this Bill amends section 18b accordingly. However, it is proposed that the report under the Prices Act for 1980 be submitted as is presently required.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 18b of the principal Act, so that the report required under that section be submitted as soon as practicable after 30 June of each year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 20 August. Page 542.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the Liberal Government of South Australia on its record as a Government so far, and for its determination to make South Australia a better place to live in. Members on both sides of the House would be aware of my deep concern regarding the problems of juvenile delinquents and also of the reason why I became more deeply involved in this matter some years ago. That reason, of course, was the treatment that young people were receiving during the reign of the Dunstan Government.

I was concerned about the way in which they were allowed to do just what they wanted, with a complete lack of discipline in the institutions. At times staff members were placed in unbearable, intolerable situations. There were riots at the McNally centre at very high cost to taxpayers, the first costing about \$75 000, and another riot following within three weeks or so costing over \$50 000. Members who were in this House at that time will remember the removal to another Ministry of the then Minister in charge of correctional institutions.

At times, by their outlook and indeed their actions, the supervisory staff showed that the philosophy that they were following, no doubt by direction, was quite wrong. There is no doubt that the former Government told the department what philosophy to apply in the treatment of

young offenders in this State. I believe that, over the years, and more recently, we have been subjected to frequent studies of crime, listing the causes and, of course, the cures. So much of this material has been purely theoretical, and like so many theories this work has done little to alleviate the situation.

Improvements have usually come about when someone working in the criminal justice system has seen the need for something to be done. Motivation is usually practical and generated, initially, by those who are engaged in direct contact with criminals. I believe that all people who work in the field of correctional services, particularly in the juvenile area (and I am talking about the psychiatrists, sociologists, and the like), should all be obliged to do some work as floor workers on the line in these institutions. They should have a term of about eight months to give them real experience of the problems with which they are trying to grapple in an area, instead of merely looking at problems theoretically.

I believe that these people, such as practitioners and theorists, have been living on a cloud, floating some distance above the level of reality. We are surrounded by books on drugs. If I were to go to the library now, I believe that I would be able to procure 10 or 12 books on drugs, the problems of drug addicts, and the like, together with the methods of treating these unfortunate people. In reality, none of these methods is effective, and this has been happening for so many years.

Authors have set out various methods regarding the treatment of children. The great person on this aspect some years ago was Dr. Spock, who told everyone and advised so many people through his books and teachings what children should be allowed to do, how they should be allowed to please themselves entirely, and how they had their rights. However, he has now stated publicly that he was wrong. He said that he had made a mistake. To me, a man of that calibre, who is supposed to be highly intelligent, has caused terrible havoc in the world, and no-one will ever know the damage he has done to many thousands of people of this world. He is no more than a criminal. He, as an intellectual, was to teach and advise people, and he expected them to have confidence in him to carry out his advice. We will never know the really terrible things that resulted or how far the matter has gone, because we will never be able to assess the great number of people his teachings have affected.

Mr. Slater: Did you have a happy childhood?

Mr. MATHWIN: Well, I have had a better childhood since I have been here, watching the children on the other side of the House perform. When papers are written on these subjects, in many cases they are over-stated; this is a typical fault and failure of reformists. However, the evidence remains that comparatively little progress has been made in understanding, predicting, controlling, and certainly changing criminal behaviour. One thing is certain: it is possible to lower the rate of crime in authoritarian societies, but at a price, namely, the loss of freedom, which is a price most people would prefer not to pay; this outstanding fact came out in my recent trip, during which I studied the situation. Most people would prefer not to lose their freedom. With freedom comes the need for greater controls to prevent people from becoming licentious. More controls are needed in the areas of consumerism, pollution and social welfare, which brings with it criminal penalties, many of which are unavoidable.

Another aspect that one must consider when studying this matter is civil rights, which have also had the effect in many cases of enabling the guilty to escape and leaving the innocent unprotected, which means that the whole system of law is at risk of losing public confidence and support.

Yet another aspect, annoying to say the least, is the playing-on-words game, in which people try to make it difficult to know what is going on. The changing of names happens continually. The word "prisoner" has been changed to "inmate". Now, I believe that, in some areas, such people are being called residents. The name "prison" is being changed to "correctional institution", and warders are now known as correctional officers. Juvenile delinquents and juvenile criminals are now being called young persons in conflict with the law. Institutions such as Borstal and trade schools are now known as training centres or community homes. If one realises it, it is only the name that has changed. Retribution is now frowned on as a bad term. We are told that the in term today is social justice, which covers such a wide range of expression. If the people working in the field of criminal justice really want to get their point across and to have people understand them, they ought to stop playing around with words, that is, calling something by a different name.

The public has a right to know, and to be advised in terms that they understand, not in terms that change from week to week. In the past, people in the department feared certain facts becoming too well known. Information has been difficult to obtain, and this is the only way in which people who are really concerned about the problems are able to ascertain whether we are going right or wrong. There is no point in their worrying that you may be on the wrong track, if you are sincere about doing what you want to do. If the figures go against your thoughts on any matter, obviously you ought to change your thoughts.

Last year, the year before, and the year before that, I tried to obtain information about driving under the influence by teenagers and juveniles, but it was unobtainable. I was not allowed to be given it. Now, this Government has allowed such information to be published, so that people will be able to see whether the situation can be improved and whether the system is working. If it is not working, we ought to be responsible enough to try to do something about the problem.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The Division of Criminal Statistics was set up when I was Attorney-General.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member, as Attorney-General, would not give to the House the figures of juveniles caught driving while drunk. Such information was refused by the then Minister of Community Welfare, the then Chief Secretary, and the then Attorney-General, because they were frightened of it being proved that their system was not working. That is the honest fact about it. If the honourable member is going to be fair dinkum about it, he should say "Yes, we made a mistake. We should have produced the figures." Many people cry out that we ought to have better staff and better training facilities. When people talk about prisoners and penal reform in this field, does it mean that we ought to have more highly-educated officers?

There is little evidence that that would make a concerned humane officer; in fact, education alone does not make better people. The ignorant and the learned alike both have their fair share of humanitarians and punitive bigots. We cannot have a tougher law enforcement and at the same time demand reduction in money or finance on what people term wasted training and treatment programmes for offenders. That is impossible, because the two do not go together. It is difficult, and it has been proved a stumbling block, to try to distinguish between one category and the next. That has never been more true than when we talk about criminals. Offenders vary considerably. When he was Secretary of State in the United Kingdom in 1908, Gladstone made the following comment:

Habituals are men who drop into crime from their surroundings or physical disability or mental deficiency rather than from any act of intention to plunder their fellow creatures or being criminal for the sake of crime. The professionals were the men with an object, sound in mind and body, competent, often highly skilled, who deliberately, with their eyes open, preferred a life of crime and knew all the tricks and turns and manoeuvres necessary for that life.

Anyone who has had experience as a probation officer, a prison officer, or a residential care worker is well aware of the need to deal differently with the individuals represented in these two groups.

I have studied this situation fairly fully. Some people may think I am not sincere about it, but I am, because I am most concerned about the situation, and especially about young offenders. If we are to talk about criminals generally, if we are to have any success at all, whatever that may be in this field, if we are going to win any at all, the younger we can give them treatment, the better.

It is almost impossible, when they get through their life and finish up in the hard senior prisons, to change them. I believe that, the easier and the quicker the treatment, the better. It is my belief—and I have not talked it over with my Ministers or my Premier—that changes needed to be made, particularly in the area of juvenile delinquents.

