

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, June 21, 1973

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: My attention has been called to the presence of distinguished visitors in the gallery in the persons of the Hon. Henry May, M.P., Minister of Local Government and of Internal Affairs in New Zealand; the Hon. Claude Stubbs, M.L.C., of Western Australia; and the Hon. Allen Hunt, M.L.C., Minister of Planning in Victoria. I invite the Hon. Henry May, on behalf of the visitors, to take a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to escort the honourable member to the floor of the Chamber to be presented to the Speaker.

The Hon. Henry May was escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Dr. Eastick to a seat on the floor of the House.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day, Government Business, to be taken into consideration before Questions without Notice.

I ask the indulgence and co-operation of the House in this matter. It is necessary for us to pass today the Appropriation Bill in order to ensure that, especially the academic salaries that I explained in outlining the Appropriation measures, will be paid at the due date and not delayed. Given the fact that the House has had other important business to deal with, we have not been able to find time to deal with these Appropriation measures, and it is necessary for us to pass this Bill now so that the Legislative Council can consider it today. It is intended to proceed now with the Appropriation Bill, and the full period of Question Time will be given immediately after we have dealt with that Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Members on my side have the opportunity now to air grievances against the administration by the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to achieve a certain result.

Motion carried.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day, Government Business Nos. 1 and 2, to be taken into consideration forthwith.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That Order of the Day, Government Business No. 1, be taken into consideration on Wednesday next.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 19, Page 22.)

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

That the adjourned debate on the second reading of this Bill be now proceeded with.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The opportunity prevails now for members to indicate their grievances and to show where the Government, through either its own actions or those of its Administration, has failed the people of this State. In the latter days of the Fortieth Parliament this House saw fit to pass, with the concurrence of another place and after a conference, a Bill to provide opportunities to alter the provision under which the State Planning Office functioned.

As a result of the passage of that Bill, a situation has arisen whereby new formulas are used to determine the transfer of subdivisional land. We accepted the opportunity given by that Bill but we did not expect or believe that the delay that would follow would be anywhere near as great as it has been. Many people in this State are embarrassed financially, sociologically and economically because many transactions for land which they had purchased in good faith and about which negotiations had been undertaken even before the Act came into force on December 1, but for which plans were not submitted before that date, have been delayed and still have not been cleared by the State Planning Office. Documents presented to this department since December 1 for negotiations that have been completed or have taken place after December 1 are also delayed. Many organizations and people who have contracts with builders or have sought financial contracts with financial organizations, particularly banks, are not able to conclude the transactions that would allow the release of their funds or, in regard to housing contracts that are based back to banks, they are unable to give a definite date for the undertaking of the building.

One expects that, in changed circumstances, there will be some confusion and delay, but the nature of the delay that flows around and is part of the State Planning Office administration at present is not to the credit of the Administration of this State or of the Minister responsible for it, because it is causing considerable difficulty to many people. Many other aspects could be aired, but I want it known that members on this side, when that measure was passed, understood that the activities of individuals would not be seriously hampered. They have been hampered, and I complain on their behalf.

When an earlier Appropriation Bill came before this House, I sought information from the Minister of Works and the Premier concerning the water supply of the Virginia, Waterloo Corner, Gawler River and Angle Vale area. I said that, because of the continued delay in the release of Bolivar water and because no reticulated water was available to this area, many people were concerned, and, because of the delay in acting or deciding on this matter, the problem existed that people who had purchased at prices that related to the use of the land for agricultural purposes, particularly fruit and vegetable growing, were denied the use of the land. Because it did not have reticulated water, the land could not be subdivided for housing, and persons who had bought in good faith, with an assurance that water from one source or another would be available—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who gave them the assurance?

Dr. EASTICK: We will come to that in a moment. These people were not being given the chance to complete the operation which they had commenced and in which, in many instances, they had invested their life savings. The Minister then, and at other times, indicated it was necessary to determine that Bolivar water was of high quality and would not cause a diseased condition if it were used. I and other members lauded the fact that the Engineering and Water Supply Department's funds were made available to the Agriculture Department to undertake tests.

During the last few months I have had the chance to peruse a copy of a letter sent to many people on June 5, 1964, from the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and signed on behalf of the then Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. J. R. Dridan). It is headed "Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works—Use of Effluent". The letter states:

Upon completion of the Bolivar sewage treatment works, large volumes of clean effluent will be available from these works. Provision is being made to discharge this effluent into the sea, as this would in any case be necessary during the winter months. However, in view of the shortage of natural water resources in this State, it would be wrong to discharge waste water which could be used to great economic advantage for irrigation purposes. Realizing the value of water to South Australia and the great increase in production which can be achieved by properly planned irrigation, the Government has appointed a committee to investigate fully the possibility of using the Bolivar effluent for this purpose.

The letter then refers to the constitution of the committee and continues:

This investigation could lead to developments of great value to landholders and to the State but cannot be conducted in a thorough and efficient manner without the co-operation of landholders in the area concerned. After reviewing the broader aspects of the proposal, the committee now wishes to embark upon a soil survey, as no firm proposals can be put forward until the soils within the area have been tested and classified.

This is back in 1964. The letter continues:

While the exact sampling points can only be determined as the soil survey proceeds, the committee and those assisting the committee will probably wish to enter upon your land to examine and test the soil. I trust that you will see your way clear to extend full co-operation to the committee responsible for carrying out this important investigation. Care will, of course, be taken to avoid damage to your property, and those conducting the survey will contact you if they are in any doubt as to your wishes in respect to any particular aspect of the work. A "right-of-entry" form is enclosed and the work of the committee will be greatly facilitated if you fill in any necessary details.

Those details are then given. Authority was given by the many people in that area at the time: they have given unqualified support to the many requests for help made by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and by other persons inquiring on behalf of the department of the Minister of Development and Mines. However, up to this stage the people concerned have not been able to obtain any real indication of the results of the examinations made and the reports prepared. The fact that the underground water supply in the area is diminishing and the fact that many people have discharged their responsibility to the local community by using no more than the quota allotted to them illustrate that this is a complex socio-economic situation.

The people concerned have sought the support of the Government and have asked the Premier to address them on the matter, although it is acknowledged that the Minister of Environment and Conservation will be addressing a meeting on Thursday of next week. I hope that the information that the Minister gives when he represents the Premier on that occasion will clearly indicate the future position and explain how these people can proceed to arrange either to quit the area or to have it considered for different types of use from those existing at present. Various plans made available indicate that this is not an area for urban development until at least the year 2,000. Until these people can obtain a sufficiently high sale price for their land, are they to continue to pay rates and taxes and other charges based on the inflated prices they paid when they were permitted to buy land in this area in the belief that water would be made available to them?

I accept that this is a complex sociological and economic problem. Indeed, a similar situation could arise in the South-East, where moves have recently been made to bring water supplies under control, and those people should not be placed in an embarrassing situation which can only bring harm to themselves and which is an economic burden on both themselves and their families. This is a problem that must flow eventually to the State, because such a large group of people unable to achieve their aims is a constant problem to the economy.

In the Fortieth Parliament a Bill dealing with the points demerit system was passed by this House. All members at that time recognized the value of a demerit points system, but it was then indicated that problems were associated with the number of points that could accrue to a driver convicted on an offence. The loss of three points for a speeding offence in a commercial vehicle, even though the speed may have been only two or three miles over the limit, was highlighted as being likely to cause many problems for first-class professional semi-trailer and commercial vehicle drivers. This situation has now come to pass. Today many commercial drivers who have followed this employment all their lives and who have amassed 12 demerit points have been precluded from following their occupation. We recognize the need for a deterrent against wanton disregard for the law, but I suggest that this law, which has been recognized as deficient in this area, should have been brought to the attention of this House in the two days this week during which the House has sat. This matter is of grave concern to many people who must leave their home for other employment. For example, I instance the case of a person in Padthaway who must go to Keith, Naracoorte, Bordertown, or another town about 30 miles away, having been a truck driver and having lost his driving licence by accruing 12 points as a result of commercial overloading offences. He must live away from his wife and family because there is no alternative employment in the small local area. The Minister of Transport acknowledges that a problem exists in this area. He has indicated that he has a committee currently reviewing that points demerit system and I refer to a letter of May 25, 1973, he forwarded to me, as follows:

One of the points which the committee will consider is whether in fact the Act should be amended to permit a court to grant some dispensation in cases where 12 points are accumulated and it could be appropriate for the offender to be permitted to drive if he needs a licence to be used in his business or to earn his livelihood.

I accept his recognition but I am concerned with the interest of people throughout the State now being disadvantaged economically because they cannot follow their profession of truck driving. These are people who cannot readily obtain other employment without having to go away from their wife and family. Their place is being taken by non-professional or insufficiently trained professional drivers, who take these vehicles on to the road. As this is an area of grave concern, I should expect legislation on the matter to be introduced at the earliest possible moment. I hope the Minister will see fit to do that in the remaining days of this session.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I am concerned about the rights of councils and ratepayers. On Tuesday, I asked the Minister of Local Government a question about this matter. His reply to me was somewhat fulsome; it was unsatisfactory in the detail it gave. Soon a Royal Commission will sit in Adelaide for the purpose of making recommendations about local government boundaries in this State. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not comment on the sittings of the Commission, as that matter would

be *sub judice*. The matter of local government boundaries is contentious, and I am the first to agree that some areas in the State could well do with adjustment. However, I do not suggest for a moment that all council boundaries must be adjusted.

The other day, I pleaded that individual residents and ratepayers should have full opportunity to have their say and to study the recommendations of the Commission. As the Minister pointed out, the terms of reference of the Commission have been extensively advertised in the newspapers and made known in other ways. Councils are preparing oral or written submissions. Opportunity is also available for ratepayers, residents or any other people in the State to give evidence. However, the many members of this House who have had experience in local government know how loath the average citizen is to give up his time to write a submission or to give oral evidence. It is to the great credit of councils that they are preparing these submissions.

The Minister has assured us that, when the Commission brings down its findings, legislation will be introduced in this House to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission with regard to boundaries. I am concerned to see that ratepayers and residents in each area have the opportunity to study those recommendations before effect is given to them in this House. I have a suggestion to make to the Minister of Local Government, part of whose work is concerned with zoning in local government areas. Under the Town Planning Act, zoning plans and regulations must, by law, be displayed at the council office for a specified time during which ratepayers and residents can have the opportunity to comment or lodge a protest. That is a perfectly democratic right to which they are entitled. I suggest that a similar scheme should be used in the case of recommendations of this Royal Commission, so that the average ratepayer would have the opportunity to study the recommendations before any amalgamation or other alteration was made in his council area. This simple democratic right should be given to people, although I admit there may be some administrative difficulties.

In passing, I remind the Minister that the Local Government Act Revision Committee, in its voluminous and well-documented report, recommended against this type of Commission. However, I know why the Minister is going ahead with this Commission. I am concerned about the rights of ratepayers. I do not want the Minister to introduce legislation that will ride roughshod over councils and residents in certain areas. Some councils are concerned to some extent about some of the terms of reference such as the arbitrary levels of ratable incomes, which appear to be empirical levels to classify certain councils in financial groups. No-one who looks at the advertisements in the newspaper can see how these groups work out. I am talking about the system of Government that is closest to the people in our three-tiered system of government.

Mr. Hopgood: In theory.

Mr. COUMBE: How many years has the honourable member served in local government?

Mr. Hopgood: So what!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I think you're being rude.

Mr. COUMBE: I confess that the Minister is exemplary in his conduct in this House. I have never heard him react to an interjection! I suggest that greater consideration should be given to residents and ratepayers who will be affected by the recommendations of the Royal Commission. They should be given the opportunity to consider these recommendations before legislation gives effect to them.

I know that several councils are holding public meetings before making their submissions to the Commission,

Some councils have expressed to me the very point that I am making today: that they would like the residents in their area to have an opportunity to examine the Commission's recommendations, so far as they affect that area, before legislation is introduced. I believe that is the ultimate in democracy. I suggest in this case a procedure similar to that adopted under the Planning and Development Act in relation to zoning regulations, whereby the regulations are displayed at the council office or similar place for a fixed time during which residents have the opportunity to lodge a protest. I consider that that is a reasonable suggestion and I put it to the Minister in the genuine hope (although it may be a vain hope) that he will agree to it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to raise a matter briefly, but the brevity of my remarks does not detract from what I consider to be the importance of the matter. I refer to the operation of this House. Those who were members of the Fortieth Parliament would recall how the Opposition was treated shabbily because of the Government's predisposition to rush matters through the House. Members on this side voiced many complaints during that Parliament about how the Government was conducting the business.