The community service orders, which are to come into operation, should be coupled, I believe, with restitution orders, where the juvenile delinquent would sign a contract to work off the cost paid by the hour. He would be paid the minimum wage by the hour. The Government would provide the victims with finance, and if the juvenile broke his contract he would then be placed back, without doubt and without argument, in the institution. In order to work, this area must be properly supervised. I believe that the victim should be involved, too. This system is in operation at the moment, and working very well, in Boston, U.S.A. It has been working for more than 12 months in Munich, with great success. It is also working to a certain extent in California. Community service orders operate in parts of Canada and in Switzerland, but the restitution order is the one that I believe, according to reports I have, is working very successfully in Massachusetts.

I believe that correctional services, both adult and juvenile, should be under one Minister, thus leaving the Department for Community Welfare to carry out its job of caring for children in distress and those children who are placed under its control. I believe that, with the wide areas it covers, that department has a pretty fair load, and it would be relieved of that situation. The Chief Secretary, presumably, who is now in charge of adult correctional services, would be given the same area with juveniles under his cloak as Chief Secretary.

Mr. Slater: Heaven forbid!

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Gilles can forbid what he wants. Obviously, he has not given this matter very much thought.

Mr. Slater: Haven't I?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think so. I do not think he has any experience.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: If he's given it any, it would be more than you have given it.

Mr. Slater: Half a minute.

Mr. MATHWIN: How do I take on a ridiculous—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Glenelg should ignore the interjections.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, Sir. I believe that, as a Government, we should investigate the use of private enterprise in a much wider field of providing homes.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: I think the member for Elizabeth has had an accident, and he has my permission to leave the Chamber.

Mr. Slater: Are you going to get private enterprise to run the gaols?

Mr. MATHWIN: When ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise when you do not know what you are on about.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I hope you remember that while you are speaking.

Mr. MATHWIN: I will. I believe that private enterprise should be used for a much wider field in providing homes, not just open houses, but secure care with proper programmes submitted to the Minister for the treatment of the children. There will always be a need, irrespective of the philosophy of some members opposite, irrespective of the philosophy of the previous Government in this place, and it has been proved time and time again in every country. I visited 15 countries looking at this problem, even those behind the Iron Curtain, for those who have leanings to the left. Every country and every chief in charge of juvenile problems and juvenile crime agreed that we must have secure institutions for some of these children. I know that might hurt some members opposite, but it is a fact.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: No-one has ever disagreed with that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not know. When the honourable member was Minister he was in a cleft stick. I know that he was embarrassed on a number of occasions on that matter. There will always be a need for high security care, and these security risks must be housed to protect the public. These are the hard core recidivists who, in this State, represent about 3 per cent to 4 per cent, similar to the figure in Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia in the area I investigated.

For the benefit of the member for Gilles, I point out that the use of private enterprise institutions in this manner is in operation in Switzerland, in most States in America, all States in Canada, in the United Kingdom, and in India. If that is not sufficient proof in response to the giggly interjection of the member for Gilles, I do not know what is. I have figures to show how many of these institutions are in operation.

The Police Department should have a special section to deal with youth, similar to the Larrikin Squad, but upgraded to cater for modern youth. Police officers should be closer to the situation and should work in closer contact with the youth of the State.

There must be tighter liaison between the Education Department, the Department for Community Welfare, and the Police Department, with much more stress on education for those who need it and proper assessments of the standards that have been reached by some children. It is apparent to most countries that have bothered to find out that almost all children who are headed for a life of crime are dropouts from the education field. Sometimes this occurs through no fault of their own, because they may have experienced problems as slow learners, they may have been partially deaf, or they may have had other problems which might not have been detected until they were assessed.

The Government must ensure that proper tests are made when youths are first taken to an institution and, when they are found lacking in some direction, assistance from teachers, on a one-to-one or a two-to-one basis, should be provided to bring the children up to a reasonable level of education. This method is practised in a number of countries. Some children need one-to-one

contact. I would like to see some of the \$1 100 000 a day that is spent on education in this State directed to these children. Criminals are costly; we must realise that solutions to the problem will not be cheap. We are in a position to do more about this situation.

Children should be made to learn. In an institution, they should be made to have lessons and, if there is some trouble, it must be explained to them that they have to be taught to a certain standard of education. In Poland, a child must acquire a certain standard of education before he is allowed out of gaol, and, if he does not achieve that level, he remains in gaol until he has completed his course and attains that level. In some cases (and this is where assessment is so important) children find it impossible to reach that level and, if this is detected during assessment, treatment can be given.

All of the countries that I visited recognised the importance of re-education for children. In countries behind the iron curtain, in Rumania and in Poland, re-education is referred to as "resocialisation", but this is not implied in a political sense. Semi-security institutions should be provided for delinquents, and incentive schemes must be implemented to allow youths to progress through, and benefit from, the stages of these institutions. Youths must be prepared for their return to the community as responsible citizens and, again, the emphasis should be on education.

In Manitoba, Canada, the person in charge of young people of this kind was a lecturer in education; he puts a lot of emphasis on educating them so that they can express what they mean. Some children find it very difficult to express themselves, so they are educated and they gain confidence, and they learn survival in the community. Canada has initiated special outward bound camps for these children. Children go into the wild at weekends, 90 to 100 miles from a town.

Records of all offences committed by juveniles should be kept. In Switzerland, when children reach the age of 18, the records are destroyed and a fresh record is started. In this way, children are given a fresh opportunity. I do not mind that, but I do mind the fact that records are not kept, and I say again that records of all offences, not the records of one offence in five, should be kept, perhaps on a computer. This computer record could be destroyed when a child turns 18. It is imperative that all information about a child be available. If we really mean to tackle the problem we must have detailed information about what is happening and about how successful the treatment of these young people has been.

I was honoured by Parliament, and perhaps lucky in some ways, to be able to undertake this study tour, the subject of which was juvenile problems and delinquency. I studied the methods used by different countries in trying to correct the problem, and I say "trying" deliberately, because it is a big problem and one can only try to correct it. We cannot always be successful; it is impossible to obtain 100 per cent success in this field. Unfortunately, some young people and some older people who turn to a life of crime do not want to reform. Terrible though it may sound, some people are incurable.

We must face the fact that there will always be a need for institutions and prisons, because some people will always be residents of them, and there is nothing that anyone can do about it. The situation in regard to these people is unlike the situation in regard to a person who is ill with a disease; he can go to hospital, be cured, and come out of hospital. This is not so in regard to certain criminals. We should try to help them for their own good, keeping in mind that we, as members of a Parliament or a Government, have a responsibility to those people who

obey the law. We must ensure that those who abide by the law are protected. Unfortunately, there will always be institutions and inmates of those institutions. I decided to leave Australia with a clear and open mind.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Blank.

Mr. MATHWIN: You can say "blank" if you like, but, as long as it is blank, there is room for information. The former Attorney-General thinks there is no room for any more knowledge in his skull. Perhaps this is because he has had a haircut since I saw him last.

I chose the programme of countries I visited with the purpose in mind of gaining information about the full implications of problems existing in those countries. I first visited India, with its vast problems of caste, religion, poverty in the extreme, and illiteracy. The increase in population in India is 16 000 000 people a year, more than the total population of Australia. Most of this population increase occurs in areas where there is illiteracy. The Indian Government tries to educate people about birth control, this education attempt being carried out by educated Indians. Unfortunately, the population is still increasing at the rate of 16 000 000 a year. Taking the matters I have mentioned into full consideration, I believe the Indian authorities are doing a good job with the problems they are facing.