Mr. Wright: The people accepted it all right. They returned us with a 60 per cent vote!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member knows that the workings of this House are largely unknown to the general public. This sort of complaint is rarely advertised, but many legitimate complaints were made during the Fortieth Parliament about the haste with which the Government, despite the long hours that we sat, rushed Bills through the House. The climax came in the last week of the sitting, when a completely rewritten Education Act that had taken eight years to prepare was pushed through this House in a week. When speaking on that occasion, I said:

However, Opposition members have had no real opportunity to study the Bill, which was only ready in its printed form a few days ago.

The Minister of Education interjected, saying:

You've had six days. What more do you want?

On that occasion I pointed out that complaints had come from the Labor Opposition in Victoria when the Government there was seeking to introduce a measure to register schoolteachers. That is a comparatively small part of what is covered by an Education Act, yet the Labor Party complained that it had had only three weeks in which to study that measure. What I have said is typical of the sort of treatment that our Opposition got from the present Government in that Parliament. If this House is to be a deliberative House, there should be sufficient time for all members, including Government members, to become familiar with the legislation introduced. That is a major task for a member of Parliament. I know that it is not performed by some members, but it is performed by the Opposition. The second important matter is to allow sufficient time for the general public to make representations to members and have a point of view expressed.

That was not done (it could not be done) during the life of the Fortieth Parliament. We have been told that we have a heavy programme ahead and the Premier gives the impression publicly that he and his Ministry are working hard. This is the argument that has been given me to support an increase in the size of the Ministry, but no opportunity is given for mature consideration of legislation in this House. I certainly hope that, in the life of the present Parliament, that position will not obtain.

It shows the sort of thinking in Queensland, which had a one-House Parliament for many years under a Labor Government, when the decision of the Party Caucus automatically became law.

Mr. Payne: That still applies in Queensland.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that the Deputy Premier has been less than courteous regarding the provision of offices for members in their districts. That may be considered to be a small matter, but it is serious to individual members. The Government determined the conditions and the first we knew was when we received a letter about district offices. The arrangement that the Government was offering was not convenient to many country members.

Mr. Langley: What do you want?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We were asked to make submissions. I and other members made them, but I received a letter from the Deputy Premier saying that there could be no variation of the original scheme. The Opposition was not consulted about this. This is typical of the sort of treatment being meted out to the Opposition by the Government. I hope that in this Parliament sufficient time will be allowed for mature consideration of legislation.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): Soon the Premier of this State will attend a Premiers' Conference to deal with inflation and its effect on South Australian citizens. Most people know that inflation is reaching the proportions of a nationwide crisis. Costs in Australia are increasing by about 10 per cent a year, and it seems that the Commonwealth Labor Government and the State Labor Governments either do not know how to take proper corrective action or are unwilling to do so. Today's *News* contains the following report:

The Federal Treasurer (Mr. Crean) said today inflation could reach 2.4 per cent in the present June quarter, paving the way to an annual inflation rate of 10 per cent. It is higher than we would like but it is happening, he said.

What a statement for a Commonwealth Treasurer to make! What will he and the Premier do about it when the Premier consults his Commonwealth Government counterpart in Canberra next week? The whole of Australia is concerned about the action that the Commonwealth Government may take, supported by the States. The report also states:

Mr. Crean said he would be calling for the fullest co-operation from State Premiers next week to help fight inflation.

This was a reference to the prices justification legislation, the object of which, I understand, is to supervise possible increases in prices of goods produced by companies with a turnover of more than \$20,000,000 a year, and it is estimated that there are about 35 such companies in Australia. We know that that action would deal with only part of the problem, because the problem of inflation at present encompasses many items. The increase in the price of consumer goods is running at an extremely high rate, and it is popular for Governments, for electoral purposes, to quickly blame the increase in the price of basic food products for being the basic cause of inflation, whereas closer examination shows that the pressure on prices generally is the real cause of inflation.

The costs of manufacture and services, combined with distribution costs, are causing the high prices. The real reason for the increase in the price of many basic food items is that these items have been sold too cheaply in the past and have had to be produced at a cost below the economic cost of production. Now, because of world shortages, prices have risen to a figure that is returning something like an equitable profit and living to those who produce them. It is wrong for the State Premier, in conjunction with his Commonwealth counterpart, to blame

food price increases. It is the pressure of wages in general terms that is the reason for the inflationary spiral. One of the great deficiencies of this Parliament in this week's sitting, after a recess of seven months, is that the subject of the inflation crisis in Australia has not been effectively referred to by the Premier. This is one of the greatest financial crises Australia has experienced for several years, and savings are being depreciated, if they are in cash or debentures or are related to property, at a rate of 10 per cent.

What will happen to people's savings if this situation continues? Obviously, it will have a tremendous effect on the quantity of savings, and it will make a mirage of money saved by many people in this community, particularly the young people who are trying to save for future houses and necessities of life. On April 2, an article published in the *Australian* predicted that, if this inflationary spiral continued, 1 lb. of butter might cost \$27 by the year 2012. How far away is that year? No doubt some members in this Chamber will see it. Obviously, inflation is the greatest problem confronting Australia today and, when one observes the pent-up demands in this community, one knows that the Government must act to safeguard people's savings. An article published today outlines the demand for consumer goods in the various Eastern capital cities: popular motor cars require a wait of from two to three months in two of these capitals, and some air-conditioning units ordered in January will not be available until August.

This type of demand will not stop in the next couple of weeks, but will require Government action. Will the Commonwealth Labor Government, which is so much influenced by the dictates of the A.C.T.U., concur in the latest request of the A.C.T.U., which believes that taxation should be increased and that incentives for increased production should also be taxed? Will this Government agree with the general negative attitude that an already overtaxed community should be further taxed at a stage where all incomes are being effectively reduced by high taxes and there is a demand for wage and salary increases that are heavily taxed and do not return to those who get them an effective spending power? I believe that it will be an extreme test of the Labor Party in Government in this State and in the Commonwealth to take action that will probably be electorally unpopular. Have Mr. Crean, Mr. Whitlam, and the Premier of South Australia the courage to take unpopular electoral action to help solve this most pernicious crisis that is sweeping through the lives of everyone in Australia, or will they sit around and wait for 12 months before doing anything?

Mr. Wright: What's your theory?

Mr. HALL: It is a demand inflation because there are not enough goods in this community at present. One has only to talk to the commercial leaders of Adelaide to realize that they cannot get enough goods.

Mr. Wright: Tell us about the solution.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member well knows that the first thing this and other Governments should do is to increase Australian production. I do not think the honourable member would quarrel with that statement, but what is being done by the Commonwealth Government? Apparently, in conjunction with the South Australian Premier the Commonwealth Government has restricted Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in its plans to recruit workers in Europe. This incident seems to have gone largely unnoticed in South Australia, but this company has always maintained a close liaison with past South Australian Governments and has established substantial enterprises at

Whyalla. No doubt we should look for further co-operation with this company, but it is now being denied the right to recruit migrant labour from outside Australia, even though it cannot obtain labour here.

Mr. Wright: The company won't pay decent wages.

Mr. HALL: The answer of the Labor Government to demand inflation is to cut production. It is scandalous that the Labor Party ignores the cure for inflation, that is, to provide added production in this community. The backlog of goods is being accentuated by the Labor Party in Government, because of its antagonism to big business, and this Party continues its policy of levelling down and knocking off the profitable companies in Australia. The cry of Labor has always been "Down with profit, let's foster the unprofitable." All I can say is that Mr. Whitlam, who was easily one of the most popular Prime Ministers a few months ago, would not win an election today.

The community lacks confidence in a Government that will not say what it will do. The community does not know whether the Government will take positive action or the negative action to which I have referred, and does not know what the State Premier intends to do, except to introduce popular legislation. His so-called popular land price control was one of the most spurious moves of all, because Government departments have been selling land at high prices. The Government seems to be ignoring the basic problems in the community, and I wonder whether the Commonwealth Government will be supported by the State Labor Government or asked to do something effective at a time when the Commonwealth Treasurer has said, "It is happening." At least the Commonwealth Minister acknowledges the problem, but Dr. Cairns is saying that there may be an increase in taxation, the Prime Minister says there will be no increase, and the Treasurer has said, "It is happening." So Australia lurches on into the most inflationary period in its history, with everyone who has money trying to put it into something that will hedge against inflation. However, the inflation spirals upwards because the Government neglects to take positive action.

Mr. Wright: Tell us how to solve inflation.

Mr. HALL: I have told the honourable member: the first thing is to increase Australian production and give the public of Australia the tools with which to work. What is needed is positive action by the Commonwealth Government, supported by this Government, which will result in either freezing prices or maintaining them at a constant level. This State, as the Premier has often said in referring to the Commonwealth Government's cures for inflation, is likely to be hurt the most and is greatly interested in a proper attitude being adopted to the inflationary spiral in Australia.

I believe that one of the most harmful things that the Commonwealth Labor Government has done is inhibit migration to this country. All the developing countries of Europe have found it necessary to supplement their labour resources, yet the Commonwealth Labor Government inhibits migration to this country, which even by world standards is developing at a high rate. It is doing this when every comparison we can make with other countries shows that we need to increase migration. It is distressing when, this Parliament having commenced after some months of recess, the Premier says nothing at all about the matter, acting parochially and showing no interest in the general scene. The States have been downgraded generally because major issues such as these, in which this State especially is greatly interested, have been ignored.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am glad—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you the puppet or the puppeteer?

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Actually, I have just said that I am glad.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Good!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Gladys Millhouse!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am about to say something nice about the Liberal and Country League; no wonder the Minister is interrupting me. I was going to say (and I think I had better say it now, without being sidetracked by the Ministers, although I hope they will be named in *Hansard*) that I am glad the L.C.L. has at last woken up to the fact that—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Leader of the Opposition took the lead you gave him yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. The L.C.L. has woken up to the fact that it is possible to have a grievance debate on the motion to initiate or resume the debate on an Appropriation Bill or a Supply Bill. I do not believe that on Tuesday it had woken up to that fact. The member for Murray is laughing at that, but either that is the explanation or the L.C.L. was so embarrassed by the business that was to come that it did not want to say anything at all in the meantime. Anyway, the L.C.L. has taken the Liberal Movement lead today and has managed to think up a few things to say.

Mr. Hall: Pretty poor things.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was not going to say that, because I am being nice today. It had a few things to say.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had a few things to say the other day: I raised three matters of grievance, and I do not intend to enlarge on them again..

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am especially glad that the Minister of Education is in the House, because on Tuesday one of the matters I raised concerned his department and he found it convenient not to be here at a time when he could have replied to what I had said. He was away from the Chamber. At least the Attorney-General, who was concerned with the other two matters I raised, was here to give some sort of an answer, lame though it was on the major issue. On the other issue, he gave an answer. But this does not apply to the Minister of Education; he has said nothing whatever to me, in this House or by letter, about the matter that I raised the other day.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I posted a letter yesterday, but never mind.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it certainly has not arrived here in the House, nor has it arrived at my district office.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I will send a telegram to the Postmaster-General on your behalf.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The interjections of the Minister are typical of his arrogance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order, and I ask the honourable member to ignore them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but it is through interjections that a person's character often appears, and that is the case now. The L.C.L. may regard this as a laughing matter, but the matter I raise concerns the position of certain women in the teaching profession.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're going to raise that again?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going to ask for a reply, and I should prefer (I accept that the Minister has stirred himself to give me something in writing) that he replied here in this House publicly to the complaints I made on their behalf.

Mr. Wright: He has replied to you, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has not to this date said one word about the matter, and I do not believe that he would have if I had not raised it again. Now that he is here, I hope that the Minister will be able to stay in the Chamber long enough to reply. The only other matter that I desire to raise (it really leads on from this) is that, as I and other members have pointed out, we have not met for about six months now, and some of us, in the interests of our constituents and other members of the community, have made representations to Ministers on various matters. I know that this Government regards itself as so secure in office that it can afford to ignore members on this side of the House, as well as many people in the community, but I give two examples of the way I personally have been treated by Ministers in the last few months. I dictated letters to both Ministers concerned about this matter this morning.

I wrote to the Attorney-General last December, I think it was, about the activities of a certain organization in Adelaide, making complaints on behalf of a constituent. I heard nothing, although I think I got the usual formal acknowledgment from the department. I wrote again in March asking for a reply but, having heard nothing whatever in the meantime, I have now written again to the Attorney-General asking for a reply to the question I referred to him nearly six months ago. I know that the Attorney-General is a busy man, but I suggest that it is neither courteous nor in the best interests of administration that letters should go unanswered in this way, and I hope that he will see that this sort of thing does not continue. The other Minister about whom I complained in the same way (and I bet a few members on the other side, if they were not inhibited by the fact that they are members of the Government Party, could back me up in this sort of thing)—

Mr. Payne: You're wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see, there is favouritism; Government members get answers and we do not. Is that what the member for Mitchell is saying? That is the only inference to be drawn from what he is saying. I wrote some months ago to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, transmitting a complaint, and supporting it, by one of my constituents about consent to a subdivision and involving a planning matter. It was in April that I had, after some weeks, a partial reply from the Minister saying that he would look into the matter, or something, but I have heard not another word since.

I am glad that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has come back into the House. I hope that he will take the matter up and give me a reply. As I have said, I dictated a follow-up letter to him today, and I hope he will be looking out for it and make sure that I do get a reply so that I can let my constituent know what is going on. It is not good enough in these matters for Ministers simply to treat members on this side (or on either side) with ignorance. Let Ministers recall that we are making representations not for ourselves but on behalf of members of the community, and they deserve some attention.

The only really new matter to which I turn concerns the intention, so declared, of the Government through the

Premier to peg land prices if they continue to rise. I have received several representations from people, one as recently as this morning from a member of the legal profession, asking what is happening in this regard; Threats have been made concerning retrospective legislation. The imposition of penalties for actions retrospectively is abhorrent and unusual, I am glad to say, in our system of Government. Yet that is what has been threatened by the Premier. The member of the legal profession who approached me this morning asked what he should do and how he should advise his clients. Should they sell their land at the highest price offering? Will this be made an offence in some way when Parliament meets again? He said that he could not provide an answer to such questions simply because he did not know. Although this session has been called for one purpose only (to clean up, I fervently hope for good, the constitutional situation in this State) this subject is of such great importance that someone on the front bench should say something about it before the session ends. I therefore ask that, if not today then certainly when we next meet, a statement be made about the Government's intention regarding land prices, so that people will know where they stand and we will not be governed by intimidation and bluff. I hope that the Minister of Education will answer the question I asked last Tuesday. I hope that all Ministers will be less dilatory, and I do not necessarily blame them—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You get prompt replies in the vast majority of cases, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With due respect to the Minister of Education, he is comparatively speedy in the replies he gives to letters, but I know from my own experience that he cannot answer for other Ministers. Indeed, certain other Ministers are very tardy indeed, and it is not a good thing. Finally, I ask the Government to make a statement on its intentions, legislative or otherwise, on land prices.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Unlike the subjects referred to by other members who have spoken in this debate, my subject is local and concerns inflation. The member for Goyder dealt with this matter on a wider basis.

Mr. Millhouse: And he dealt with it very well, too.

Mr. VENNING: The honourable member should leave that to other people to judge. He should—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Rocky River should address the Chair and not the member for Mitcham.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the inflationary situation as it affects South Australia and an article in this morning's *Advertiser* headed "Food price rise in South Australia double the average". Interjectors to the member for Goyder's speech asked what he would do about this situation, but that is not the point I want to make. I want only to highlight certain facts in a post-mortem of the Premier's 1970 election policy speech. The press article states:

Figures given yesterday show that food prices in the six capitals rose by an average of 0.8 per cent in May. In Adelaide the rise was 1.9 per cent.

It continues:

Increases in food prices for the capitals were: Perth—another Labor governed State—

2.3 per cent, Adelaide 1.9 per cent, Brisbane 1 per cent, Sydney 0.8 per cent, Canberra 0.7 per cent and Hobart and Melbourne 0.2 per cent.

Mr. Harrison: Read the rest.

Mr. VENNING: I now refer to the Premier's policy speech delivered on May 5, 1970. The L.C.L. Government was in office from 1968 until that election. Leading up to the election in May, the Premier said in his policy speech, at page 25:

Perhaps the most worrying economic point for the average person is the break-neck speed at which the cost of living is rising—

this is three years ago—

During the past two years as part of its policy of free-for-all the L.C.L. Government has drastically reduced the number of goods under price control.

Price control was instituted in this State by an L.C.L. Government and we are pleased to say it is still here. The Premier continued:

In September, 1968, price control was lifted on some 32 items, including many building materials, along with clothing, soft drinks, and cooking utensils.

The then Treasurer, Mr. Pearson, also announced at the same time that many items would remain under control, but that the Prices Commissioner would not fix prices on them unless action became necessary, whatever that meant. And so we now see that even items which are supposedly under price control have been rising significantly. This has meant simply that the L.C.L. countenanced a reduction in spending power. In addition to the seven new taxes, it has imposed on South Australians price increases that have cut into every area of family budgeting. Train and bus fares have increased significantly, bread is up, water rates—

the Premier referred to water rates in his second reading explanation of the Appropriation Bill—

have gone up and are going up further, sewerage rates have been increased, and petrol, milk, butter, meat, soft drinks, clothing lines, doctors' fees, university fees, liquor prices, fishing licences, car licences, and most recently newspapers have all been increased.

Indeed, we know how much they have increased since that time under a Labor Government. The Premier continued:

But the list does not end there. Perhaps the greatest area of L.C.L. failure in this regard, apart from the increase in costs for staple foods, is the spectacular rise in building materials. During its term of office the prices of building materials have risen 8.3 per cent. A Labor Government will administer the Prices Act to protect the purchasing power of money in this State. It will change the present disastrous course.

By looking at the present situation I should like to see how the course has changed. There has been no change in the course of inflation in this State. True, it is indeed a problem to halt inflation, but the point I wish to make is this: the Premier made certain comments during the election period, when he told the State a very serious untruth, and he could not halt the story when it was proved that he had not done as he had said. In his second reading explanation of this Bill earlier this week, the Premier and Treasurer said:

The previously worrying situation has also been relieved by some unexpected increases in receipts, particularly in stamp duties and water rates.

In the past, the Treasurer was critical of the former L.C.L. Treasurer (Hon. Sir Glen Pearson) because of increases in charges. However, now the Treasurer says that the financial position of the State is much better than he expected because of increases in revenue from water rates and stamp duties. He also said:

A complete analysis of the reasons for the higher returns from stamp duty is not yet available, but it is known that a very high volume of property conveyance transactions has had a major effect, and this may produce about \$5,000,000 more than the amount expected when the Budget was compiled.

We know that the Government was responsible for increasing rural water rates, which had previously received some special consideration because of the geographical situation of the areas concerned. However, this Government, not being very sympathetic towards the man on the land, saw fit to increase rural water rates to such an extent that the Treasurer admits that the increased revenue from

water rates is one of the reasons for the present improved situation.

Mr. Keneally: What does the man on the land think of you? Do you remember the last election?

Mr. VENNING: The member for Torrens has already referred to the Royal Commission that has been appointed to take evidence in relation to local government boundaries. I believe that possibly the situation of local councils has reached the stage when it may be necessary for someone to look at the whole matter. Over the years, through their regional conferences, councils have asked the Highways Department to permit them to do the work of maintaining sealed roads in their areas. This work includes grading the sides of roads, keeping the grass away, and general maintenance. However, the Highways Department has decided to do this work itself, so it has not been possible for councils to receive additional revenue in this way that would have helped to make them viable council areas.

Now there will be this Royal Commission. If the rumour has any truth in it, the Minister expects to reduce the number of council areas from 137 to about 30 or 40. If this happens, it will take the word "local" out of local government, and the effect on local areas will be far from what we would wish. If the Government had listened to the requests of councils in days gone by and allowed them to do this road maintenance work, councils could have maintained their identity and been viable. They would have done an excellent job in their areas and, being on the spot, they would probably have maintained these roads in better condition than they have been maintained.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I want to deal with two matters of great importance to the people of the State. In these cases, the Government has been arrogant in its treatment of members and the public of South Australia. During the seven months since the House last met, two Ministers in particular have made statements that should have been made in this House so that members who represent people in various districts would have had a chance to comment on what was said. First, the Minister of Transport offered to give away the railways of South Australia, and then the Minister of Community Welfare offered to hand over to the Commonwealth Government the field of Aboriginal affairs. I do not believe either of those Ministers had the right to make those public announcements without first informing Parliament. I am fully aware that the present Government would like to hand over Aboriginal affairs, because it has made such a shocking mess of handling them.

Mr. Hopgood: Oh!

Mr. GUNN: I am afraid I cannot shout the honourable member down today, because my throat is not the best. The actions of the present Premier, when he was in charge of Aboriginal affairs between 1965 and 1968, have created a chaotic situation in relation to the well-being of Aborigines. The present situation in my district and in other areas is alarming, to say the least. Some recent happenings are causing great concern to many of my constituents. I hope the Minister will show some courage and at least have a look for himself at just what is taking place in the area, and meet the people concerned. I recall the last occasion when he visited these areas; perhaps he gained some valuable knowledge.

I have received several complaints from people living in the Stuart District about the problems caused there by Aborigines. It is high time the Minister looked for himself; he should not just say that he will hand over this field to the Commonwealth Government. The way the Government is tackling this problem, it will get not better

but worse. I have had a look at this problem. It ill behoves the Government to continue the senseless policy advocated by its Commonwealth colleagues. We know that the Premier is not concerned about South Australia's rights. It was rather hypocritical of the Government to send the Attorney-General to London to try to protect South Australia's rights, when the Commonwealth Government is trying to get rid of not only local government—

The Hon. L. J. King: The New South Wales and Victorian Governments also think it is a good idea for the Commonwealth to have control.

Mr. GUNN: I am not talking about what is taking place in New South Wales and Victoria; I am concerned about what is happening in South Australia, especially in my district.

The Hon. L. J. King: It makes one wonder whether everyone could be wrong.

Mr. GUNN: I am quite sure that the present Government does not have the solution to the Aboriginal affairs problems.

The Hon. L. J. King: Whom do you suggest might have the answer?

Mr. GUNN: I suggest that the first thing the Government should do is take a realistic approach to the present situation, and not go along with the policy whereby Aborigines live purely on hand-outs. They should be encouraged to have some self-respect and to show initiative. The present policies pursued by the Premier and the Minister have denigrated the Aborigines, and I challenge the Minister to deny it. I now wish to draw to the attention of honourable members the statement made by the Minister of Transport about the operation of the South Australian Railways. For a long time the Minister has criticized the attitude of members on this side.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: With justification.

Mr. GUNN: Without justification. Recently he released a few copies of a report that I believe has wide significance for the future of the South Australian Railways. The report refers to the operation of the railways in the districts of all members. My constituents and I are most concerned about some of the recommendations in the report, such as the statements made about the future of the lines from Port Lincoln to Penong and Buckleboo. The Minister should be thoroughly ashamed, because he has not made sufficient copies of the document available to members so that they can take the report to their districts and discuss it with their constituents. The Minister made available three or four copies and deliberately tried to prevent members from carrying out their duties. It is all very well for the Minister to laugh.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't blame us if you are not speaking to your Leader or your Whip, who have copies that they could make available if you were interested. It's not our fault if you have internal troubles.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister is trying to divert attention from the matter under discussion. He is a past master at those tactics. We on this side are fully aware of that, and we are not like members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Thank goodness for that.

Mr. GUNN: Our Party is a united Party, and I assure the Minister that he will be fully aware, when his Government next goes to the people, of just what the people think.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am sure we will be.

Mr. Wright: If you say you are united, you are not truthful.

Mr. GUNN: We know what attitude the democrat from Adelaide adopts. He does not believe in giving the people the opportunity to decide for themselves. At the State

Australian Labor Party Conference he wanted to dictate to people about joining unions. That is how democratic he is.

Mr. Wright: Where did you get that idea? I'll have something to say about that later, and I hope the press publishes it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I want to refer to the attitude of the present Commonwealth Government in regard to the primary producers of this State. I am concerned that the future of these great primary industries will be jeopardized because of the attitude being adopted by that Government. During the Commonwealth election campaign, Mr. Grassby and Dr. Patterson went around the country trying to make good fellows of themselves and promising to make available to the rural community \$500,000,000 at 3 per cent interest.

Mr. Slater: Are you better off now than you were 18 months ago?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, thanks to the policy of the previous Government. I have praise for the previous Liberal and Country Party Government in the Commonwealth Parliament but not for the Socialists that now occupy the Treasury benches in Australia. We have seen nothing of that \$500,000,000. We have had the present Prime Minister causing much concern to the wheat industry by his threats not to continue the wheat stabilization plan. The Prime Minister and the Minister for Primary Industry have made conflicting statements, and Dr. Cairns has been insulting our friends.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And selling your products at a better price than you have ever had before.