I visited a number of institutions in India, including closed gaols. Most of the children in institutions steal because they are starving. Many of those children come from the country; they run away from home and go to the city hoping to get some sort of work, but on arrival they find that they are unable to do so. Many of the children in these institutions were mistreated at home, so they went to the city to get work. When they arrived in the cities they could not get work, so they entered into a life of crime. I believe that the Indian department concerned is doing a good job with these children. The first thing that happens to those children is that they are taught to read and write, because they are illiterate. They are then taught to do some sort of work. That programme is proving successful because the children can then go out into the community and are able to look after themselves to some extent.

I visited a home for violent children which has an average occupancy rate of 500. That institution had a staff of 60, including the doctor, dentist, and two welfare workers only, the rest of the staff being equivalent to residential care workers and teachers, in the main—60 staff to 500 children! Those children slept 60 to 80 to a dormitory. One had to feel sorry for them and worry about the situation, but one must give credit to the Indian department for doing a good job with what facilities it has available.

I next visited Israel. There, again, they have problems. The Israeli Budget is divided into three parts: one-third for defence (which is imperative, and anybody who has been there would realise that); one-third to repaying borrowings; and only one-third is left to run the country. Israel has a vast financial problem, yet it has succeeded. The Israelis claim they have a one-third success rate with their juvenile delinquents. There are Israeli and Arab welfare workers who work in the slum areas with the street gangs to gain their confidence. They are sometimes challenged and accused of being spies for the authorities, and some of the young children are reluctant to succumb to their approaches. In Israel, as in India, stress is placed on the family situation and on getting families together. It is interesting to note that in Israel there is a trend back to discipline. They are returning to a situation in which there must be rules and regulations.

A person in charge of juveniles in Israel can appeal to

the court for an extension of 12 months to the sentence of a child who is not responding. That person can, also, if it is believed a child is progressing well, apply to the court to have the time at an institution lessened for an offender. I visited a number of institutions in Israel, one of which was for girls. I there talked to the lady in charge of the Girls Distress Unit. She said that she has been concerned for some time because girls are treated leniently by the courts. She said that she had often brought this to the attention of the department, the courts and the public, saying that the courts were not doing the young girls a favour by imposing light sentences. In fact, she suggests that that was helping to lead them on to the wrong road. That lady told the courts and her department that she believed they should tighten up instead of letting the girls get off too lightly. She suggested that the girls should be given sentences equivalent to those given to boys for the same offences. People would know that girls subject themselves to pain occasionally, and attempt suicide and the like. The Israelis rarely apply corporal punishment. However, at the institution I visited, although they were lax with some rules, if the girls got out of hand they did apply corporal punishment.

The Israelis place great importance on education. They have institutions to which they have tried to attract young people for four hours schooling, work or sport. Again, the emphasis is on educating the child. The police are reluctant to keep files on children. Recently, the age of responsibility of a child was raised from nine to 13 years. The Youth Probation Authority in Israel has considerable power. It assesses, decides on and recommends to the court what type of punishment a child should receive. There is a tightening up at the moment in the treatment of juveniles and a greater emphasis on discipline in that country.

The next country I visited was Rumania, behind the Iron Curtain. There children are considered to be responsible from 13 to 18 years of age. They have another age group that they consider to be the young adult group, which ranges in age from 18 to 21 years. If an offender is still having problems, he or she is kept under the wing until reaching the age of 28 years. Because of the length of time for which these young people are committed (and some of them are sentenced to four, five or six years detention), they are able to be trained in an occupation. There is a greater opportunity to do that because of the length of sentence these young people are serving. Those children are taught to be tradesmen, such as fitters and turners and mechanics. The indentures they receive are recognised by society and by employers (the employer, of course, is the Government in Rumania), and they are found a place in a factory after release from an institution.

If they have no home to return to they are provided with accommodation. There is a follow-up period by the department, in which the head of the party in that area and one of his committee members will be, as it were, a voluntary probation officer, and accommodation and a job are provided. The department tries to get co-operation from the parents but sometimes this is a bit difficult to obtain.

I visited a number of institutions in Rumania, one of which was about 250 kilometres from Bucharest at Craiova. I inspected this secure institution which is called a school, and the equivalent of the residential care workers are called teachers. The stress is placed on teaching responsibility and discipline. The boys in institutions in Rumania are responsible for keeping the classrooms, the passages and everywhere else spotlessly clean. The whole system works on a points basis. In Rumania, there is no parole system at all. The boys are released under the care

of someone local who looks after them. I attended a court sitting in Bucharest but I do not have time today to deal with that.

I proceeded to Poland, where there is no corporal punishment. In Poland children become responsible at 14 to 18 years of age. I personally saw Professor Holst, who is in charge of the criminology section in Poland. The institutions are called schools and they talk of resocialisation. It is not a political situation: it is a form of re-education. It is interesting to note that in Poland great emphasis is placed on the family situation. The family situation and the church are strong in Poland, where 86 per cent of the population attend church regularly, and there are now many younger people attending church. I am sure that this has a bearing on the smaller number of young people who are in trouble in Poland. It reflects the strong family ties. The department tries to assist in every way to keep the family together. The big problem in Poland is the use of alcohol. They do not have institutions with mixed sexes. The stress in Poland is on education and discipline. The inmates have to go to school and they have to acquire a certain standard before they are released from the institution. They sleep in dormitories with four to six beds in each.

Professor Holst is one of the most learned men in the field of juvenile delinquency and he said that the main problem, as in all other countries, is the recidivist, the hard core young criminal. Wherever I went I was told that that was the biggest problem, and it is an insoluble problem. Later, I wanted to visit East Germany but because of a misunderstanding I was not able to do so. Perhaps they have not forgotten what happened in the Second World War. I wanted to go to Karl Marx Stadt. Eventually, after I got to Warsaw, they said I could go to Berlin, but I did not want to go there so I did not go. I finished up at Munich, which was one of the lighter moments of my trip because while I was there I bumped into the member for Salisbury at the railway station.

It was obvious (and this is so according to what the head of their department said) that the big problem in Germany today is drugs. It is interesting to note that the headquarters of the drug scene which was in Holland for some time is now moving into Germany, where they are having great problems with drugs. The third worst problem they have is violence. They work on community service orders, and this system has been working successfully in Bavaria for over 12 months. That scheme is called Bridge and it caters for children 14 to 24 years of age. They treat their first and second offenders lightly. However, they are not first offenders as we know them who have probably had 10 offences before they are classed as "first offenders". The system in Germany is policed very well. They have many social workers, and many volunteers to assist these people. These people assist the aged people in their homes, they assist the handicapped, and they do gardens. This department in Bavaria asked the Government for financial assistance, and this year it has received 12 000 000 Deutschmarks for that scheme. Some of these people have found regular jobs after they have been involved in that scheme.

I spent much time in Switzerland, where I saw many institutions that are working successfully. I went to one institution in the mountains that caters for 600 or more boys. It was complete with a farm and it worked on a points system. Everyone who is taken into that institution is placed into secure care in a heavy security block. From then on they have to work their way through with achievements until they eventually get to an open situation. They are then housed in modern flats to which they are given a front door key, and they are allowed to go

out into the village or the town to work. They are completely independent. This gives them an understanding of what will be required of them once they go back into the community. That was one of the best places I saw, other than parts of Boston and California. They stress the need for re-education, and children have to spend a certain time in the classroom.

The second institution that I visited was completed only last October at a cost of 11 000 000 Swiss francs, a very new institution with everything in it. It had separate cells in which the offenders were locked. There were no peepholes; inmates had their own toilet and their own hand basin. There were doors in front of the toilets. One day a young fellow decided to rip the door off and try to get out of his cell. The authorities then decided that if the inmates did not want the doors on they would take them off, and therefore they took them off every cell, to prove that if the boys wanted to take the doors off, then they did not need them. Similarly, if a young boy smashed a window because he wanted to smash something, and that let in cold air, then they left it as it was. Their opinion was that if he wanted to let cold air in and live like that, then that was what he could have for a few months. When the window was replaced he did not break it a second time. So they have the system fairly well sewn up.