Mr. GUNN: Dr. Cairns is more concerned about the North Vietnamese, who still have the blood of young Australians on their clothes. He has insulted our friends in America. We have been trying for many years to build up a static meat market in the United States of America, and, just when we have achieved this, Dr. Cairns and the other left-wing members of the Commonwealth Government jeopardized that agreement. His action would affect the people the member for Adelaide used to represent in the trade union movement, namely, members of the Australian Workers Union, who otherwise would be assisting the primary producers and graziers to produce the beef.

Mr. Wright: I wouldn't like to give you a stock whip!

Mr. GUNN: We know about the attitude of the member for Adelaide.

Mr. Wright: You'll hear more of it.

Mr. GUNN: We are used to the stand-over tactics that he would employ. He is used to using the big stick. The people of Australia will know the position when they have their petrol supplies cut off and when transport is tied up.

Mr. Langley: What about all your subsidies?

Mr. GUNN: The member for Unley says that we are subsidized. We would be pleased to have our subsidies removed if the people that he claims to represent—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear a word that the member for Eyre is saying. It must be even more difficult for those people who must record what the honourable member is saying. I ask for silence, in view of the disability that the member for Eyre has.

Mr. Wright: He certainly has a disability: he's got no brains.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Unley was talking about himself and his colleagues.

Mr. Wright: How weak! Tell us about the League of Rights. Tell us who is President in your area now.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Unley was trying to criticize the primary producers because of the subsidies that they received and I was about to tell him that we would be pleased to forgo the subsidies if the people he represented were willing to put aside their tariff protection. We do not hear anything from the honourable member on that matter. The final matter that concerns me also refers to the Commonwealth Government, and that is its industrial policy. It seems that that Government is following in the footsteps of this State Government in trying to create privileged people in this society. They tend to place a person who is a trade union organizer or a union secretary above the law. He will receive special privileges.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What special privileges will he get?

Mr. GUNN: A situation similar to that which took place on Kangaroo Island would take place all over Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are the special privileges you say he will get?

Mr. GUNN: If the Senate had not acted responsibly and laid aside the industrial legislation that Mr. Cameron introduced, in my opinion that legislation would have completely wrecked the arbitration system.

Mr. Langley: You haven't read it.

Mr. GUNN: I certainly have, and my constituents also have read it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are the special privileges to which you have referred?

Mr. Wright: I'll reply to you. Just be in the House.

Mr. GUNN: We are aware of the threats that the member for Adelaide is always making, but we do not take any notice of threats. He may make threats to the trade union movement but we stand firm, and that is what the Opposition in the Senate did, under threats from the Postal Workers Union, when that union tried to intimidate the Commonwealth Parliament. The Commonwealth Government was going to place trade union secretaries above the law.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How?

Mr. GUNN: It was going to prevent civil action being taken against them.

Mr. Wright: You killed our boys in Vietnam with your policy.

Mr. GUNN: That shows how irresponsible the honourable member is.

Mr. Wright: How much blood is on your hands? You were a supporter of the Vietnam war and of boys being killed there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River must realize that in the House there can only be one Speaker and one person with the authority to act as Speaker. If the honourable member wants to disregard the authority of the Speaker, he will be dealt with accordingly. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I was about to conclude, but I must comment on the remarks of the member for Adelaide and his behaving in a disgraceful manner, which is not what would be expected by the people of South Australia. I appreciate the chance, after seven months, of being able to raise matters that have caused great concern to my constituents. I assure the member for Adelaide that we will be paying special attention to his remarks in future.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Several pressing matters can be raised in a grievance debate, but I intend to draw attention to one matter that I believe is most urgent. However, I

should refer first to the grossly unfair tactics of the member for Adelaide in interjecting at great length whilst the member for Eyre was speaking. That honourable member's voice and speaking range have been reduced by about two-thirds. Perhaps that may be the member for Adelaide's method of taking advantage of other people's disabilities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Wright: You can do better than that, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I am concerned about the Glenside Hospital and the proposal announced recently by the Government of spending nearly \$1,000,000 on upgrading that hospital in the next 12 months. Yesterday, the Attorney-General, when speaking in another context, spoke about our inherited institutions, and I am sure that Glenside Hospital could be classed as that type of institution. Called Parkside originally, in the last 15 years it has undergone remarkable changes, not only in its name but also in its nature. The changes at Glenside Hospital have been brought about by advances in medical science, in psychiatric treatment, and particularly in the development of psychotherapeutic drugs.

The Glenside Hospital walls have come down. We have seen the new buildings known as Paterson House, Cleland House, and Downey House, and the development of the outpatient orientated form of treatment has been made possible by drugs that have been developed; we have seen the build-up of a fine reputation of the Glenside School of Nursing with a fine nursing training block at the hospital. Many more people are being treated as outpatients and remaining in the community, and because of this they can be returned to the community far more rapidly. We have seen the opening of the Strathmont Centre, and this has resulted in the transfer of many mentally defective children from Glenside. I understand that some of those children who need special care will be accommodated in new premises to be acquired by the Government at the Ru Rua Hospital. When the new block for criminal mental defectives opens at Yatala, Z Ward at Glenside will be closed.

This shows a remarkable picture of progress, and says much for Governments of both sides in that they had seen that the need existed and were willing to rise to the occasion and advance with the times. However, we may be coming to something of a dead stop, and this situation concerns me and those who are involved with Glenside. In the *Advertiser* of March 27 an announcement was made that the State Cabinet had approved an expenditure of \$200,000 to refurnish and redecorate Paterson and Cleland Wards at Glenside Hospital. These are the two main outpatient and short-term treatment centres for patients with curable illnesses.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is that too much?

Dr. TONKIN: It is not too much for the hospital, but it is far too much to spend on redecorating and refurnishing when there are more pressing needs at Glenside. The plan to spend this money on Paterson and Cleland Wards shows a complete lack of understanding of the problem at Glenside Hospital. The old dilapidated buildings should be knocked down and replaced with modern buildings, using modern methods of psychiatric treatment. Whilst the carpeting and furnishing of Cleland and Paterson Wards may go some way towards improving patients' accommodation (and no-one will deny this), most patients will still be accommodated in substandard conditions. This seems to be a stop-gap measure, and in the long term

it is a waste of money that could be applied towards upgrading Glenside and continuing with a modernization programme.

I believe that it is this sort of action in the past that allowed Glenside and the other buildings that I am criticizing to reach the condition they are in now. My statement brought forth a prompt rejoinder from the Minister, who announced the following day that the State Government would spend nearly \$1,000,000 to update Glenside Hospital this year. For some reason he compared this expenditure with the \$183,000 spent in 1965, but I could not see the relevance of this comparison except perhaps to show that more was being spent. He also said that the Government's long-term plan was to demolish the hospital's oldest and worst buildings. This may be a long-term plan, but it is a long-term plan that should take place in the short term, as it is urgent that a redevelopment plan should be put into effect immediately.

For the benefit of honourable members who have not inspected the wards at Glenside I will describe the two blocks with which I am concerned. We are all familiar with the appearance of the large bluestone building, the main building with the clock tower, which is so typical of Glenside now. Fortunately, this main building is not occupied by patients but is basically an administration building. Wards O and P which are on either side and behind that main building, are constructed in much the same way. They consist of three floors, and the stairs are on the outside of the building. The architecture is such that bedrooms, which resemble cells that could be found in some of our prisons, cannot be changed. The walls are thick and the whole building is constructed (as the Minister of Works would know) in such a way that it is impossible to modify the building in any reasonable way.

Only one thing can be done with these buildings: they have to be pulled down, because it is no earthly good spending more money on them. I give credit to whichever Minister or Government it was that did all that could be done to upgrade the buildings. There are extra bathrooms, the buildings are clean, and they have been well painted and kept in good condition, but it is architecturally impossible to upgrade them any further. It is impossible to squeeze extra bathrooms into them; indeed, it has been found impossible to move some of the outside toilet blocks inside the building.

I would not like to be there as a patient, and I do not think any of us would like any of our relatives to be nursed there as patients in those conditions. I do not see why anyone in South Australia should have to go there in those conditions. I make no reflection whatever on the staff of the hospital. They are doing a magnificent job and coping in a wonderful way with their disabilities in relation to facilities. Improvements have been made superficially to this building to what I consider is the limit. I quote again from the statement of the Minister of Health reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

The Government was improving facilities and conditions at Glenside as rapidly as possible with the funds available. The Government is not doing any such thing. It is undertaking stop-gap measures when there is an alternative plan for it to follow, and that plan should be put into operation as soon as possible. The sum of \$1,000,000 is a large sum to spend on recarpeting, on putting up curtains and repainting when in fact the real need is a whole system of new buildings. There is only one way: demolish and rebuild.

A plan for Glenside is available. It does exist and it is an imaginative plan, a plan which allows not only for the construction of a central core but which is so designed that further bedroom accommodation can be added at a minimum of cost. The study that led to the drawing up of this plan followed a decision by the Director-General of Medical Services in 1971 not to proceed with the upgrading of P and O wards, and yet we find that a further decision to upgrade wards has been made.

Many discussions have taken place involving the staff of the hospital and officers of the Public Buildings Department, and the plan drawn up takes full note of the modern needs of the psychiatric patient—the need for a bedroom and bedroom accommodation, the need for quiet living where patients can get away in pleasant surroundings and keep themselves to themselves if they wish, yet having access to recreation facilities and community rooms. The facilities must be made to approximate those available in the community as far as possible.

The cost of the first stage of 32 beds has been estimated at about \$310,000, and this is more than covered by the "nearly \$1,000,000" announced by the Minister as being ready to be spent on what I consider to be stop-gap measures. I ask the Government to consider this as a matter of some urgency and to go ahead with the construction of the pilot part of stage 1 of the scheme that has been proposed and considered, I believe, by the Public Buildings Department. If we can do that we may find ourselves getting the sort of accommodation that modern day psychiatric treatment demands and ensuring that those patients unfortunate enough to find themselves in Glenside will be getting the best possible treatment with the best possible facilities.

The cost of future development based on the three areas presently existing (Paterson, Cleland and Downey Houses) comes to about \$1,000,000 for a 128-bed scheme, and this is good value for money. It is rather like motel accommodation: not as much as must be spent on regular hospital beds. It is good value for money, but what the Government is getting by its present proposals is very poor value for money. I ask the Government to consider spending in a worthwhile fashion that money which it intended to put into window dressing Glenside, and to get started on the first stage of the total redevelopment of those ward sites at Glenside Hospital.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I, too, have a grievance.

The SPEAKER: I point out, before the honourable member for Davenport commences his speech, that it is his maiden speech in the House of Assembly. In accordance with practice and procedure he is expected to be heard in silence, and I ask members to act accordingly.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On Tuesday last I asked the Minister who represents the Minister of Agriculture in another place a question concerning the proposed move of the Agriculture Department research section from Northfield to Monarto. The Minister, in his reply, informed me that this matter was currently before Cabinet. Before outlining why I believe such a move should not take place, I should like to give a brief outline of the Northfield Research Centre of the Agriculture Department

The centre has been in existence for nine years and has been developed largely with industry funds. It has 38 graduates and between 60 and 70 technical assistants. Research includes agronomy, soil science, horticulture, and animal science, covering dairying and research into pigs,

wool, and beef. Finally, the centre has become the hub of applied agricultural science within South Australia.

The first point I make is that the Minister claims the matter is already before Cabinet, yet the workers at Northfield have not been asked for their opinions on such a move. Members opposite often espouse the philosophy of worker participation in management decisions, yet they do not apply that same philosophy to their own administration. Here is a classic case where 120 people will be shifted from one city to another, yet the workers have not been consulted. It is typical of the hypocrisy of the Government.

Yesterday the Premier said he was in favour of open Government, and one would therefore hope that he would table in this Parliament the report that Cabinet is considering in relation to that move. One would wonder, if that report is not tabled, whether it suffered the same sort of fate as the environmental report on the proposed petro-chemical plant at Redcliffs.

Two important facts must be considered here. The first relates to how much of the Agriculture Department should be shifted to Monarto. A case can be put forward as to why the head office administration should be shifted to Monarto, but that should certainly be considered in a different light from the position applying to the research section at Northfield.

The Government is looking to the complete development of Monarto and must therefore expect certain Government departments to move to the new city, but I hope that in making such moves the Government will not destroy the morale and efficiency of one of its departments.

I will now give the reasons why such a move of the research section of the department should not proceed. During the past nine years \$2,500,000 has been expended in developing this research centre. The centre has been in existence for nine years only. What a shame it would be if, at the end of nine years, it were to be shifted to a new location. Shifting would result in the immediate requirement of spending another \$2,500,000. More significantly, much of that \$2,500,000 has come from industry funds. These funds and equipment have been supplied on a totally voluntary basis by farmer organizations and the funds donated account for about \$400,000 annually. I instance the following donations:

	\$
<u>Wool Research Trust Fund.....</u>	150,000
<u>Pig Industry Research Committee.....</u>	45,000
<u>Australian Dairy Produce Board.....</u>	38,000
<u>Commonwealth Extension Services Grant . .</u>	64,000
<u>Meat Research Fund.....</u>	75,000

These are only some of the organizations providing funds. These voluntary donations from industry funds have helped to establish the Northfield Agricultural Research Centre, but what will be the attitude of these industries if the Government suddenly shifts this centre to Monarto, thereby wasting the money that has been invested at Northfield? The obvious immediate reaction is to cut off all further contributions to the centre and the agricultural research section of the department. Not only will it affect Northfield but also other research centres throughout South Australia. This applies not only in the eight years in which obvious development at Northfield will stagnate waiting for the move to Monarto but also once the centre has been shifted to Monarto.

I refer to the classic example of the new piggery established at Northfield. The Pig Industry Committee donated \$60,000 only two years ago toward the establishment of that piggery. Will that committee give another \$60,000 to establish a new piggery at Monarto? Of course not.

Not only will the confidence of the industry funds be shattered but the morale of the workers at Northfield will

also be shattered. Scientific research is a profession requiring possibly the highest motivation of any profession. If that high motivation is absent, little return is obtained from research workers.

During the past nine years the workers at Northfield have developed a high level of motivation. In fact, that motivation has reached a peak at this time: new facilities have been constructed; excellent equipment has been provided, and an ideal social structure exists among the workers. To shift that department in eight years time would destroy that motivation from this point onwards. Motivation will be destroyed when the workers realize their establishment is about to be taken from them, and particularly because they were not even consulted about the move.

At Monarto the research centre would be removed from the other important agricultural research establishments in the Adelaide metropolitan area. In research, communication between the various departments and institutions is vitally important. We have the Waite Agricultural Institute, the University of Adelaide, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, the Department of Chemistry, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. All of those bodies have technical experts and scientists who constantly communicate with the staff at Northfield. Therefore, a move of the Agriculture Department to Monarto would destroy that communication and place those unfortunate research scientists at Monarto in scientific isolation.

At Monarto only 200 ha has been set aside for the new research centre. It is interesting to note that the Government has already set aside this land even though apparently it is still considering the matter in Cabinet. This 200 ha set aside compares with the 350 ha already available at Northfield. It seems to be the intention of the gentlemen opposite to reduce the size of the Agriculture Department and reduce agricultural research in this State, and thereby slowly strangle agricultural development.

Monarto has an annual rainfall of 14in., whereas the Northfield Agricultural Research Centre has 22in. a year. Do the honourable gentlemen in Cabinet appreciate the fact that this would mean irrigating the 200 ha to bring it up to 22in. rainfall a year? This is irrigation in an area that is devoid of water and where the water must be pumped from the Murray River. Obviously this is an aspect that has been completely neglected by Cabinet in its considerations.

The agricultural research centre at Northfield has become the focal point of agricultural extension advice in South Australia between the scientists and the farmers. Even with the development at Monarto, Adelaide will always be the focus of business and social contacts in South Australia. Shifting the Agriculture Department to Monarto will simply mean shifting this advisory section of the Agriculture Department away from the focal point—another move that will tend to strangle agricultural development in South Australia.

Finally, Cabinet in its lack of wisdom has already decided that further development of the Northfield area should stop. There are many buildings, projects and equipment purchases that have already stopped. To take one example, there is the building of a \$100,000 cold room complex. This complex was first put on the drawing board in 1963, and now it has finally reached the stage, after much Government and Public Service bungling, of being built; and just at the point of building this cold room complex we find Cabinet stopping it. In stopping it, it is holding up research into controlled atmosphere cold storage in South Australia, research which is now directly affecting the cold storage of \$4,500,000 worth of apples and pears each year,

and a potential \$14,000,000 worth of citrus here in South Australia.

Much of the trouble along the upper reaches of the Murray River arises from the fact that we cannot sell our citrus fruit. One way of holding this fruit over until we can find a suitable market is by cold storage. Cabinet, in deciding that the development of this cold room complex should stop while it procrastinates about the potential development of a city that cannot start for another eight years, is destroying further agricultural industry in South Australia.

To move the research section of the Agriculture Department from Northfield to Monarto would be a fatal mistake. Let me reiterate the pertinent facts. First, the staff have not been consulted and, therefore, their morale is low already. Secondly, the confidence of the industry trust funds, which donate about \$400,000 a year to that development, will be shattered. Thirdly, the establishment cost of \$2,500,000 would immediately have to be repeated at Monarto. Fourthly, the workers at Monarto would be isolated from other scientific institutions; and fifthly, such a move would completely restrict agricultural development in South Australia. One suspects it is the deliberate policy of the Government to impose this sort of restriction.

The regional development policy of the Government is about to run amuck, because the Government has not given adequate consideration or thought to the planning of its new city. Some Public Service departments should be shifted to it. In their future wisdom, I hope the Government members will at least see the folly of their ways so far and decide that the research section of the Agriculture Department should stay at Northfield.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support what the member for Davenport has said about the Government not taking an active part in allowing the research section of the Agriculture Department to consult with it upon the future activities of the department. If the Government is to get this new town established at Monarto it must provide satisfactory conditions there to attract industry and workers. With the new town likely to be established, some Government departments could investigate the possibility of moving there: for instance, the proposed new Motor Vehicles Department could be at Monarto.

The Hon. L. J. King: It might not want to go there, either.

Mr. McANANEY: Other countries have had to ensure that there is enough enticement to attract people to new places. To achieve this, better conditions must be provided. There is the example of the Motor Vehicles Department at Mount Gambier, which is more up to date than the head office. I have been informed that people from Murray Bridge who write to Mount Gambier get their motor registrations through more quickly than they do from Adelaide. This could happen in the case of Monarto—all the administration could be done at Monarto. It will be difficult to entice industry there; it will be more costly to entice industry to go to the new town than it would be to move a Government department there. Perhaps one of the big insurance companies would be willing to go there.

Let us consider the development taking place in South Australia at the moment. When I say that, I believe the population growth in South Australia used to be nearly 3 per cent. We have dropped back and are only just ahead of Tasmania in that respect. Our population growth is now less than 1 per cent. I know that some people believe in zero population growth and that anyone who has more than two children is now considered a traitor to his country. These are modern ideas. All that

I could read in the report about this new town concerned what had happened in the district in past years. Nothing was said about what industries would be attracted there by the Government. I do not think that at this stage it is known what will happen there.

Mr. Evans: The Government knows it has picked the wrong spot.

Mr. McANANEY: Perhaps that is why it is not doing much about it. I think the Government has much to answer for with regard to the increase in land prices in South Australia, because it should have foreseen that this would happen. We all agreed to the planning legislation. However, the moment that planning is undertaken the blocks available become fewer, because people cannot go out a bit farther from the city and buy a block to build on in a few years. The blocks available become fewer and land prices therefore increase. Then the situation is reached where young people cannot buy land at a reasonable price. I congratulated the Government on introducing the planning legislation, but I condemn it strongly for its lack of action in ensuring that more blocks are available. Most of my work over the last three months has been in trying to get titles through the Land Titles Office, which has been absolutely clogged up with work. I do not condemn the people who work there, as I believe they work overtime and are doing their jobs to the best of their ability. However, the Town Planning Office and other departments have to be consulted, and there is a general hold-up at this office that is affecting the number of blocks available. The Government must take action to see that this problem is removed. It must take full responsibility for the high land prices in South Australia at present. The Minister of Transport is now in control of the Railways Department.

Mr. Becker: Is he in control?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, since legislation was recently introduced, and that is why the department has gone bad. I realize that there are certain difficulties with the railways, but I condemn the Minister for the misleading and incorrect statement he made about the fact that public money had been poured into roads, and that the poor old railways had been completely starved of funds and that that was why they were not functioning properly. That is a deliberate falsehood. Over the last five years, \$6,000,000 in Loan funds has been spent on the railways. In addition, out of general revenue \$19,500,000 has been given to the railways from public funds to keep them going.

Mr. Max Brown: They are hardly a paying proposition.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member has not been here very long. When I came here first, the railways were paying their working expenses. If the honourable member reads the Auditor-General's Report, he will find this information there. What is this spoon-feeding of public funds to highways? In the year ended June 30, 1972, motor receipts tax was \$18,000,000. That sum includes registration fees paid by the people who use the roads and wear them out. Therefore, this money is collected from users.

To that sum, \$3,250,000 in road maintenance charges can be added. With other odds and ends, that comes to a total of \$22,000,000 paid in this way. In addition, under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, \$25,500,000 is allocated. I know that the Commonwealth Government says that this sum comes from public funds, but petrol tax is at least 50 per cent higher than this sum; the people who use the roads pay that tax, so that this money goes in expenditure on roads. Therefore, how can the Minister say that public funds have been used to spoon-feed highway expenditure, whereas the poor old railways have been starved?

I realize that oversea countries find it difficult to make their railway systems pay, even when they are under efficient private management and ownership. However, in this State there is only a 25 per cent return on the carriage of country passengers. Why has the Minister, during his term of office, not had the initiative to examine what was done in Western Australia with regard to carrying country passengers? In that State an efficient, modern bus service, which practically pays for itself, is providing adequate transport for these people. The Minister allows this situation to continue year after year at a cost of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000. How many schools could be built for that sum? If this money had not been wasted in this way, the member for Davenport could have the Glenside Hospital in a satisfactory condition. Under the Minister, the situation has now reached such a shocking state that he is trying to hand over the railways to the Commonwealth Government, which must have in it some bad business people if they are interested in our railways, unless they are impressed by the fact that the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner has made the Commonwealth Railways pay.

I believe that this year the Commonwealth Railways did not quite make the profit that they made in previous years. However, if the railways are handed over to the Commonwealth Government, who will assess whether they are operating in the interests of the community? At present the Public Works Committee and the Transport Control Board examine whether railways are necessary. Will we leave that duty to the Commonwealth Government? If we do and if there is an objection, the Commonwealth Government may say, "We must bear in mind that South Australia has only 10 per cent of the population." The Minister should therefore tell the House the precise details of the scheme. He has guaranteed that trade unionists will still have jobs, but he has not said whether we will have railway services where they are needed.

If the railways are well managed, they can operate economically and compete against private transport, but they must be modernized. The Railways Department should use road transport where it is necessary; this happens in Western Australia, where the Government may operate a service at a loss to ensure that people continue to receive an adequate service. However, there is no guarantee that that will happen here if the railways are handed over to the Commonwealth Government. So, the Minister should make a Ministerial statement about his policy in this connection. He should take notice of the seven or eight reports on the railways that have been made during the last decade; those reports have been ignored, except when the last Liberal Government was in office. If there is a reasonable alternative mode of transport, it must be used. I hope the Minister does not try to mislead the public by saying that the railways are starved and the highways are favoured; he should study the Auditor-General's Reports.

A report has been issued on the way people should pay for water, and I am disappointed that the Minister has said that he will not take any action on the report. Of course, we cannot suddenly change to another system. However, it is obvious that we must gradually change to a system under which people pay for water actually used; such a system will be fairer and it will benefit the State, because in those circumstances people will not use so much water.

Mr. Jennings: You'll be paying more.

Mr. Wells: Put a bore down!

Mr. McANANEY: Yes; I have to put a bore down for a house I am having built.

Mr. Jennings: Surely there are already enough bores in your house.

Mr. McANANEY: Of course, I would much rather have my property connected to a service provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Unfortunately, we have not had time to study the Jong report on how people should pay for water. We were informed that a committee would inquire into the committee on water rating. I wonder whether finality will ever be reached. The Government maintains that it is interested in the development of South Australia but, although there are so many reports and committees, we have not seen any practical result of their findings. I ask the Government to get down to the fundamentals, which will lead to an increase in the living standards of South Australians. I hope the Government will get out of its present rut.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I wish to raise two very important matters concerning the Riverland. One relates to the water supply, which is the water supply of the River district and it also provides a large proportion of the State's water supply. In protecting that water supply we have to look at all possibilities of contamination. I hope the Minister of Works can inform me later if and when the Engineering and Water Supply Department will announce a programme for the removal of evaporation basins from the Murray River banks. The water, prior to reaching the basins, is of usable quality; in some cases its salinity is 800 parts per million to 1,000 p.p.m., which is good enough for pasture. Many farmers would accept the water if it was sent in their direction rather than in the direction of a basin. At present the basins established on the banks of the Murray River are an important source of river salinity.