Discipline is thoroughly stressed, and rules must be kept. I was most impressed in Switzerland that I saw no vandalism, and I was there for quite a long time travelling fairly widely. I saw no graffiti or any broken trams or railway carriages. In fact, to me everything seemed pretty good. I complimented one of the chaps at one of the institutions on the way in which youth seemed to be responsible to society, and I asked him why he thought that they did not have such things as vandalism. He replied that he likened the situation to a child as part of a family, where the mother and father teach their children responsibility to their family, to other people and to themselves. When a child goes to school, that teaching is continued by people in the education department. A child is taught to be responsible not only to himself but to other people as well. That would appear to me to be a fair assessment of why those things do not happen as much in Switzerland as in some other places.

I have a great deal more to talk about (but unfortunately time may not permit me) in the area of community service orders and restitution orders, something that is working so successfully, particularly in Boston. The restitution programme in Boston is working well. The Department of Youth Services restitution programme, quarterly report, 1 July to 31 December 1979, states:

All clients fall into the offender category. Three hundred and fourteen, or 74 per cent are clients who lack skill or adequate education.

This proves the point that I have made that young people need education. With regard to restitution, the report states:

As previously stated, all clients involved in the programme are obligated to fulfil financial restitution. The following restitution payments have been made through this reporting period (July through December 1979):

	Restitution		Per Cent
	Owed	Paid	
	\$	\$	
a. Clients who have completed the programme	25 490	25 890	102
b. Clients who have terminated from the programme	37 793	16 682	44

I may have an opportunity later to continue with that subject. Suffice it to say that I found that the emphasis is on discipline, which is important for these juveniles. Coupled with that is the fact that children must have a good family life and must be taught to be responsible. Also, they must have provision for sporting activities, which is another important aspect in bringing up young people to make them responsible within society.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I rise in this debate to, again, symbolically oppose the adoption. I do not want to go into great details about why I do that, because last session I was able to put on record my reason for opposing the adoption of the Address in Reply, my reason being that I believe the debate is an incredible waste of Parliament's time and it is an incredible amount of time-wasting and money-wasting for the people of South Australia.

I do not think we could have heard better support for my proposition than the speech made during the last hour. It was my very great regret that I had to sit in this place, as I was following the honourable member and, for fear he might sit down, I had no choice but to sit here and listen to the dreary drivel that he put into *Hansard* this afternoon. I really think it was a very good example of the old phrase "ignorance is bliss". If ever I have heard twaddle and tripe put before this House it was the way the honourable member spoke this afternoon.

Let me take one example before I go on with the matters that I want to deal with. He gave, as an example of some type of punishment, an occasion, I think, in Switzerland that when at some sort of reformatory or prison a boy broke down a door on a toilet, so the authorities applied collective punishment and proceeded to remove all the doors. He then told us a similar sort of story concerning a broken window. However, he did not go on to draw the conclusion (and it was left to the House to draw the conclusion) that every other person in the institution had their window broken as a result. I cannot imagine more woolly-headed thinking and irrational and illogical sorts of argument than those put by the honourable member. I think he is totally ignorant about the situation of correction, and it is a sad thing that, having gone on this Cook's tour of correctional institutions as he has done, he has come back with so little insight into the way correctional policies should be applied, and are being applied around the world.

I think it is very interesting to reflect on the implications of his extraordinary suggestion that correctional institutions in this country should be handed over to private enterprise. That is about the ultimate in absolute madness for the sake of simply applying what the Liberal Party sees as its philosophical stance. The last example I can cite of an institution which was run by private enterprise along the sorts of lines that he is talking about was that infamous example in Bjelke-Joh's Queensland, in Brisbane, where a whole series of elderly people were kept in an institution, virtually as slaves. That is the sort of thing that will happen if correctional institutions and institutions of this type are handed over to people in the private sector. I have never heard such rubbish in all my life. However, I do not think that we should take lightly what the honourable member has raised this afternoon. Knowing how frantic this Government is to hand everything over to private enterprise, I would not be at all surprised to hear that Rupert Murdoch has made a take-over offer for Yatala. That is the sort of thing that the honourable member is advocating. What rubbish it is, and it ought to be nailed home for the stupidity it is. I think I have said enough about the honourable member and I certainly do not want

to waste any more of the House's time on the sort of absolute malarky that he was putting into the official record this afternoon.

I will now deal with some far more serious matters. I believe that, whilst these debates continue, the few of us who seek to make use of them should continue to do so. I particularly want to deal this afternoon with a matter that concerns me greatly, because it involves 50 of my constituents and their families. I refer to the situation which exists at Elizabeth South at the factory of a firm called Schrader-Scovill. I spoke in the House some time ago about some of the aspects of the matter, but I will put more of the facts on record this afternoon, because of the scurrilous situation there.

One would think, from looking at the circumstances of that industrial dispute, that we were living in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, because the circumstances are as follows: there is a factory which produces tyre valves, and controls about 98 per cent of the Australian market. Therefore, it is in a monopoly situation. It is owned by an American multi-national Schrader-Scovill. The factory, established in this State with the assistance of the State Government about 20 years ago, significantly proceeded to operate in this State for nearly 20 years without one industrial dispute. I am sure that every member will agree that that is a good record. Suddenly, there was a change of management. The former manager, Mr. Morgan, left, and a Mr. Dunne took his place. Since the change, I am told that industrial relations at that plant have nose-dived, and there has been nothing but trouble between the manager and the employees—not just the blue-collar employees on strike at present, but between the manager and all other employees.

The situation is, as I understand it, that, since Mr. Dunne has been there, there has been nothing but strife. Significantly, Mr. Dunne is not a South Australian; he came here from elsewhere. He formerly worked for I.B.M. and, no doubt, learnt his industrial relations, or lack of them, whilst working for that organisation. He came here about 18 months ago, since when there has been nothing but trouble. I am told by people who have been trying to deal with him during this dispute that he showed little but pomposity, arrogance, and an absolutely egotistical position in the whole matter. Where the employees have been prepared to act in a deferential fashion, he has shown some willingness at least to talk to them, but not until last week or so was he willing to talk with the union involved. He has shown the attitude of a complete egomaniac in the way in which he is dealing with this dispute. He says that it is his dispute and his alone, and has refused to agree to having independent private arbitrators arbitrate the dispute. He refused to accept the recommendations that were put, not by the union or by some member of the Labor Opposition in this Parliament, but by officers of the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

As one might expect, when the matter was reported in this morning's *Advertiser* and comments from the Minister were listed, he merely said that one of the parties had refused to accept the recommendations he had put. In that context, it means that the boss had refused; there is no doubt about that. I have checked on that from the union today to ensure that that was the case. It is interesting to speculate that, had the union refused to accept the recommendations of the Minister, no doubt he would be railing and ranting all over the city and the State complaining that this was industrial obstructionism of the worst type. He is not doing that, because the boss is the one who is being obstructionist and unreasonable.

I believe that something drastic must be done in the

circumstances. Here we have a United States multinational with an authoritarian Godlike boss man reminiscent of the eighteenth century industrial relations on one side, a company that has a monopoly on the products it produces in this country and a manager who is a foreigner to South Australia, who has been imported here in the past 18 months, and who does not understand the way in which our community operates, negotiates and arbitrates. Apparently, he only wants to confront. On the other side, we have 50 South Australian residents and their families who are, basically, being treated in a most inhumane fashion, who are being treated like industrial coolies or serfs, who have been dismissed, thrown out, regardless of how many years of loyal service they have given to the company—"Sack the lot of them; to hell with them."

That is a deplorable and despicable situation, and one in which the Government should be taking a much greater interest than it has shown at present. There is one easy way in which the dispute could be resolved and in which industrial sanity could be brought back to the Schrader-Scovill plant, namely, by Schrader-Scovill getting rid of Mr. Dunne, because he seems to be the lynchpin that is holding the whole situation in dispute. I suggest that that is what is needed. I do not suppose that we are likely to see that occur because, Schrader-Scovill being a multinational, its headquarters are far away, and no doubt it is getting its information from Mr. Dunne himself and, therefore, is unable to make a rational judgment about what is going on in that plant.

What I would like to see is Mr. Dunne come out publicly and tell the community and the State what is his attitude to these matters. As the member for Elizabeth, in which district this plant is established, I challenge him to have the guts to come out and publicly debate the issues. I am sure that he will not have the guts to do it, but I certainly look forward to that debate, if he is prepared to come forth. I do not believe that he has one shred of evidence that could be put before the people of this State that would indicate that he has been anything but unjust and unreasonable in this whole matter. I sincerely hope that he accepts my challenge, because I believe that only by this sort of means will we ensure that this dispute is brought to a head and resolved satisfactorily from the point of view of my constituents.

It is a grave situation, where this enormously powerful organisation Schrader-Scovill is on one side, and happened to make a mistake by appointing an authoritarian manager who cannot run the plant effectively. As a result, 50 of my constituents, on the other side, are in the position of being treated like serfs. It makes me angry to think of that situation, and I hope that, for the good of all of the people of this State, this Government will bring pressure to bear to ensure that this dispute is brought to a speedy resolution because, if it goes on much longer, the situation will get completely out of hand. I sincerely hope that the Government will take certain measures.

The only measures it has really taken so far that have had any effect have been to involve 80 police officers in the picket-breaking exercise last night. What must that have cost South Australia! It is an incredible situation: an American multi-national set up a factory in this State with State Government assistance, and then made the mistake of appointing this fool as manager. The result is that the State Government pours further funds into the matter, by bringing State police, citizens of this State, into this dispute against 50 residents of this State.

What a shocking situation! Imagine how my constituents feel about paying for State police to act against them. It is

a deplorable situation, and I hope the Government takes the matter much more seriously than it has done in the past. I hope that Mr. Dunne does not prove a coward, but comes out and agrees to debate publicly, with me or anyone else, the issues involved in the dispute. I think that the only description that could be used for his attitude at the moment is that it is authoritarian, arrogant, and cowardly.

I want to deal now with some matters that have come to my attention in the past few days. I have had the unfortunate experience of being involved in certain investigations in relation to the Yatala Labour Prison. I do not wish to talk directly about those matters in this debate, but I want to address myself to some matters which have come to my attention as a result of that and which I view with very grave concern.

Since I have shown an interest in matters at Yatala Labour Prison, I have been in contact with a large number of people who have expressed to me their very grave fears and concerns about the situation there. They are fears not only concerning financial matters (and I am not permitted to discuss those matters in Parliament) but also matters involving the safety of prisoners in the gaol. That is the matter to which I want to refer particularly this afternoon.

There have been in Yatala gaol over the past 12 months at least six deaths of prisoners that I know of. I know that the average daily number of prisoners in Yatala is between 300 and 400, and I believe that for that number of people to have died in the prison during that period is an absolute scandal. Most of them are written off in the reports that are prepared (and I use the term advisedly) as having committed suicide. We are told that it is a sad situation, but that it is tough in there and some people cannot stand the pace and so they commit suicide. That may be so in relation to some people in Yatala, but I believe that the situation is far more serious than is indicated by those reports.

I had cause to have contact last week with a prisoner who expressed to me his grave fear that his life was in danger. He told me that, and I have no reason to dispute it, because he showed me the marks on his stomach where a cross had been placed with a knife by other prisoners. He had been told that, if he did not undertake a certain course of conduct, the cross that had been carved on him would be the site where a knife would be buried. As a result of that, I urgently contacted the Director of the Department of Correctional Services and informed him, and the prisoner was shifted out of the gaol. I believe that he at least, one individual, is somewhat safer now than he was previously.

I also expressed concern for another prisoner, but I was told that that prisoner, on being approached by the department, was not prepared to make any allegations about his safety. Now I have found today that another prisoner had a knife thrown at him this morning. Fortunately, the knife missed its target, but one can imagine the fear in which that prisoner lives at present. Many other prisoners in that gaol live in fear of their lives.

I have said that the Yatala gaol has been responsible, in my view, for the death of at least six people in the past 12 months. That is a scandalous situation, and one for which the Department of Correctional Services must bear a lot of responsibility. In dealing with this matter, I want to quote to the House from the report—no, I am sorry; it was not a report, but the assessment of Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Millhouse: "Remarks", I think; anything but a report.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, the remarks of Mr. Cassidy, who was appointed by the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I want to quote from the so-called Cassidy—remarks, was it?

Mr. Millhouse: That was the word the Minister tried to use.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Remarks, yes. Particularly, I want to quote from a memo from Director Gard, who wrote to the Superintendent, as follows:

As discussed previously, the Minister has appointed a consultant for a period of one month. This action has been taken as a result of a series of escapes from custody at Yatala Labour Prison, and also to assist the Assistant Director, Correctional Institutions in the preparation of his report into a number of matters. These include accommodation requirements, institutional security standards, security procedures, equipment, and staff.

As this is a Ministerial appointment, Mr. Cassidy has the right to enter any sections of the prison and to talk with any officer or prisoner in the institution. Would you please ensure that he obtains every co-operation.

Then we had a letter back to Mr. Cassidy, from Mr. Gard again, as follows:

Dear Mr. Cassidy,

Further to your appointment as consultant for a period of four weeks to submit a report on security matters at Yatala Labour Prison, I now advise that your report has been received.

I can only assume from that comment that there must be two documents in existence, because that is clearly a report, and not "remarks", as alleged in the House by the Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: Peter, why didn't you support my no-confidence motion, in view of what you are saying now? It was on the first day of the session.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I want to refer to this report, because it has a very crucial passage in it in relation to the security of and safety of prisoners. On page 17 of the "remarks"—this semantic debate—

Mr. Millhouse: For heavens sake, call it a report. We all know that is what it is.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This semantic debate is getting me down. The matter is far too serious to become lost in semantics. I thank the member for Mitcham for my copy of the report. It was kind of him to provide it. On page 17, the report states:

The lack of officer supervision and the boredom of the exercise yard results in prisoners, through utter frustration, finding other outlets—fights, planning escapes, and the stand-over tactics by the hardened criminal. It affects mental attitudes and behaviour. There is no longer any segregation of prisoners in exercise yards—

that is the crucial point: there is no longer any segregation of prisoners in exercise yards—

and this could lead to serious repercussions, particularly with the increased number of young people now coming to prison.

It was always departmental policy to have a boys exercise yard, No. 5, and particular attention was given in maintaining supervision over this yard. Incidents are occurring where the hard core prison element are taking advantage of this situation and imposing their will on young offenders. In exercise yards, shower wings, and other areas where prisoners are crowded together, segregation should be strict to protect the young offender. Failure to exercise this rule could result in severe criticism of the department when serious incidents occur. Present management may claim that the procedure of segregation in yards was discontinued during Mr. Taylor's time. However, this is no excuse for the

present Superintendent's not reviewing this procedure when circumstances indicate that segregation is important for the safety of these young people.

He did not indicate what the circumstances were. He also made the following recommendation (No. 6):

Segregation of prisoners in exercise yards and showering parades in bath wing.