Reference to the Gutteridge report shows that Dishar Creek evaporation basin at full capacity contributes more than 100,000 tons of salt annually to the Murray River. So, it is high time the Government announced what it intends to do in this direction. This problem could be solved, although it may be costly to do so. This water could be sent out into the country, well away from the river, where it would not do any further damage. I know that Geosurveys of Australia Proprietary Limited has carried out work to try to find a suitable area in which to create a basin well back from the river. If this water was used for irrigating pastures, it would not be necessary to have a basin along the river. There is adequate room in the country back from the river for pasture development. As the Minister knows, the average annual rainfall in that area is only 8in.; consequently, this water could be put to valuable use, and it would also relieve the danger of having to release evaporation basins into the river during the critical summer months.

We had this unfortunate circumstance earlier this year at the height of the irrigation period when the Berri basin had to be released into the river. There was a flow into the Murray at that time of only 1 500 cusecs, and the department recognizes that these basins should not be released into the river unless there is a flow of over 10 000 cusecs, similar to what we have today. The Berri basin was brim-full which meant that the basin either overflowed into the river or the water was released. This created many problems for the people downstream, especially in the Waikerie area where the salinity level had increased considerably.

As long as the basins remain along the banks of the river, the irrigators, the people of Adelaide and the industrial areas of Port Pirie and Whyalla will be faced with this permanent danger of having to release these basins

into the river at a critical time. Enormous damage can be caused through a sudden rise in salinity, and any member who has had anything to do with irrigation will realize the problems that it can create. I should be pleased if the Minister of Works could supply me with details of a proposal for a plan to remove these basins. They must be removed; they cannot stay there forever. These basins probably represented the easiest way out when they were first established there. However, the time has now come when the demand for Murray water is such that the basins must be removed to protect all users of the river.

The other point I wish to make is the Government's attitude in regard to rain damage in the river area over the past two years. In most instances, growers can survive one bad year, but we have had two bad years consecutively, so that growers who produced predominantly sultanas and currants have been severely affected. In a letter I wrote on April 27 to the Premier, I stated, in part:

Growers producing predominantly currants, sultanas, and certain peach varieties are the worst affected by the rain damage. Since the losses incurred are due to an "act of God" and are in no way associated with the efficiency or management of the grower, I believe the Government has a direct responsibility to meet or partially meet, depending on the circumstances, the Government and Renmark Irrigation Trust water rates of those growers faced with economic ruin.

The Minister of Lands offered to defer water rates for a year but this, in itself, is not the answer, as the following year some growers will be faced with two years rates and charges. This situation must be approached in a similar manner to that of floods, storms or fire disasters, with direct assistance to enable formerly viable growers to re-establish. I stress "formerly viable growers", because my main concern is for such growers. Without direct assistance we could lose these growers who operate in a good decentralized industry. In reply to my letter to the Premier, the Minister of Lands wrote on May 22, as follows:

You will recall that in reply to an earlier letter which you wrote to me I said that it has been the policy of this department to assist growers in financial difficulties by agreeing to deferment of charges in appropriate cases and circumstances. Any grower who was unable to meet his commitments to the department should make application through the department's district officer giving full details of his financial position whereupon each individual case would be considered on its merits.

The question of deferment of water rates in the Renmark irrigation district is, of course, a matter for the Renmark Irrigation Trust to consider. The Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, provides that loans may be made to primary producers in necessitous circumstances as a result of natural calamities such as drought, frost, fire, flood, etc. to enable them to continue in the business of primary production. Advances bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers at the time of making the advance. Any fruitgrower who considers he qualifies for assistance under this Act may apply for a loan to provide carry-on finance. Applications will be considered on their merits on an individual basis.

The Government is able to make direct grants to growers in necessitous circumstances if it desires. Section 5 (1) (c) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act refers to "direct grants of money to primary producers in necessitous circumstances". The Government is able, if it wishes, to make direct grants to assist these primary producers. Of the growers who have approached me about this problem, some have been young couples who have tried to establish themselves on fruit blocks within the last two or three years, who have put all their savings into the

property, who have borrowed what they could from the bank or a packing shed (or both) and who now find that, as a result of two bad years, they cannot carry on and that additional finance is not available to them through normal channels.

For such growers to qualify under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act they must first exhaust all other avenues of finance. Their normal channels are banks and packing sheds. Once he has exhausted all other avenues of finance without success, a grower is regarded as being no longer a viable unit. He does not qualify under the Act if, in the Minister's view, there is no strong likelihood of his being able to become a viable unit within a given period. This is not necessarily the fault of management or anyone else, but it is the problem that a primary producer, especially a fruitgrower, sometimes runs into. Soft fruits can be readily damaged by rain: last January and February, we had about 5in. of rain, which is about two-thirds of the annual average rainfall in that area, right at the critical time when the currants, sultanas, and certain peach varieties were just reaching maturity. Therefore, if a grower has already exhausted all forms of finance other than any available by approaching the Government, he has virtually reached the end of his tether, and I consider that this is why few applications have been made under this Act.

Recently the department has produced an application form that fruitgrowers can use to make application, but before that time the application form available under the Act did not relate to fruitgrowing. It was concerned basically with wheatgrowing, woolgrowing, barleygrowing, and dairying. Consequently, until about three weeks ago there was virtually no way in which a fruitgrower could apply under this Act, and I will be surprised if any applications that have been made are approved, because in my opinion they would not come within the terms laid down in the Act. I would ask the Premier, any other member of Cabinet, or anyone else to go to that area and personally delve into the financial problems that some of these people face.

The well established grower may have had a loss of \$5,000 or \$6,000 this year or last year but, if he can still get finance from his bank, he can carry on in that way. That is the luck of the game. My major concern is about the young grower, the good solid grower who now cannot carry on. I sincerely ask the Government to delve into this matter. I can supply particulars of individual cases of several growers to any member of the Government who is willing to go there, examine this matter, and find out whether some money can be made available to ensure that we do not lose important members of this decentralized industry.

To have aggregation of properties would mean a reduction of population in this country area. I think there are between 25,000 and 30,000 people in the Riverland area at present, and we certainly do not want the population to decrease merely because of rain damage or any other national disaster over which the growers have no control.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The first grievance I wish to raise is about State finances. I am surprised that the Treasurer cannot release the financial statement of the Revenue Account for May. Normally, a financial statement for one month is available in the first seven or eight days of the following month but this is June 21 and we have not received the figures for May. One suspects that something is drastically wrong, that the Government is embarrassed, or that there is some other reason, such as a pending election, that the Government is using for the delay in releasing the figures.

Recently the Treasurer stated that the proposed deficit of about \$7,500,000 would be about \$5,000,000 at the end of this financial year, and it is no surprise that the deficit will be reduced, because we find that the collection of stamp duties shown in the April figures is almost to Budget. In the Budget estimate, the State proposed to raise \$25,000,000 from stamp duties. At the end of April it had raised \$24,772,000. With two months remaining, it is reasonable to assume that this figure will be exceeded by at least \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000. Also, collections of land tax are almost to Budget, standing at \$9,882,000 at the end of April. Whereas we expected to collect \$11,000,000 in succession duties, we had collected \$9,735,000 to the end of April.

Gift duty collections are more than the Budget estimate, and receipts from transport licences also exceed the Budget estimate by about \$1,000. The State proposed to collect a total in taxation for the year of \$107,781,000 and at the end of April it had received \$95,181,000. Receipts for the month of April were \$9,700,000 and, assuming that receipts for the last two months of the financial year are at the same rate as for April, the Government's receipts will exceed the Budget estimate by about \$6,800,000.

Mr. Duncan: That's good housekeeping.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, it is good housekeeping by being able to keep costs at a fair and reasonable level, but the Government has been fortunate that the high rate of inflation has contributed to increased income. We know that land transactions have added considerably to the stamp duties collections.

This brings me to another point in relation to the State Taxes Department. If any honourable member had visited that office recently, he would have been appalled at the working conditions there. The office is overcrowded and understaffed. Officers are working under extreme pressure, so much so that in one section the shortage of chairs and desks is such that officers are virtually playing musical chairs. As one officer leaves the office or attends to someone at the counter, another takes his chair to attend to his duties.

It is appalling that the State Government will receive income of more than \$25,000,000, much more than the Budget estimate, from stamp duties, yet the staff there are working under probably the worst conditions applying to any State Government department. I appeal to the Treasurer to act immediately to find alternative accommodation for the State Taxes Department to ensure that officers working there are given fair and reasonable working conditions and also to ensure that the public is afforded fair and reasonable conditions when they visit this office to pay money to the State.

I also consider that, in addition to the shocking working conditions, the staff is required to use obsolete equipment in embossing documents. This relates particularly to adjudged stamping of various documents and, because of poor working conditions and the fact that the office is understaffed, the normal stamping of documents is now taking several days, whereas in previous months one could get virtually same-day service. The Government has an obligation to take immediate action about the position. If members of the Government do not believe me, I challenge them to make an inspection. I, as a former bank officer, would not tolerate my staff working in such conditions.

I would not work in those conditions, and I think we are fortunate to have public servants in this department who are obliging and do everything they can to assist the public, even though they have to endure these appalling conditions.

I believe that a white-collar worker should be allowed at least 100sq.ft. of working space. These conditions have been recommended, but I am surprised that the Labor Government does not pursue that policy. In almost every Government department, but particularly in the State Taxes Department, a better reception area and better accommodation for visitors are needed. I visited this department some time ago, and three officers and three desks were confined in an area 10ft. x 12ft.; two extra chairs were brought in so that no-one could enter or leave the room. Also, there was insufficient space on the desks on which to place our documents. I appeal to the Government to take immediate action concerning this department.

The housing shortage is highlighted more in my district now than ever before. Rental accommodation is needed in this State, and the Government must encourage the Housing Trust to increase the building of rental houses. My largest file would contain copies of letters to the General Manager of the trust, but almost every reply I receive, no matter how heart-breaking and deserving the case may be, indicates a wait of three years or 31 years. It is about time that the Government carried out its previous promises and did something about this shortage.

I believe that the Premier rushed into acquiring the site of Monarto, at a time when many people considered that there was the chance to move the Adelaide Airport. To people living in my district the airport is nothing but a jolly nuisance. It is time that an international airport was established in South Australia, but it should be established some distance from the metropolitan area. The site at Monarto would have been ideal, but the Premier was not willing to let that happen.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I hope that I shall be able to speak later in the Address in Reply debate when I can refer to my other grievances. However, before speaking about grievances, I thank the Government for its co-operation in asking in the first place that the Supply Bill be allowed to proceed and then the two major Bills required to be introduced be debated as soon as possible. I thank my colleagues for accepting that request and abiding by it and not mounting a grievance debate on the Supply Bill. It was not an instruction but a request in both instances, and as Opposition Whip I appreciate the co-operation of the Government, my Leader, and my colleagues.

Also, I appreciate the Government's approach this afternoon in not criticizing my colleagues for expressing grievances, as this is the only reasonable chance we have had to do so, because of the passage of Bills that the Government requested be passed early in this short session. My main complaint now is that the Government has a double standard in relation to land values. I ask Government members to consider what their attitude as citizens would be if they had read in a newspaper that the Premier would control prices of allotments, and allow an increase of about 7 per cent a year while, at the same time they received an account from the Valuer-General for the unimproved valuation of their allotment, involving increases of up to 90 per cent for the last three years.

In my district the highest increase was 30 per cent for unimproved allotments. This is a Government department, and a Government officer has placed this increased value on land in the Hills area. At the same time the Premier states that he wants to control land prices so that the increase in value will be no more than 7 per cent a year. That seems to me to be a double standard, because if we are looking for an example to be set it should come from a Government department. Other speakers in the debate have referred to the Government's selling land it owned

to the highest bidder at prices well in excess of the profit margin that the Premier suggested should be realized by private enterprise.

Mr. Coumbe: And even above the Valuer-General's valuation.

Mr. EVANS: That is so. Land prices have escalated too far recently, and the only solution is to have about 50 per cent more allotments on the market than is required by the demand. This would stop speculation, although there will always be speculation in select areas, as that cannot be stopped. At present the South Australian Railways is showing a loss of \$20,000,000 a year. It has 8,800 employees, equalling a loss of \$2,250 a year or more than \$40 a week for each one. I do not suggest that it is absolutely necessary for the Railways Department to be a complete paying proposition, but I have no doubt that we have allowed the total railway system to reach a low level. This is the fault not only of a Labor Government but is also the fault of previous Liberal and Country League Governments. However, the present Government now has the chance to make changes.

The stage has been reached in which a person does not admit that he works in the Railways Department, because he is not proud of the fact that the department is considered in a poor light by most people. That situation is not the fault of rank and file employees, but is the fault of those who have the power to make necessary recommendations for changes. People employed on the permanent way staff receive poor salaries on which they have difficulty in maintaining their families. At the same time, we have a poor system of the total administration of the department, which is over-burdened with too much top wood and insufficient professional staff concerned with business management and similar sections to overcome the difficulties. We cannot afford to continue to lose \$20,000,000 a year, or \$100,000,000 in five years, representing the cost of seven Modbury Hospitals or 20 high schools in each year. The losses in this one department would cover the cost of building 20 of the largest types of high school constructed today.

I appreciate the support I received from the Government and I hope members opposite appreciate that we have tried, in the main, to abide by the request made. We realize a great deal of time has been taken up in this grievance debate, but it is the only opportunity available to members on this side in such a short session when only two financial and two non-financial measures are being dealt with.

Motion carried.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The statements of the Treasurer are rather revealing. There is an attempt by him to suggest that the premonition of the Opposition at the last election that we were staring at a \$15,000,000 deficit was scaremongering. The Treasurer, however, is on record as having said in Canberra that the deficit was approaching \$10,000,000, and subsequently he was reported as saying that it was likely to be \$13,500,000. We acknowledge that he had said initially that he expected a Budget deficit of \$7,500,000.

The document presented is interesting in several ways. For the benefit of the House I shall quote from it under the heading "Revenue Budget 1972-73". The quotation is as follows:

On August 31 last, I presented to the House a Revenue Budget which provided for a deficit of \$7,500,000. The costs associated with decisions taken subsequently on over-award and service pay increases, metropolitan employment producing works, and drought relief (upon which I commented fully when submitting Supplementary Estimates

last November), led to the possibility that, in the absence of other factors, the full year's deficit could be as high as \$13,500,000.

All departments were directed to implement stringent economies, consistent with continued efficient operation, and to defer expenditures where possible, and during the latter part of the year the results of these measures have become apparent. The indications are presently that savings in general departmental operation may total more than \$3,000,000.

This immediately raised questions in my mind and it must surely raise similar questions in the minds of all thinking people. If economies of this nature can be effected without disruption of the projects of this Government, were the original projects or the original sums made available for them unreal? We were told earlier this week that the projects have not been disrupted, but we wonder whether they have been. What was that \$3,000,000 to be spent on if it can now, by one or two notches in the belt, be brought back to help the deficit situation? No member on this side would like to see a \$13,000,000 deficit and I am pleased to know that economies to the extent of \$3,000,000 have been effected, but it is extremely important that we should receive an assurance that the, budgeting measures taken in future will ensure that the money is to be well spent and that it needs to be spent.

One wonders then whether there have been economies because projects to be implemented in the interests of the people have been held back. Contractors say that, on many occasions, they have put in tenders by the normal procedures and even though subsequently they found that theirs was the lowest tender and normally they could have expected to get the contract, still no contract was let and the matter has been the subject of more and more delay. Are we seeing a series of economies brought about by denying permission for projects to proceed? Perhaps the Treasurer and others may say that we are talking about Loan funds and that most capital works come from this sector. However, the servicing by officers and certain other expenditure could be contained within this economy of \$3,000,000 would have applied in this interval of time.

The Treasurer has not revealed over what period of time these economies have been effected. Has it been in the past two months or the past four months, or does it go back over a period of time beyond six months? Has it applied only since the Commonwealth Labor Government came in and sent out the message that no more funds would be made available to the States? Does it go back to the time when the Premiers were denied the opportunity of seeking additional Commonwealth funds at the Canberra conference? What is the date from which this economy has been effected? From that answer, if we ever get it, we could work out some revealing details. We come now to the revelations of the Treasurer in the next paragraph, in which he states:

The previously worrying situation has also been relieved by some unexpected increases in receipts, particularly in stamp duties and water rates.

I remember when, in 1972, a Bill was before this House in relation to conveyancing and matters associated with motor vehicle charges. At that time it was clearly indicated to the Government that the measures contemplated would return a much greater sum than had been claimed. Although that opinion was not acceptable to the Government in this place, amendments were accepted subsequently in another place and then brought to this House and accepted here because discussion between members in another place and Treasury officials revealed that the measures introduced by the Treasurer clearly were not a clear

sample of the type of transactions which would be involved and did not reveal the sum to be expected. Members who have been here in previous years will recall what occurred with regard to rural land tax. When the Government introduced a Bill to deal with this matter, the return was supposed to be \$1,100,000 but, within six or seven sitting days, an amending Bill was introduced because, on checking the details, it had been found that the return would be more like \$1,250,000. Something is wrong somewhere if we are continually to have incorrect assessments made in cases of this type.

The Treasurer has said that, because of the long summer resulting in a larger than normal use of excess water, there will be an increase in water rate revenue of about \$2,000,000 on what was estimated. That is an easy way of explaining the extra \$2,000,000. I wonder whether it is as simple as that, especially when we consider that water rates and rebate rates have increased. Whereas the cost of rebate water was previously 35c a thousand gallons, it is now 40c a thousand gallons. The excess water rate, which was previously 35c, was subsequently increased to 40c a thousand gallons. This extra sum of \$2,000,000 has come from the pockets of all property owners in South Australia, including the little people who were supposed not to be affected. How much of this extra money is the result of the original calculation being incorrect? Obviously the increase of \$5,000,000 from stamp duties associated with property conveyances, and the \$2,000,000 from water rates must be considered in connection with the \$8,500,000 over-estimate. The Treasurer's document states:

These, together with other smaller increases, are expected to bring total receipts to a figure of about \$8,500,000 above the original estimate.

We shall be interested to see just what the actual sum is above \$8,500,000 when the final figures are available. Normally members expect to have access to accounts up to May 31 long before today's date. Those on the mailing list usually receive accounts by the 9th or 10th of the month following the month in question.

Mr. Burdon: What about veterinary services and medical fees?

Dr. EASTICK: I will perform a veterinary service on the honourable member in a moment; he might progress thereafter in an entirely different tone. My point is that today is the 21st, yet we still do not have access to the accounts of the State up to May 31, 1973. What revelation would there be in those accounts to be considered in conjunction with the figures given by the Treasurer? As I have said before, the people of South Australia have been over-taxed and over-rated by the Government. The figures in this case clearly indicate that what I have said previously is correct and that the Treasurer, in the measures he has introduced, has pulled the wool over the eyes of many people in South Australia. The final figures will be most interesting.

L will not go into the percentage increases in all cases, but the cost of many items has been increased by 400 per cent, and of some by 500 per cent. In 1962, the fee for removal of a caveat was \$2, and in 1972 it had increased to \$10, an increase of 500 per cent. Each registration fee, after the first, with regard to an instrument that purports to deal with more than one piece of land included in any title, has increased from \$1 to \$4—a 400 per cent increase. These are minor increases, but there have been major increases that have affected commerce and industry and all transactions in this State. Today's *Australian* reports that, since the Commonwealth Labor Government came to power in December, food prices have

increased by an average of 10 per cent. In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Treasurer referred to the Public Buildings Department, and one of the major factors contributing to the over-expenditure for which this Bill will provide appears to be the increase in the price level of materials. Certainly, these prices have increased considerably. In the case of a small scout hall in the Paradise area, eight months ago the quote for its erection was \$13,800, whereas a quote received last week is \$14,900, an increase of \$1,100 in eight months.

Spokesmen for the building industry have said that inflation is presently running at 18 per cent. For example, a house costed 12 months ago at \$14,600 is now costed at \$16,700. There is a direct relationship between these increases and wage rises, yet we have heard nothing from the Treasurer to suggest that he will attempt to tie wages or alter the situation with regard to wage increases. The sums we are dealing with at present are considerable. We do not object to these Estimates being passed, because we recognize that they are necessary to fulfil promises and contracts, but they will increase as time goes by as a result of the activities of this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues.

There is no indication that any tangible approach is being made to help the people whom the Government claims to represent. There are many opportunities for the Government to indicate clearly its concern for the people and to ensure that measures brought before this House are properly costed. If those opportunities are taken there will not be doubts as to whether the figures are justifiable. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I find it very difficult to please the Leader of the Opposition, but that no doubt is in the nature of things.

Dr. Eastick: It may be mutual.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may be true, although I appreciate that the Leader has to raise something before the House even though he does not have terribly much to raise. The Leader originally complained we were facing a large deficit, and then he found that we were not; so, he complained about that! I wish to refer to the two bases on which we went into further deficit; one was the provision of metropolitan unemployment relief works at a time when the Liberal Commonwealth Government had adamantly refused the request of Liberal and Labor State Governments for metropolitan unemployment relief programmes.

Dr. Eastick: Will they continue after June 30?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Partially. The matter here now is that we had to go into extra deficit to provide work for people who did not have it, while the Liberal Government in Canberra refused relief to people in urban areas although it gave it to people in the limited area of South Australia that it considered to be rural.

Mr. Becker: You got the biggest hand-out, overall.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We got the least hand-out for unemployment relief programmes. We did not get money for an unemployment relief programme from the Liberal Commonwealth Government and we had to budget for it by an extra deficit. I brought in the Supplementary Estimates, and the Leader did not protest about it. No-one voted against it.

Dr. Tonkin: Are we getting value for money?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let us deal with the financial aspect of it. I turn now to a further matter causing a deficit—the inevitable wage increases that took place as a result of arbitration tribunal decisions and the decisions of a Commonwealth Liberal Government in

relation to over-award payments which we had to match. Those were the things that caused us to go into extra deficit. When we were faced with this, we had been told by the Liberal Commonwealth Government not to budget for extra wage costs and we were told that we would be met in February on that score.

Mr. Becker: Wouldn't Gough do it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; he said he was not ready to meet us and he said there would be a proper appreciation of our financial position this financial year. Further, he said he was willing to put the normal Premiers' Conference forward for that purpose, but it so happened that, when the Premiers met him, they did not ask for the date to be brought forward; instead, they asked for it to be on the normal date, because various financial matters had intervened which meant that it would no longer be necessary for us to have the earlier date. I have referred to the two bases of the extra deficit; it was not a question of the Government's being spendthrift. The bases were known and clear. At the time we had to go into further deficit I instructed the departments to look to economies.

Dr. Tonkin: When was that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last year. I am surprised that the Leader has suggested that it was strange that we did this, because honourable members chided us and said, "What economies is the Government making?" The member for Mitcham, then a member of the Leader's Party, demanded to know what the Government's economies were; he now sees that there was \$3,000,000 worth. Members opposite said that departments were slowing down some of their programmes; it did not mean that the programmes were originally extravagant, but we had to cut our coat according to the cloth we had. Members opposite have been talking today about the necessity of the Government's spending more money in some areas; one member opposite talked about the need to improve conditions in the State Taxes Department. I agree that the conditions should be improved; we have programmes to improve the conditions, but we had to slow down our programmes.

Dr. Eastick: What will be the effect on the escalation of tender prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the Leader expect that we should have gone into the kind of deficit about which he has been thundering so that we could let contracts earlier? As soon as one gives an explanation to the Leader he thinks up a contradictory objection to the one he has just had answered. A little bit of consistency from the Opposition front bench might be sensible. Regarding Budgets, I suggest that the Leader talk to the honourable member next to him, because there has been no Budget in all the time I have been here the final result of which has been within millions of what was originally estimated, and every Treasurer can vouch for that fact. In fact, the South Australian Treasury is frequently complimented because it gets so near to its estimates.

Our Treasury officers are known to be the most competent in Australia in making Budget forecasts. I naturally rely on them, and I pay a tribute to them. Revenue has now come in as a result of some seasonal factors and as a result of a change in a number of transactions, including land transactions, that have altered the financial results. The estimates we made originally were on the basis of the existing rate at which such transactions were going.