This Government has already been given advice that it is dangerous to have non-segregated yards and showers that are not supervised—it has already been told that. Yet, only this morning a prisoner's life was placed in grave jeopardy as a result of this practice of not having segregated yards. I believe that that is a grave neglect of duty on the part of the Chief Secretary, and it is lucky for him that no real harm came to the prisoner this morning, because, if any harm had come to that man, the Chief Secretary's resignation should have been with the Premier this afternoon.

The Government has been warned but it has not taken the necessary action to overcome the circumstances and, as a result, we are faced with the situation that now exists. I believe that the Government is gravely culpable in this matter, and something should be done urgently. I do not believe that the Government is genuine in wanting to protect the prisoners when they are in the yards. It is well known that not only are there numbers of hardened criminals that operate as a gang within the yards (as the Cassidy Report claims) but also that some of those prisoners receive, to put it mildly, favoured treatment from some of the officers. The whole situation has reached the stage where it has become a complete and utter farce.

Mr. Slater: Perhaps we should take the advice of the member for Glenelg and hand it over to private enterprise.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This private enterprise Government is making a shambles of trying to run the prison. The circumstances surrounding the Cassidy Report are fascinating. The report is all over town; anyone who wants a copy can obtain one from the member for Mitcham, who has made copies available to all and sundry. Some source made it available to him. The press got hold of it. There has been no secrecy about the report.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Perhaps it fell off the back of a truck.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know about that, but numerous members on this side of the House have a copy, and they experienced no difficulty in obtaining one. The point is that the Government has been put on notice about the grave situation that exists at Yatala but no reaction is coming from the Government in regard to the situation, and it is about time that something happened. I am gravely concerned for the lives and the physical well-being of some of the prisoners in that institution. I believe that something must be done urgently to provide them with much greater protection than they have received in the past. It is not good enough for the Government to say, "We are doing everything in our power to try to alleviate the situation." That is not true; the Government has not done so.

It is my earnest plea that the Government take urgent action to make life inside the prison safer. We have heard a lot from the Government about its concern for the security of the prison, which, in the Government's terms, means ensuring that the inmates do not get out, but there is another aspect—namely, ensuring the safety of the prisoners while they are in that institution. Those prisoners face a greater danger than the community would face if some prisoners escaped from the institution. Something must be done, and it is my earnest plea that the Government urgently take action to implement some of the recommendations of the Cassidy Report, because, if it

does not, there will be more deaths in that gaol, more hangings, more suicides and more prisoners injured and stood over than there have been in the past, and goodness only knows, there have been problems in the past in regard to that institution.

In the interests of common decency, the Chief Secretary must do something about the situation. I wanted to put that matter on notice, because there is a grave danger that other prisoners will suffer injury, and certainly threats, unless something is done to provide them with much greater protection. I could refer to other aspects of the Cassidy Report that are of more than passing interest, but I will not proceed with that matter at this time, as I wish to deal with other matters.

I now refer to the District of Elizabeth, which is an outer suburban district. More and more people recognise that outer urban areas of the country are rapidly becoming more deprived than they have been in the past. Goodness only knows, those areas have traditionally been the most deprived areas in the country since the Second World War. Whyalla is the only other area in South Australia in which unemployment rates are higher than those in Elizabeth. In my district live many people who may be described as flotsam and jetsam, the rejects of industrial society, people who have suffered injuries of work and have been thrown on the scrap heap of the invalid pension.

Hundreds and hundreds of deserted wives live in my district because the Housing Trust puts people into what have been called ghettos of deserted wives and under-privileged people. This situation puts tremendous strain on my area, which has little enough resources to be able to handle the problems confronting it even if it did not have these additional burdens. It may seem strange to some members opposite who represent middle-class districts, who live middle-class lives and who almost never meet working class people, that the situation in this country is becoming more and more grave.

The Fraser Government's policies are polarising this country. On the one hand, we have approximately 60 per cent of the community who are relatively well to do, who find that life is reasonably tolerable, and who are able to cope with the day-to-day problems of life pretty well. Those are the real dwellers in the lucky country. On the other hand, we have up to about 40 per cent of the community who do not have enough money for their daily needs. They are generally housed in poor housing, have poorer education, and are in circumstances where they can be exploited to a much greater extent by the rapacious sector of the business community. They are people who are generally the under-privileged, the down and out of our society.

More and more they are being forced to congregate in poorer and poorer, and less well serviced, areas. I make no apology for saying that some parts of my electorate fit right into that category. I think it is about time that people started to talk seriously about recognising these problems. It is all very well for organisations such as the Messenger Press to have a policy in my electorate of not printing anything except good news (it will not print bad news, because it says it does not want to reflect on the area). I think it is about time we were honest and forthright enough to do a little reflecting where it is necessary. It is certainly urgently necessary in relation to my electorate and, in particular, in relation to other outer urban areas, some of which are represented now by one or two members on the Opposition benches. I think it is interesting, if one looks at newspaper reports, to see how bit by bit the Fraser Government's policies of supporting the 60 per cent and to hell with the other 40 per cent are biting more and more. An article appeared in the

Advertiser of 15 June 1980 under the heading "Houses bigger", as follows:

Australians are continuing to build bigger and bigger houses each year. A report published in Canberra yesterday says the size of the average privately-built Australian house, at the end of the seventies, was 151 square metres, compared with 130 square metres at the start of the decade.

The planning committee which produced the report predicts the energy crisis will soon catch up with home builders, as it has with car buyers.

What that is in fact saying is that, whilst there are fewer and fewer houses being built in the latter part of the seventies, those that are being built for the fat cats who can afford them are getting bigger and bigger. In other words, the distribution of wealth in this community is becoming more and more lopsided.

An article appeared in last night's *News* titled, "People 'travelling more now' ". Good heavens, you could have fooled the deserted wives in Elizabeth, who think that the big outing of the month is to be able to afford the train fare to go to Adelaide for a day. That article states:

More people are travelling now, despite the world's economic situation, according to a well-known London airline executive.

"People are spending more on travel and leisure," the sales director of British Caledonian Airways, Mr. Duncan Haws, said.

Indeed, the 60 per cent, the well-to-do in this community, are well able to spend more money on leisure activities. But the other 40 per cent, who, in a sort of twisted sense (and this may be the cause of the smile on the face of one of the members opposite), do have a great deal more leisure than they would have expected to have had previously, and have to spend that leisure time locked up in their houses because they cannot afford to go out. If they want to go anywhere, it is a case of going for a walk around the block, or a walk down to the local shop. Of course, because the outer suburban areas of this city have been built in the age of the motor car, a walk to the local shop in Elizabeth West, for example, might mean a half hour's walk. This is the sort of situation that people are now confronted with. I noticed in today's *Australian* an interesting article on page 3 which, under the heading "Making 'whopy' isn't much fun in the big city", states:

Australian outer urban living has created a new type of person who might be described as a "Whopy". A Whopy is, according to Dr. Clive Beed, senior lecturer in the Department of Regional and Urban Economic Studies at the University of Melbourne, a person who suffers one or more disadvantages purely because of location in the outer urban areas of cities.

"To move around our low-density city, it is imperative to have a car, especially if we live in the outer suburbs," Dr. Beed said yesterday delivering the second in a series of public lectures on Melbourne, past, present and future. Unfortunately, the majority of Melbourne's population does not have personal use of a car. "These people include women living in the outer suburbs, elderly and handicapped people, low-income earners and young people."

That is a grave situation, which is developing more every day. "The prisoners of the outer suburbs," they ought to be called, because that is exactly what they are. They have no more freedom, in an economic sense, to move out of their homes than prisoners locked up in a gaol have, because they simply cannot afford to get out of the dreary, droll existence that life has become. I find it very depressing to go around my electorate and see how this is happening, more and more and more. There is absolutely no response from the Government of this State, or from the Federal Government, about this matter.

I have been quoted in this House many times by the Deputy Premier, who likes to quote the phrase "Calling for a new society", as saying that this society is not good enough and that we ought to do better. He hoo-haks that statement and says, "Rubbish". If this society is producing the sorts of problems developing and emerging in our cities and towns, and if this society is going to continue to approach these sorts of questions in the fashion it has in the past, without providing any answers at all, this society is going to fail. We do need a new economic order. We do need a new society to cope with these problems. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

THE BANK OF ADELAIDE (MERGER) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I am glad to have the opportunity to speak in an adjournment debate, because we have been denied that opportunity on the past two evenings through what I believe is the truculence and petulance of the Premier. I presume that this was done because the Opposition called for a quorum of the House at times during the Address in Reply debate. Of course, it is the prerogative of the Government to maintain a quorum, and I believe that members on this side were acting in the best interests and conscience of the House when they did that.

I turn now to the subject about which I wish to speak this evening, tourism. I listened to the remarks of the member for Brighton a few days ago on this subject. I respect his views on this matter and appreciate that he had a direct association with the tourist industry prior to becoming a member of this House. I believe that he has a little more perception of the situation than has the Minister of Tourism, because her contribution on this matter was, earlier this year, to have a committee to inquire into tourism in this State. Its report to this State was, I believe, hastily conceived, and made no constructive recommendations. Unfortunately, it came to the wrong conclusion. We find now that the Minister has again undertaken to precipitate a review. This will be undertaken by the Public Service Board in association with a firm of private consultants from Queensland and will be into the operations and functions of the Department of Tourism.

It is my contention that it will probably be another negative inquiry and, if anything, the operations of the department might be curtailed even further and even the allocation of funds might be reduced, but that is an assumption and time will tell. The member for Brighton, when speaking the other day, started off on the right track. He mentioned that one of the important things in tourism is customer relations and I could not agree with him more, but I do not think he carried that point far enough. I hope I can add a little to what the honourable member said.

I believe that the real issues in attracting tourists and encouraging intrastate travel lie a bit deeper than just advertising and promotion, and customer relations is probably one of the important aspects concerned. Of course, another aspect is the amount of money that is

available to do all of these things collectively. In May this year, I said that I believed that we ought to have a more collective approach; I think that my press statement expressed it correctly. I called for a complete and immediate investigation into the South Australian tourist industry. The press statement said:

Controversy over South Australia's ability to lure visitors has followed recent comments by the Tourism Minister, Mrs. Adamson, and Adelaide City Councillor, Mrs. Wendy Chapman . . . Mr. Slater said today it was now clear tourism would no longer be accepted as a dormant issue. "It cannot be put down as a minor industry and given second-rate treatment," he said.

I still stick to those remarks, and I believe they are probably more appropriate now than they were a few months ago. I also note that, about the same time as my statement was released, the Director of Tourism in South Australia said that the tourism funds allocated by Government were too miserly. That is an unusual statement by a Director of a Government department, but a true one. He went on to explain why and I concur with those remarks.

Two recent surveys conducted in New South Wales have shown that, in the tourist industry, customer relations is one of the most important aspects. These travel agents' surveys found that customer relations was the biggest problem; that caring for people to take the hassles and worry out of travel is becoming increasingly important and should be made an area of top priority. It is essential to provide hospitality for tourists, to ensure that tourists are not ripped off, because it happens too often. Many of us know from experience, both within Australia and overseas, that plenty of rip-offs occur when travelling. That does not give a good impression of the industry. Much gimmickry is used in parts of the world to attract visitors. One of the most unusual gimmicks was brought to my attention by the columnist Phillip Adams. It came to his notice while he was at his barber's leafing through a recent issue of one of this country's most authentic publications, *Australasian Post*. The article, which referred to a "miracle", stated:

Apparently more than 10 000 people have made religious pilgrimages to Maria Rubio's front room at Lake Arthur, New Mexico. Whereupon they fall on their knees as they behold the amazing apparition: the face of Christ on a pancake.

For less perceptive, secular or sceptical eyes, this portrait seems to be a normal burn mark, produced by the action of hot frying pan on yielding batter. Yet the *Post* proudly displays a huge close-up of this variation on the Rorschach blot. (Slightly larger than a 20c piece, it bears an uncanny resemblance to a burnt pancake).

It just shows the sort of gimmicks that people will use to promote a false image of tourism, whereby people are taken in. I think this is one of the classic examples of that. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Tourism should start baking pancakes because, after all, she could bake pancakes and come up with the 12 apostles which, appropriately, might fit in with the members of the Cabinet. I use that as an example of the sort of gimmicks people get up to to encourage tourists and they get touched.

The travelling public, whether it be interstate, overseas or intrastate, is looking for value for money. Customer relations is the most important aspect of tourism, and travel agents, Government agencies and all associated with the industry should ensure that the travelling public is not subjected to excessive hassles and worries associated with travel. As I said before, caring for people to take the problems out of travel is becoming a top priority. I believe

that goodwill in the tourist industry is probably more important than any other aspect of the industry, and we should do our best to promote that aspect in South Australia.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I want to put a few points straight for the misguided and naive member for Elizabeth, who tried to ridicule me in relation to the restitution programme and, in particular, the programmes for private enterprise dealing with young offenders. Obviously the honourable member, who has been touring around kowtowing with his comrades of the P.L.O., would do far better if he went to some of the countries that are doing some good for the young people in their community. To put the honourable member on the line, let me tell him of one of the programmes which are in operation in Massachusetts, Boston. The programme types are as follows:

Two hundred and fifty private, non-profit agencies make up the wide spectrum of community-based programmes available to D.Y.S. youth. Programmes can be categorised as residential, non-residential, casework supervision, or detention. The department services three types of youth: detained, referred, and committed.

Residential: For those youth who pose a serious threat to themselves or the public, secure treatment provides intensive counselling, education, and recreation in a physically secure facility. Residential group care provides varying degrees of structured residences with in-house or public education and job training.

That is a full description of what is available. Let me emphasise to this Chamber, and to the absent member for Elizabeth who has now retreated (or probably gone home because he likes an early minute on Thursday night), that there are 250 private, non-profit agencies operating in Massachusetts. The honourable member tried to pour scorn on the situation, saying that it was ridiculous. If he really had been around, instead of wrestling with the problems of his comrades in the Middle East, and seen what was going on in the world he would know that people are concerned and many countries are concerned about the young delinquents within their communities, and they are doing something about it.

One of the biggest problems occurred after a director, a Dr. Miller, who was in charge in Massachusetts, closed down all the institutions in that State and put all the young people out in the community (and I suspect that he was following the philosophy of the former Government in these matters). Eight years afterwards the authorities are still trying to right the wrong that Dr. Miller created in letting all these young people out of institutions. That Government has now gone to private enterprise to provide secure and non-secure facilities to treat these young people, at a cost of about \$100 a head which compares over there with a cost of institutionalising them within State organisations of at least \$30 000 a year a head. Of course, the cost would not matter to the member for Elizabeth. However, it is not only the cost that matters to me but also the success of the scheme, and it matters to me that the situation that presently prevails in Massachusetts is more successful than it has ever been for many years.

I am quite sure the former Government intended to follow suit on Dr. Miller's action of putting young offenders out into society, and I say that because when I visited institutions, such as McNally, I got the impression that they were about to open the gates there and put the same system into effect as was practised by Dr. Miller. Thank goodness they did not do it, and they did not do so mainly because pressure from members like myself who

the Government realise that the ridiculous situation that had prevailed in Massachusetts fixed that state for 8 years.