Mr. Coumbe: Will that slow down next year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may well do so, but I point out that, although there have been protests this afternoon about land transactions, since the announcement I made on land prices the amount of land coming on to

the market in South Australia has quite clearly increased, judging from the advertisements in the *Advertiser*. The supply to the market has increased, and that is a good thing.

Dr. Eastick: Was it a calculated risk on your part to do that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, as the Leader will see from the report of the land prices committee of inquiry that I expect to table next week. Frankly, I do not accept the Leader's strictures, because I think that the course which the Government has followed in this matter has been prudent and proper.

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

QUESTIONS

PRICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when he will table the report of the land prices committee of inquiry? Only a moment ago, the Premier said that the report was forthcoming and would be tabled. Will it be next Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday and will it be a printed report that will be made available to all members?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report is the one that led the Government to take the action it has already taken on land prices. Some of the committee's recommendations have been published, but the whole report has not been published, because it was necessary to take certain action before the entire report was published, otherwise some unfortunate public results might have ensued. However, I am satisfied now that the whole of the report should be published; indeed, the majority view of the committee's members is that it should be published. I intend to table the report next Wednesday. I do not expect the House to sit next Tuesday, as I assume that, at that stage of proceedings, we will be waiting for the result of the deliberations in another place on the two constitutional Bills that have just passed this House. I expect the House to sit next Wednesday, and I intend to table the report then.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is aware that the latest figures released by the Commonwealth Statistician indicate that for last month the increase in food prices in Adelaide was more than double that of the national average? Will he also ask whether his colleague is aware that it has been suggested in some quarters that the increased charges made by the South Australian Meat Corporation have been a significant factor in the substantial increase in the cost of meat? I am sure the Minister will agree that, if this is the case, it is a serious matter and should be investigated immediately. I therefore ask the Minister to request his colleague to inquire into this urgent matter and supply a report for members as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do that for the honourable member.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry tell the House what action, if any, will flow from the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the advantages or disadvantages of worker participation in industry and commerce? This is a vital matter for this State's trade union movement. At last it seems that, if the Government is willing to act on this report, the workers of this State will take a rightful place in industry and in determining the policy of the industry for which they work and for which they produce immense profits.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not think there is any need for me to go into the recommendations and the advantages and disadvantages of the report of the committee that inquired into the direct participation by workers in industry and commerce in the State. However, Cabinet has decided to adopt the committee's recommendations. As a first step to encourage the introduction of worker participation in management, on a voluntary basis, in the form of joint consultative committees, and job enrichment schemes, and to provide advice and information on all aspects of worker participation, a small section is being established in the Labour and Industry Department. Positions of executive officer to take charge of the unit, project officer, and research officer were advertised nationally last weekend. When the appointments are made these officers will seek the co-operation of management, employer associations, and trade unions in experiments of both joint consultative committees and job enrichment schemes, both in Government departments and instrumentalities as well as in private industry. They will also provide guidelines for the establishment of joint consultative committees and assist in their establishment. The Premier has previously announced the Government's objective that employees generally should have the opportunity of greater involvement, interest in their work and relief where possible from the monotony of repetitive tasks. They are the main recommendations of the committee, and we hope that the department will have this small unit established soon.

RECOVERY GROUPS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Attorney-General find out from the Minister of Health the extent to which this Government supports recovery groups in the State? If the Government does not support them, will it favourably consider doing so? I refer to a letter that I have received, signed by several recognized leaders of the Kangaroo Island community, including a local medical officer. The signatories endorse the work of recovery and know that it fulfils the needs of many people, resulting in their personal stability and usefulness within society. These people go on to say that recovery is an essential service for many people in this State. More specifically, they refer to a request that they have made (and I call on the Government to consider this paragraph in the letter specifically) that a full-time salaried field officer be made available in the State, to co-ordinate with other groups throughout South Australia working on recovery.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health.

BICYCLE TRACKS

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is aware of the increasing use of bicycles in the Adelaide metropolitan area and whether it is also aware that this mirrors the trend in overseas countries? In view of this trend, will the Minister say what proposals the Government has to provide special cycle paths, lanes, routes or trails, and will he also say whether the Government is making any provision for such facilities in new areas of Adelaide and at Monarto? It has seemed to me for some time that the motorist has been pampered and favoured at the expense of other road users. The Americans, possibly in the light of their impending energy crisis, have gone bicycle crazy in recent years with restricted paths in new suburban developments in San Francisco and New York, a Washington commuter route that has an exclusive cycle lane, and in Boston, where a 1971 Bicycle Transportation Act allows highway funds to be spent on bikeways. In certain

Swedish cities, 25 per cent of all journeys are on cycles, because the city centre is restricted to buses, delivery vehicles and people on two wheels or on foot. Holland is, of course, renowned for its cyclomania. Such countries have grasped the obvious that, whereas the motor car is noisy, polluting, space-taking, expensive and energy-consuming, the bicycle is quiet, clean, space-saving and economical. I have been told that 16 bicycles can be parked in one large car parking space. In this context, we are left far behind, with one or two enlightened exceptions, such as on the Sydney Harbor bridge and in the case of the group bicycle scheme at the Australian National University. In view of the world-wide trends and the obvious advantages to society in encouraging the use of bicycles, I ask the Minister to give this matter urgent attention.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate the point the honourable member has raised. We are fully aware of the trend (I think that this is the right word to use) towards bicycle transportation and, as a result, the Director-General of Transport and his staff in the Planning and Development Branch of the department is now working on the proposal. I hope that we will have something more specific soon.

MIGRANT HOUSING

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether the Government will continue to support the scheme whereby housing developers in South Australia have an office in London, arrange for selected migration to South Australia, and use this migration as a way to sell their houses? I raise this matter because of the other matter that I mentioned in the grievance debate this afternoon, namely, the matter of migration to South Australia, which had been encouraged previously by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to assist to fill positions in the work force at Whyalla, and I have referred to the Commonwealth Government's apparent decision to refuse to allow that company to continue to use that scheme. It seems that what is in essence a similar scheme enables housing developers to arrange migration from England to Australia so that the developers can sell houses to the South Australian work force. There seems to me to be no difference in principle between the two schemes, and, following my remarks in the grievance debate, I ask the Premier what is his Government's attitude to this scheme, over which I understand the Government has some oversight.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am interested in the impelling motives of the honourable member and I wonder whether what he has said could have anything to do with preselection of a Liberal and Country League candidate for the Mitcham District. As the honourable member has said, there is a scheme by which the State Government supports approved developers in South Australia in the matter of assisted passages under the Commonwealth Government and State Government joint migration scheme and under which the people who come here must be properly accommodated, as specified, until they can obtain housing and employment. All people who have come under that scheme have found employment within a short time. That scheme will continue, but of course within the limits of the newly-announced Commonwealth migration programme. The Commonwealth migration programme is not now at large in the importation of migrants from those countries with whom we previously had bilateral agreements. The present position is that the States are required to provide the Commonwealth

with an assessment of the need of the States for migrants in certain occupations, and where the national need is established on the basis of the States' submissions, it will be possible to obtain assisted passages of migrants who fit the other criteria now required by the Commonwealth and who fit within the employment categories set out in the national need statement. The people who come under the State-assisted programme would have to fit into that programme as well. At present an assessment is being made by the State of our area of national need for people in certain employment categories, and I expect that this will be established shortly to the Commonwealth Government, with which we are in constant consultation on the matter.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Works say what action is being taken by the Electricity Trust to meet the increasing demand in the South-East? My attention has been drawn to a statement made by a spokesman for the Electricity Trust yesterday that power consumption in the South-East has increased by 8 per cent to 10 per cent above the rate used at this time last year. It was stated that the trust was meeting the demand in the South-East by importing more power from the Adelaide metropolitan area, particularly from the Torrens Island power station. The spokesman said that if power consumption kept on increasing at its present rate facilities in the South-East would not be adequate. Has the Minister any comment about that statement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that a second 132,000-volt transmission line from Tailem Bend to Mount Gambier was commissioned in September last year, and the facilities for supplying power to the South-East are sufficient to meet demands for the present and for the foreseeable future. If and when additional facilities are required they will be installed, but there is no reason for me to believe (and I am certain that this is the case) that there is any likelihood that we will not be able to meet the demand.

DEPARTMENTAL ECONOMIES

Mr. ALLEN: The Premier said this afternoon that rigorous economies had been implemented in all Government departments. Can the Minister of Transport say whether they have been carried out in the Highways Department and, if they have, whether they have been implemented in the administration section of the department or in the roadwork section?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The short reply is "Yes".

BLUE ARMY

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Attorney-General inform the House of any knowledge he has of the recent activities and management of the organization calling itself the Blue Army? Recently I have had a spate of complaints from constituents who have called on this organization for help only to find that the so-called tradesmen had no qualifications, with valuable property being destroyed as a consequence, and that charges were high. Also, an arrogant attitude had been adopted to anyone who had the temerity to question the management. As the Attorney-General was overseas at the time on important business, I

rang the Fraud Squad. I do not intend to disclose the information I received, but it was rather disquieting. I would appreciate the Attorney-General's interest in this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have received a report from the Police Department concerning this matter, and I am having further investigations made. If I am able to make a statement, I shall inform the honourable member.

Dr. Tonkin: Will you make it in the House?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If I can, yes.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier investigate the manner in which building regulations applying to farm buildings are operating? I have been contacted by an engineering firm whose main trade for many years has been erecting hay and implement sheds and other farm buildings. Apparently, the new regulations are causing concern: first, it would seem the regulations are too stringent for the type of structure this firm has erected for years although it has a 100 per cent safety record with its buildings. Councils are administering the Act in different ways, and in some council areas this firm can construct buildings such as it has been constructing satisfactorily for at least 40 years, but in other council areas it is required to lodge calculations on an engineering basis.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It depends on the building inspector, doesn't it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems to depend on how the council interprets the regulations. From my knowledge of the buildings, some of the recommendations of council engineers have been ridiculous. This firm is being inconvenienced in what was a satisfactory operation, resulting in considerable difficulty for people living on the land, as in some cases it cannot erect the type of shed it has been erecting for many years. A letter from this firm states:

Therefore, for the time being it appears that business of fabricating buildings for rural use could be in jeopardy, particularly in the council areas where the Building Act is being enforced. Also, ultimately one can even consider the future viability of a venture such as ours.

Will the Premier look into this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss it with my colleague and let the honourable member know the result.

CAMELS DESTRUCTION ACT

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Premier say to which of his Ministers he has entrusted the administration of the Camels Destruction Act, 1925-1926? Section 4 of that Act allows licences to be issued pursuant to section 245 (2) (c) of the Crown Lands Act, 1915. Before the Premier corrects me, I hasten to explain that I am aware that that is also the wording of section 244 of the Crown Lands Act, 1929, as amended. Knowing the keen interest that members opposite take in this legislation, I intend to place on notice the following question:

How many licences have been issued under section 245 of the Crown Lands Act 1915—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is asking a Question without Notice, and therefore cannot give notice of a Question on Notice on which the Question without Notice is based.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir, for your guidance. I intend to put a Question on Notice, so it is necessary for me to know to which Minister the question should be addressed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I confess that what the honourable member has told me has enlightened me on a subject on which I was previously completely ignorant.

I imagine that the relevant Minister is the Minister of Lands. Since that is only an imagining, I will have to inquire, and I will let the honourable member know.

PARK LANDS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think my question should go to the Premier, as it is a matter of policy, but his deputy, the Minister of Works, may feel that he should answer it instead. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to have removed from the east park lands the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot? My question arises from a reference in this morning's paper that jogged my recollection of the discussion that has taken place in the last few days, and indeed weeks, regarding the alienation of park lands since the foundation of the colony, and the desire of many people that that alienation should cease. Whether it would go as far as the removal of this building, the festival hall and Government House, I do not know.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The festival hall and Government House are not on park lands.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is that so?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are on Government reserve.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought this building would be on park lands. Be that as it may, I should like to know from the Premier what is the Government's attitude to the moves suggested for this purpose. I especially ask him about the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot, because the report states that the council will be asked to take

positive action for its removal so that the land can be incorporated in Rundle Park.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally enough the Government is looking at anything that can be done to return the park lands to their original use. The long-term purpose of this installation is naturally under study by the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: This particular one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, this building. That has been so for some time. At this stage no commitment has been made as to the removal or date, but the matter is the subject of study. Obviously there are some difficulties in the removal, but we are disposed where we can to be helpful to the City Council in its aim of improving the park lands, an aim in which we entirely concur.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, June 27, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 6.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 27, at 2 p.m.