In England, Massachusetts, Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia, they are all now after a very lenient period of operation, most following a socialist type of Government which had been easy on offenders and which had lessened discipline, doing the cleaning up after the damage had been done. Time and time again it was proved to me that this was actual fact. In British Columbia, the socialists were in power for three years and reeked havoc with the juvenile problem there, and the country is still trying to get over it. The same thing occurred in Manitoba, which had a socialist Government for eight years that reeked havoc with these young juvenile delinquents and criminals. The new Government which has been in power for three years is still trying to rectify the situation. It had to bring in new staff, and had to get rid of a lot of the existing staff. Many of the staff in those countries are appointed by the Government and, of course, as such, can be disposed of when they are not doing the job correctly.

The great thing about private enterprise doing these jobs in institutions is the fact that they must submit programmes to the Government that they will put into operation for these children and they must estimate the type of success that they will achieve, and if they do not come up with the results, the Government is able to stop their intake of these young people. Therefore, private institutions would have to lift their game and provide more suitable programmes.

There was also some slight slur on me due to my mentioning restitution programmes. The summary of the D.Y.S. restitution programme states in part:

The D.Y.S. Restitution Programme is a unique effort proposed as a model for social, vocational and educational rehabilitation, as well as skill training and employability development of juvenile offenders. Pivotal in the model of every youth's involvement is a victim restitution process, a public benefit job, longer-term employability development and an educational programme. In this way the youth has a multiple reinforced experience in restoration, responsibility and personal development.

This is a scheme operating in Boston that is working successfully. The idea is to involve the victim in the situation so that they have meetings during the time the juvenile is working. The offender must pay back an amount of money. The Government supplies the money to the victim, and then the money must be paid back by the young offender by working for so much an hour. He must put so much into his savings, provide so much for the restitution programme, and work that amount off.

During the period of time that the offender is working to pay this money back, meetings are held between the department, the social workers, the child's parents, the child, and the victim. They talk the matter over and in that way the juvenile begins to realise what he has actually done—the damage that he has done, and the problems he has caused for the victim. It makes him realise that there is another side to the story. Indeed, it creates a better community situation, and it is a success as far as these young people are concerned. As my time has now expired, I shall continue my explanation of this at a later time.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The refusal of Dow Chemical Company and the State Government, either through the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Minister of Environment, to publicly debate or at least answer the criticisms of the Redcliff petro-chemical project is leading many people in South Australia to question whether or not this project is in the best interests of the State.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you one of these people?

Mr. KENEALLY: I have made my position clear and I will make it clear once again, if the Minister will be patient. On Monday, I attended a meeting convened by the Conservation Council of South Australia to debate this project. The speakers included Dr. Coulter, Dr. Hailes, Ms. Ally Fricker, the member for Mitcham, the Hon. John Cornwall, and a spokesman for the South Australian branch of A.F.I.C., whose name I cannot recall, and I apologise to that gentleman for that. Invitations were issued to the Minister of Mines and Energy to attend that meeting, or at least to send a representative from his department. Regrettably, the Minister or his representative saw fit not to attend. Also, an invitation was issued to Dow Chemical, requesting that that company be represented on the speaking panel but, unfortunately, Dow Chemical also saw fit not to attend that meeting.

With the two major proponents of the petro-chemical development not being prepared to attend, the argument was almost lost by default. The only speaker at that meeting who was prepared to support the Redcliff petro-chemical project was the Hon. John Cornwall, who put forward the A.L.P. policy. As that policy has been widely circulated in recent weeks, there is no need for me to go through it again. Briefly, the Labor Party supports the project with the correct environmental protection measures. At that meeting I heard very little that was new. Speakers repeated allegations that have been widely circulated in the printed and the electronic media.

My only surprise at the meeting was to hear the member for Mitcham's views. That was the first time I had heard him come out quite clearly opposed to the development, although he did have some reservations about his total opposition to that project. I think that perhaps what has happened is that the member for Mitcham has sniffed the breeze again, and believes there is some petty political advantage in it for him.

The views expressed at that meeting may or may not be correct but, if they are allowed to go unchallenged, one cannot blame the community for accepting them as truths. The questions frequently asked are: What have the authorities got to hide? Why is it that the State Government and Dow Chemical consistently refuse to attend public meetings to discuss this project? Why is it that they are unable to put forward position papers? Why will they not answer the many questions and criticisms that have been raised? I know that some of those answers are available, so they ought to be promulgated. To continue the present position is to make the lot of people in my district so much harder to bear.

Representing the area that will be affected by the development, I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister of Environment, and Dow Chemical to come clean (if that is the term) on this project. The Minister, in reply to a question I asked him on Tuesday, said that he had no intentions of making any public statement until the environmental effects statement had been assessed by this Government, and then by the Federal Government. No-one expects the Minister or Dow to comment prematurely on the e.e.s. What we want these authorities to do is to state clearly the protections that they will ensure will be part of the Redcliff project. Surely we are not asking them too much in asking them to tell us what those safeguards will be. We also want to know whether the Government is absolutely certain that Redcliff is an appropriate site for the plant, not necessarily the best site, but a suitable site. We also want to know what the Government is prepared

to do to finance the extensive needs of the Port Augusta City Council in order to cope with the impact.

Since the first announcement of the Redcliff project, there has been almost a void in the dissemination of information about what will happen there, and many people are still ignorant of the processes at Redcliff. What has happened in recent months is that that void has been filled by those people who oppose the building of Redcliff. So, this very considerable change in public opinion, to which I have referred previously in the House, has taken place.

It was stated at this meeting that the change in public opinion had taken place because information had been fed into the community, but, unfortunately, that information is only one side of the argument. For people to have a balanced view, they ought to be told the other side of the argument. Then, if they make a judgment that, on balance, they are against the project, they could make that judgment with all the information at their fingertips. At present, they are being denied that opportunity, and that is not good enough.

My position, put simply, is that I am in favour of the project so long as those protections are available, and I remain confident that the safeguards can be provided. If there is any indication that that is not the case, I will be opposed to the establishment of the project at Redcliff. I was heartened by a firm statement made by the Minister of Mines and Energy, on Tuesday, when he hypothesised that, if E.D.C. was spilled in the Northern Spencer Gulf, it might result in the residents of Port Augusta having to be evacuated, because it would be of considerable danger to them. I asked the Minister, by way of interjection, what would happen if that hypothesis were correct. He said that, if there was any real possibility of the people of Port Augusta being poisoned by E.D.C. or having to be evacuated, he would have to reassess the matter. I am heartened by that. That is the sort of firm statement the people of my district would like to have heard before. It is one that should not have had to be dragged out of the Minister by way of a question or interjection in the House.

The Conservation Council of South Australia is seeking that three simple points be agreed to by the Government, as follows:

1. A less environmentally sensitive site should be found. The extra cost would only be about 2 per cent of the total project cost.
2. The process should be carried through to finished P.V.C. in a closed process in one plant.
3. Terms of indenture should be extremely stringent with standards for work exposures and environmental pollution set by society prior to signing the indentures. Terms such as those recommended by the commissioners of the 1974 Redcliff inquiry would be a minimum.

Answers to those three points ought to be able to be given without necessarily looking at the e.e.s. or waiting for the e.i.s. or the indenture agreement to be passed by the House. These simple requests should be answered. I am asking the Government and Dow to provide the answers at the earliest possible moment. I do not mean to wait until the e.e.s. has been assessed by State and Federal Cabinets before these discussions can take place. My concern is for the residents of Port Augusta, who have been kept in the dark too long about this project.

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 26 August at 2 p.m.